

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 23, 1952

FIVE CENTS

**Horatio Alger as Stalinist Hero:
The 'New Psychology' in Russia**

... page 6

Borg-Warner: Sequel to a Strategy

... page 2

The U.S. Blackmails Bolivian Regime

... page 3

On the South African Landscape

Atomic Subs, Nehru and Speaker Rayburn—



This road sign appears on the barbed-wire fence of a farm facing the Johannesburg-Vereeniging road. Reproduced from the South African Cape Argus, May 23.

**'Make Ourselves Feared,' He Said:
U.S. Policy Succeeds— with Allies**

By GORDON HASKELL

The past two weeks have been somewhat disheartening to the architects of American foreign policy. The trouble is not that Stalinist Russia has gained some advantages on the diplomatic or military field. The real difficulty is that the peoples outside of the areas of Stalinist control continue to show restiveness and balkiness when it comes to accepting the American strategy of defeating Stalinism by almost exclusively military means.

The reluctance of the peoples is reflected, even if in a highly distorted form, in the speeches and actions of their governments. In countries where powerful socialist movements exist, it is reflected much more clearly through the leaders of these movements. And although reluctance to accept one policy is not the same thing as the development of a clear and consistent alternative, it at least indicates a political state of mind from which an alternative policy can crystallize in due course.

In India, Prime Minister Nehru made a speech in parliament in which he urged "the countries of Asia to make it clear to those warring factions, to those great countries, which are so much exercised by passions against each other, that they will not enter the arena of war." He went on to denounce the recent political maneuvers of the Rhee regime in South Korea, and to say that any support of the Rhee regime means "support of the very thing which the United Nations is supposed to stand against."

Atlantic Pact of Colonialists

But Nehru went beyond his usual general denunciations of the warlike preparations and gestures of Russia and the United States, to attack one aspect of the Atlantic Pact. He stated that although he was not opposed to the aim of forming an alliance to resist aggression, the pact had "extended itself apparently as a defense of the colonial possessions of those nations and that is a very serious matter so far as we are concerned." In discussing the refusal of the UN to take up the Tunisian charges against France, Nehru came close to threatening withdrawal from the UN unless this kind of issue were taken up. He said that the refusal to discuss this matter had so annoyed the Asian and African nations that the time might come when they would feel happier in their own countries than in the world body.

In Europe, the French government threw a real scare into the State Department by releasing to the press a cabinet decision in favor of four-power talks over Germany.

This seemed to be in direct contradiction to the American policy of refusing any further discussion with the Russians about the unification of Germany until they have agreed to have an international commission survey the extent of political freedom in Eastern Germany.

After Acheson had talked separately to the British and French ambassadors in Washington, a French cabinet spokesman "reinterpreted" the stand of that body to the effect that all they had been talking about was a conference of some subordi-

(Turn to last page)

One-Third of Business Activity Is Propped by War Economy

"One third of the nation's total business activity now springs from the defense buildup." That startling statement is the keynote of an Associated Press report quoting "top government economists."

They said that "before Korea, only about 7 to 10 per cent of business stemmed from national security spending," and now that share has risen to over 30 per cent.

According to the AP, the government economists "asked not to be quoted by name," but they made comments like this:

"It's perfectly obvious that, without the defense program, we would be in a recession at the present time. The only thing holding the economy together at the present level is defense."

The above news item is quoted from the railroad unions' weekly *Labor* for May 31. There is a curious sidelight on that too. The same week, it was heard as part of a news broadcast over the radio station of the New York Times, WQXR; but it never appeared in the *Times* as far as we know.

Yet it points to one of the most important over-all facts about American society today, bar none.

The figure is "startling," as *Labor* says, only because it is somewhat higher than previous estimates. But what it points to is the stage of American capitalism which we have called the Permanent War Economy.

Briefly, it is the stage of the system in which a decisive factor in maintaining the social order becomes production of the means of destruction (war goods), as distinct from (1) the means of production, and (2) the means of consumption. While imperialist war has always been inherent in capitalism, preparation for war now is an integral necessity for the underpinning of the whole economy.

It was this phenomenon which was analyzed in detail in the important series on "The Permanent War Economy" by T. N. Vance which ran in *The New Internationalist* during last year.

While the meager AP dispatch is tantalizing (and it is so partly because of the significant fact that

the government economists "asked not to be quoted by name," as if there was something subversive in the information), it brings new testimony to show that the conclusions drawn by Vance were based on conservative, rather than exaggerated, estimates of the weight of the war economy in modern U. S. capitalism.

Vance concluded: "The Permanent War Economy has provided capitalism with but a temporary respite, while aggravating every phase of the class struggle. There can be no rational or permanent solution to any of the basic problems that beset mankind so long as capitalism or Stalinism exist."

Buffalo's Liberal Party Headed by Labor

Erie County Organization Elects Unionists to Leading Posts

BUFFALO, June 10—At a county committee meeting held here last month the Liberal Party of Erie County elected, to almost all of its top offices, local CIO and AFL leaders and liberals closely identified with the labor movement.

The new officers include leaders of the CIO United Auto Workers, the AFL Teamsters, Motion Picture Operators, Meatcutters and Butchers Unions; as well as members of the CIO Steel Workers, Packinghouse Workers, and the

Not in Stock

The World Assembly for Moral Rearmament met on June 6 at Mackinac Island, Mich., trumpeting the claims of the right-wing "Moral Rearmament" program as a safeguard against the "Communist faith."

They too brought forth their tame ex-Stalinists, in one case an Italian ex-CP member from Milan, Angelo Pasetti, who thanked America for shipping grain to his country.

"But," he added, "you must also send us a superior ideology to Communism, or it will be like sowing wheat in the sea."

But there are no factories in the U. S. which turn out such a superior capitalist product to compete with Stalinism's demagogic appeal, neither under the Marshall Plan nor Point Four. This ex-CP'er is still of the same mind as when he was in the party: that the fight for peace is a matter of American versus Russian exports.

AFL Retail Clerks Unions. The new treasurer is a prominent liberal clergyman, known for his outspoken espousal of labor issues; the new chairman is a prominent local labor attorney.

WELCOME STEP

The former county chairman, who received more than 12,000 votes in the last municipal elections when he ran against both Republicans and Democrats, resigned from the party, after the election of the new officers. He told the press that he had funda-

mental differences with the new labor elements, but declined any further elaboration.

Although still too early to determine whether this important organizational development in the local Liberal Party will lead in the near future to decisive independent political action, it is a step to be welcomed. The Liberal Party of Erie County is now at least the political vehicle of a significant portion of the local labor movement, instead of a mere appendage of the New York organization.

Sequel to Borg-Warner: The High Strategy Flops

If the steel workers want a dubious consolation for their dizzying trip on the Wage Stabilization Board merry-go-round they need only think of the almost forgotten Borg-Warner workers.

It was nine months ago that the United Automobile Workers (CIO) "recessed" its strike against the Borg-Warner company. The union was demanding, among other things, that this firm bargain on a nation-wide basis for all its plants scattered over the country; but a heart-rending appeal from the WSB, endorsed by President Truman, induced the UAW to go back to work temporarily.

In the long leisurely weeks that followed, the WSB proceeded to investigate this major union demand, even going so far as . . . to appoint a special panel to bring in recommendations.

were finally swayed by Reuther's insistence that the union was virtually certain to win its demands if it called off the strike. Why go through a strike and annoy "public opinion," when you can win what you want without it? It was a persuasive argument.

Back at Scratch

The strike was called off. Then for a moment or two it was rumored that the WSB panel, despite Reuther's assurances, was not going to recommend industry-wide bargaining in its report. Special trips . . . more pressure appeals from anxious union leaders . . . sighs of relief as the panel was won over.

The panel recommended

that the basic demand of the union be granted. But this was only a recommendation to the full WSB, which by the way, has itself only the power to make recommendations! The board, presumably, studied the findings of its special panel. It gave itself plenty of time to ponder and probe. And after all this . . . it reversed the panel recommendation and decided not to propose industry-wide bargaining.

On what grounds? In the course of these nine months, it concluded that it had no business making any recommendation at all on this knotty issue.

One complete turn on the WSB cycle leaves the UAW where it started. The strike, meanwhile, is "recessed."

Coast Labor Flexes Its Muscles

By LES WRIGHT

LOS ANGELES, June 13—The coast-wide strike of the Sailors Union of the Pacific (AFL), led by Harry Lundeborg, continues with no early settlement on the horizon. The union demands a 5 per cent increase in hourly wages, increased penalty provisions, and a fourth watch to provide work for more seamen. The *Dispatch*, organ of Bridges' longshore union (ILWU), in its current issue, reiterates its charge that the strike is "ostensibly for these demands" but in reality, it claims, Lundeborg wishes to keep members of the Marine Cooks and Stewards, an independent CP-dominated union, from working, in order to aid the SUP's raiding plans.

Operators of the Los Angeles Transit Lines after a meeting five days ago announced through their union, the AFL Association of Street, Electrical Railway and Motor Coach employees, that a settlement of their wage demands is "remote." They have asked for a 35-cent-per-hour increase. The company offered 18 cents. One union leader said a strike vote may be called on June 16. A recent election supervised by the NLRB resulted in a victory for the AFL union over its challenger, Mike Quill's CIO Transport Workers. Quill, on a visit here,

The last minute waverers

charged that the incumbent union had failed to gain necessary benefits for its members and "tended to keep wage standards for the rest of us" down.

In the construction industry, the strike of 3000 AFL Operating Engineers and 1000 AFL Reinforcing Ironworkers halted more than \$100,000,000 worth of Southern California construction. The union wants a wage increase of 24 to 29 cents an hour. The contractors have offered 19 cents. During this strike, a walkout of 500 members of the AFL Hodcarriers, Local 300, appeared ended when the plastering contractors agreed to an hourly wage boost of 23 cents plus an employer contribution of 7 1/2 cents an hour to a worker welfare program.

RETAIL CLERKS

A strike was authorized by 1700 members of the AFL Retail Clerks, but the walkout is being deferred at the request of a state mediator who is trying to get the union and several chain drug stores to renegotiate. The union seeks a wage increase that will up weekly pay from \$56.50 to \$74. In addition, Local 770, led by Joe DeSilva, demands double-time for Sunday work. They are offering the companies a four-year contract in return for a cost-of-living escalator clause, 4 cents annual improvement, and a more satisfactory health fund.

The ILWU reopened negotiations with four Los Angeles drug firms following a victory over the AFL Teamsters in an NLRB-supervised bargaining-rights election. Demands of the ILWU include the union shop, various fringe benefits, and the other half of a 13-cent hourly boost won last January but subject to the approval of the Wage Stabilization Board. The ILWU charged that the Teamsters' officials tried to win the workers to their union by "redbaiting" according to a *Dispatch* article.

Long Beach employees of the Associated Telephone Company, members of the CIO Communication Workers Union, voted to strike July 1 unless their demands for a new and more favorable contract are accepted. Eighteen ships were made idle in Los Angeles Harbor as the maritime strike spread to deck officers of the AFL Masters, Mates and Pilots Union. The union demands that the Pacific Maritime Association keep full crews of deck officers aboard

LABOR SCOPE

IAM President Calls for New ULPC

"The brief, but real, glorious history of the United Labor Policy Committee deserves to be remembered and respected by all union men," Al Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists told the convention of the Iowa Federation of Labor last month.

The ULPC was formed in late 1950 by representatives of the major union federations as a united front of action to defend labor standards against the wage freeze threatened by the Wage Stabilization Board; it led a walk-out of labor representatives from all war boards in early '51; it forced a serious modification of WSB rulings. Just as it seemed about to begin a new stage in the history of labor unity, the AFL abruptly pulled out of the committee and let it die. But the nine and one-half months of its existence had made an impact on American politics; the resignation of C. E. Wilson as defense mobilizer was its posthumous achievement.

High on the list of ULPC demands was a call for an end to the anti-labor trend in national

domestic policy but it went out of existence without forcing any real change. Hayes speech is a timely reminder of the job still to be done.

"GRAVE MISTAKE"

"Today, with the greatest responsibilities and obligations in our history," he said, "we are faced with the best organized and most formidable opposition we have ever faced. You already know of the organized program of the NAM and other employer groups which is being supported by their reactionary friends in Congress, their controlled press, radio, and television. You know that the objective of this program is to completely shackle organized labor." It was a grave mistake, he concluded, to dissolve the United Labor Policy Committee.

Who has the duty of reuniting labor? "I believe," he said, "the first responsibility lies with the men who now head the various unions. It is a responsibility of the officers. I think we will have little trouble with the rank and file of labor. I know they want it."

The ULPC was formed to meet the wage crisis of 1950-51. Now, a political crisis—the 1952 elections—looms for labor. What threatens is not simply a freeze of wages but a sweeping trend backward in national social policy. Time for a united political committee of all labor.

Three's Not a Crowd

Despite the volume of home-building, there are almost as many American families living in "overcrowded" quarters today as there were in 1940.

So reports the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which says that 5 1/2 per cent of all non-farm dwellers, or about 6,600,000 men, women and children, don't have enough elbow room in their present homes.

This statement must be considered in the light of the fact that "overcrowded," to the agency as well as to private industry surveys, refers to a dwelling where there is more than 1 1/2 persons per room. An apartment of two rooms sheltering three people is not "overcrowded," according to these figures.

ships struck by the SUP. On the legal side of the labor struggle three events took place. The NLRB ruled that the Pacific Molded Products Company was guilty of a "whole string of Taft-Hartley law violations in an effort to avoid unionization by the CIO United Rubber Workers." The decision directed the company to stop using anti-union tactics and to allow workers to choose their own union. The company was accused of offering better wages and working conditions if the workers vote against the union, of attempting to form a company union, and of blaming the NLRB for wage reductions.

SENIORITY

The NLRB also told the Shannon and Simpson Casket Company to bargain collectively with Local 15 of the Upholsterers International Union (AFL). The NLRB examiner "recommended" that the company stop interfering with union bargaining efforts. Within 20 days the NLRB is supposed to issue an order requiring the company to comply.

Union workers with seniority may not "bump" other workers of their own selection, ruled Superior Judge Ellison Meyer. The power of hiring and discharging rests with the employer, the judge said. The UAW, Local 805, was the plaintiff. The winning defendant was the Robertshaw-Fullerton Controls Company.

A federal court suit for \$301,472 damages was filed on June 12 by Sir James Inc., clothing manufacturers, against five labor unions. The suit charges illegal picketing. The company claims that the unions called a strike at its plant on February 20 and "engaged in secondary picketing and boycotting by refusal to transport goods in violation of the California law" banning "hot cargo" and secondary boycott practices. The unions are three locals of the ILWU, the International union itself, and the AFL Teamsters who declined to handle shipments.

SCREEN THE NEWS with LABOR ACTION A sub is \$2 a year—Subscribe now!

Next — A Labor Party!

by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party

25 cents Order from: Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

Marxism in the United States

By LEON TROTSKY 35 Cents Order from Independent Socialist Press 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

U.S. State Department Blackmail Gives Paz An Out Against Nationalization in Bolivia

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, June 11—The new regime in Bolivia headed by the Nationalist MNR has been consolidated with recognition now granted by the United States as well as Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, etc. The state of siege has been lifted by the boss of the Pan-American Union, the State Department in Washington, in spite of the critical situation of the regime in La Paz.

The story is told in the streets here about the "ultimatum" delivered by the State Department to the new Nationalist president of the Bolivian Republic, Paz Estenssoro. As it is retailed in *Lucha Obrera*, organ of the pro-Nationalist POR, the heads of the State Department laid down the following conditions for recognition, sine qua non:

- (1) Remove the "Communists" from the government—that is, remove Lechin, Butron, Nuño Chavez and the other representatives of the Nationalist trade unions.
- (2) Lay aside the program for nationalization of the mines.
- (3) Dissolve the Central Obrera Boliviana, the Bolivian labor federation, which is backing Lechin and his friends in the government.
- (4) Permit the publication of *La Razon*, the paper published by Aramayo, one of the mining magnates of Bolivia, which was silenced by the Nationalists very much as the Peron regime in Argentina suppressed *La Prensa* in Buenos Aires.

LABOR'S DEMAND

This diplomatic pressure from the colossus of the North could be very convenient for Paz Estenssoro, especially after the declarations made by Lechin on May 1. It is a public secret that the difference between Paz Estenssoro and Lechin are very sharp, particularly with regard to nationalization of the mines.

The labor movement of Bolivia, even though it is under Nationalist leadership, has deep revolutionary feelings and it was educated during many years of Marxist teachings; now the Nationalist workers vigorously demand the nationalization of the mines, agrarian reforms, and the destruction of the *Rosca*, the mine owners' circles, as the essential points of the "national revolution." In these demands the Nationalist workers are backed by the supporters of the Stalinist PIR, the Trotskyist POR and all socialist workers.

The mine workers' union and the Central Obrera Boliviana, though under the leadership of Lechin, are very strongly influenced by the socialist and "Marxist" workers, who try to push the government to realize the "program of national revolution." The government's position is made very difficult, because the armed forces have been effectively replaced by the armed workers; the bourgeois parties have lost any importance, and the workers in arms are the sole real political force in the country.

PAZ vs. LECHIN

The people say that President Paz "must obey Lechin," for Lechin talks to the president this way: "Well, if you have 15,000 armed militants of the MNR, I have 70,000 armed mine workers . . ." and: "What were you doing for so long a time in Buenos Aires, while we were fighting against the *Rosca* at home, if you did not draft a law for the nationalization of the mines?" This popular version well reveals, at any rate, the nature of the internal conflict and the alternatives before the "national

revolution" and the MNR. All this is the reason why the diplomatic pressure of the U. S. was a great help toward consolidating Paz Estenssoro's position as against the trade unions. Though Paz is not the best friend of the U. S., he is, I believe, a better friend of Juan Domingo Peron. In all likelihood, also, the U. S. cannot afford to wait much longer for Bolivia's tin; the "cold tin war" brought a political defeat for Washington and ended up with the "Peronist revolution" in Bolivia.

SHOWDOWN POSTPONED

So the complicated question of Washington's "bad neighbor policy" toward Bolivia has been solved in business terms: the Nationalist government of Paz Estenssoro, under pressure, has sold to the Yankees the 30,000 tons of tin which have been stored in Pacific harbors, at the price of \$1.21 per pound, the price which was rejected by the former military government of Bolivia.

This was probably the decisive reason for the granting of recognition by the U. S. government, in spite of the fact that "the Communists" are remaining in the government and the trade unions exert their influence. It is

The shrewd Nationalist leader

quite possible that the cynical foreign minister, Guewara, has promised the Yankees to get rid of the "Communists" at the first opportunity.

It seems that Juan Lechin, the leader of the Nationalist unions and their representative in the cabinet, has lost the battle for hegemony of the "Nationalist Left" in Bolivian policy; his May 1 declaration was pure demagoguery, not forth to appease the workers, and not a serious warning to the Nationalist right that the workers' demands must be met. The question of nationalization was solved by the government very slyly: instead of immediate nationalization, as demanded by the unions in the May Day rallies, it set up a special commission to "study" mine nationalization.

The members of this commission get the very good salary of 50,000 pesos, and all the Nationalist labor leaders are in it. After 90 days the commission is supposed to present the results of its "study" to the cabinet. Thus the basic question of the "national revolution" was postponed and at the same time the supporters of mine nationalization were appeased; and the money will discredit the Nationalist leaders in the eyes of the workers.

MARCHING BACKWARD

On the other hand, the Paz Estenssoro cabinet has decreed state control over mineral exports and foreign trade; the state gets revenue from the sale of minerals, and only the state assigns quotas for production to the mine owners. With these two decrees the workers' demand for nationalization is reduced to the bourgeois state instrument of bureaucratic control over foreign trade; it will be a powerful weapon in the hands of the regime not only over the bourgeoisie but also over the workers, exactly in the style of Peron.

The shrewd Nationalist leader

Paz Estenssoro has won this political battle against the Nationalist labor leaders even though he does not have the support of the unions which are now so powerful; and the labor leaders around Lechin have lost the battle, even though they are backed by "70,000 armed workers." For it is the pressure of international economic relations which has imposed this reactionary solution on the country, in line with our expectations.

This turn in the development of the "national revolution" is the real secret of the present consolidation of the MNR regime and of its recognition by the U. S. and other countries. The "national revolution" is marching backward, with its state-capitalist bureaucratic methods and its creation of new bosses to wield power over the workers as over the bourgeoisie. The "national revolution" is remaining what it started out as: the simple coup d'état of the Nationalist party, with Peron's support.

"ALL POWER . . ."

But this coup d'état had a very strong tail. The latter swung the workers' armed uprising against the bourgeoisie and the armed forces; and in spite of its adherence to the Nationalist party, this workers' movement maintained its own class socialist feelings and demanded socialist means for the "national revolution"—mine nationalization, agrarian reforms and the abolition of the bourgeoisie. The spontaneous impetus of the workers' uprising gave decisive force to the trade-union federation and its leaders.

But the workers' revolution could not win out under the petty-bourgeois Nationalist leadership, even if the latter is of the Nationalist "left," and it needed to create its own organs, its own revolutionary instruments, its own workers' government—even if these were not

purely "Marxist" but at least working-class in character. The Trotskyist POR has been supporting the Nationalist government, instead of presenting the slogan of "All power to the workers' unions," even though the latter are under Nationalist influence. When this slogan was proposed to one leader of the POR, it was damned as the best "support to the right wing."

NEW STAGE AHEAD

Thus the false theory of the "democratic revolution" first, to be followed by the "proletarian" revolution, as something different from the socialist revolution, has worked out to the setback of the working-class movement. Juancito Lechin, through the "over-clever" advice of the pro-Nationalist POR, has lost this battle for the workers. Now the Nationalist coup d'état will inevitably try to go over to the liquidation of the working-class "tail" of the "national revolution," to a bloody purge directed against the unions, to new massacres of the workers.

This seems to be indicated before the Nationalist workers overcome their own nationalist stage and mature toward genuine socialist revolutionary consciousness. The MNR will lose the workers' support and put an end to its political role as the "revolutionary" party. For only the socialist workers' revolution can free this colonial country and also solve, in passing, its democratic problems.

In spite of this darker perspective, Bolivia remains the most revolutionary country of this continent. It cannot escape from its social and economic convulsions, which will bring about the social revolution and also educate the working class to its real socialist tasks. This will be the next stage of the social development of Bolivia after the bankruptcy of the "national revolution" and any subsequent political and social reaction.

NEW YORK Liberal Party Dinner Hears a Threat Berle Scores Truman but Looks for a Deal

By PETER WHITNEY

NEW YORK, June 17—Speaking before the 8th Annual Dinner of the Liberal Party on June 11 at the Hotel Commodore, State Chairman Adolf A. Berle Jr. declared that "The Liberal Party will not support any candidate for president, just because he is a Democrat." The candidate would have to meet three requirements: be an honest liberal able to clean house, be able to get action and put his principles into practice, and be able to unify the country.

Unless the Democrats selected such a candidate, Berle told the 2000 members in attendance that "the Liberal Party would be staying out of the campaign, releasing its members to follow their individual feelings." However, there appears to be little likelihood of such an abstentionist position, since Berle declared that an examination of Democratic candidates revealed at least four who fulfilled his requirements. These were: Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois (first choice), Governor Adlai Stevenson of Illinois, Senator Estes Kefauver, and Averell Harriman. This listing includes all probable nominees with the exception of Southern reac-

tionaries and, interestingly enough, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, surely the most satisfactory from a liberal point of view. And though Justice Douglas has declared himself not a candidate, so has Paul Douglas.

Breaking with past practice in the Liberal Party, which has consistently apologized for Truman's record on the basis of a recalcitrant and reactionary Congress, Berle sharply attacked Truman for his "great liberal speeches" in 1948 as contrasted with his actions in office. He bitterly scored Truman for ousting liberals like Francis Biddle from office and appointing Democratic Party regulars like McGrath to the post of attorney general. Truman appoints those whom the party bosses and political machines want, Berle charged.

DIFFERENT?

But he omitted to say why he expects any of his four "desirable candidates" to break away from the Democratic Party bosses and the political machines in the big cities on which the party is solidly based.

Nor did Berle face the question: Wouldn't Truman in 1948 have satisfied his requirements, and therefore merited Liberal support? But it took four more years of Truman in office to open Berle's eyes to the fact that Truman does not practise what he

preaches, and even in the domain where he cannot cite Congress as his defense, does not carry "liberal principles into practice" but rather gives allegiance to the Democratic machine.

How will any of the new crop of nominees act differently in office? Some of them don't even go as far as Truman did in 1948 in their liberal promises and pledges. Or will it take another four years for the Liberal Party leadership to grasp that the candidate of the Democratic Party has his masters within that party, and will throw overboard any liberal ballast should he encounter rough seas?

Berle expressing the leadership's stand, revealed the dilemma which the Liberal Party faces in this presidential campaign. Disgruntled by Truman's administration, they are nevertheless forced to come out for a Truman successor from whom they can expect little better. They will continue to operate within this vicious circle as long as they are committed to their policy of alliance and support to the Democratic Party on a national scale.

UNDEMOCRATIC PRACTICE

The rank-and-file sentiment within the Liberal Party is difficult to gauge at the present time since there has been very little discussion in the local clubs on this

question. This fact does not, however, deter the leadership from publicly committing the Liberal Party despite the lack of a mandate from the membership. Such a procedure is scarcely in keeping with a leadership which constantly pledges its allegiance to democratic principles, and protests the gap between preachment and practice . . . in other parties.

The other two speakers at the dinner, Senator William Benton (Connecticut Democrat) and Dr. Israel Goldstein (American Jewish Congress president) stressed the domestic problems facing liberals. Senator Benton sharply attacked the McCarran immigration bill and Congress' failure to enact the FEPC bill. For him, an FEPC would mean "Fight Effectively the Propaganda of the Communists," which type of thinking dominates liberal circles today.

Benton cited the revolutionary past and traditions of America and insisted that the "Soviets are not revolutionary but counter-revolutionary." Oddly enough, it was this Democratic senator rather than any Liberal Party spokesman who projected the idea of such Liberal Parties in every state of the union. With such groups, the McCarrans and McCarthys and their bills could be defeated, he stated.

(Turn to last page)

MURDER IN MEXICO

The Assassination of Leon Trotsky

by General Sanchez Salazar in collaboration with Julian Gorkin

The story of the assassination of Trotsky written by the ex-Chief of the Secret Service of the Mexican police who was in charge of the investigation.

235 pages \$2.50

Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y. (Orders must be accompanied by payment)

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERESTED? Get Acquainted

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY UONE.....
STATE TEL.....

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:
 Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00
- NEW RENEWAL
 Bill me. Payment enclosed.

NAME
ADDRESS APT.....
CITY
ZONE STATE.....

MARXISM for TODAY

Albert Camus on Art, Revolt and Marx

By PHILIP COBEN

We have before us an excellent example of a unity of opposites: "vulgar-Marxism" and vulgar anti-Marxism, with the latter berating the former, as usual. The case in point relates to Marxism and art, as discussed in an essay by Albert Camus, the distinguished French author. (The essay, "Art and Revolt," is from his new book *L'Homme Revolte* and appears in the current *Partisan Review*.)

There are, of course, the vulgar-Marxists—if Marxists they can be called at all—who may think that they have exhausted the content of a given art when they have given (however correctly) a sociological explanation of the development of its ideas or tendencies. They are confusing a sociological investigation with aesthetic criticism. Marxism pioneered in the fruitful work of showing the roots of artistic production in society, and to varying degrees has fructified all of modern criticism. It flexed its muscles in this field. Some would-be Marxists became muscle-bound. They fell over on the other side of the fence to imply that (for example) a discussion of the social roots of obscenity in poetry was a sufficient comment on the aesthetic merits of the obscure poetry.

Clement Greenberg was entirely right when, in a review of Hauser's *Social History of Art*, he mentioned in passing that not much work has been done by Marxists in developing a theory of aesthetics. For very easily understood historical reasons, the most competent Marxist thinkers have concentrated their attention on fields closer to the social. It remains, at any rate, a new world to be conquered for the Marxist world-view. All we have to note here is that sociology and aesthetics are different disciplines, even though both may legitimately concern themselves with the same object of investigation.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN

That is enough for the purpose on the vulgar-Marxist error. The Camus essay represents, in its way, the other side of the coin. If hapless would-be Marxists sometimes give the impression of substituting sociology for aesthetics, surely it is no better (to say the least) to try to substitute aesthetics for social and historical analysis.

We are not criticizing here the main theme of Camus' piece. It has, besides, been done before, and somewhat more knowledgeably: the kinship between art and revolt.

"Art, like revolt, is a movement which exalts and denies at the same time. No artist can tolerate the real," said Nietzsche. This is true; but no artist can do without the real. . . . The artist remakes the world to his advantage. . . . I believe more and more," writes Van Gogh, "that one should not judge God on the basis of this world. It's a sketch of his that didn't come off. Every artist tries to remake this sketch and to give it the style it lacks. . . ."

Unfortunately, Camus does not stay within this framework. Perhaps it was not original enough. He must "render it more profound," as Lenin used to say sarcastically. If art and revolt are kin, then cannot art be used to explain revolt? He actually puts it that way:

"Revolt can be observed in art in its pure state, in its primitive composition, outside history. Art, then, should give us a perspective on the content of revolt."

There then follows the passage in which we are here interested, apart from other merits of the essay: an historical "perspective on the content of revolt" presumably given by art. It is a beautiful mix-up that he ladles out, truly "outside history."

The thesis is categorically "the hostility to art shown by all revolutionary reformers." (There is some distinction for Camus between "revolution" and "revolt," perhaps explained in another part of his book, but it is not comprehensible from the essay in *PR*.)

This "revolutionary" hostility to art is apparently a principle of all history. Camus "proves" it merely by a series of examples. Plato exiles poets

from his republic; the Reformation "exiles beauty"; Rousseau "denounces art"; Saint-Just "thunders against the theater"; the French Revolution "did not give birth to any artist" and guillotined a poet; the Saint-Simonians demanded "socially useful" art; a Russian Nihilist said he preferred "to be a Russian shoemaker than a Russian Raphael"; another Nihilist preferred cheese to Pushkin. . . .

Plato and Saint-Simon were utopian reformers; were they "revolutionary" reformers? It is not certain that Camus gave it a second thought in his search for "examples." It would be just as easy to point out the superficiality of a mere reference to the Protestant Reformation, whose anti-artistic tendencies are most obviously related to its Protestantism and not to its place in the development of the bourgeois revolution; the Italian Renaissance was also related to the latter. The same selectivity is shown by Camus' far-fetched choice of two Nihilists to represent the Russian revolutionary movement, and not the founder of Russian socialism, Plekhanov. When he lists the fact that "the French Revolution did not give birth to any artist," he means merely that no first-rate artist arose out of the revolutionary period itself in the most immediate sense; and surely the abbreviation of Chénier by the Reign of Terror was not intended as a criticism of his poetry.

But Camus, pursuing his "perspective" on social revolution as vouchsafed by art, next whips his hobby-horse to fantastic lengths. For he can scarcely gallop through the history of revolt without touching Marx. Strangely, he could have taken the easy way out (*de rigueur* nowadays) and assimilating Stalinism to Marxism, satisfy his need for examples by pointing to the Stalinist crushing of creative art; but he does not even mention Stalinism! It is actually Marx himself that becomes his example!

RUNAWAY HOBBY-HORSE

"According to the revolutionary interpreters of Hegel's *Phenomenology*, there will be no art in a just society." Actually! After a couple more references to Marx, he writes: "The condemnation of art has definitely begun. . . ."

This sort of stuff would be unbelievable for a half-intelligent American professor, let alone for a French intellectual; but there it is. He paraphrases Marx, as if illustrating his point: "Art is not for all time; on the contrary it is determined by its epoch, and it expresses, Marx will say, the privileged values of the dominant class." This (very crudely worded) statement of a relation between art and social classes is passed off as if it were identical with the idea that "there will be no art in a just society." It is an aesthetically beautiful illustration of the unity of vulgar anti-Marxism and vulgar-Marxism.

This sort of stuff would be unbelievable for a half-intelligent American professor, let alone for a French intellectual; but there it is. He paraphrases Marx, as if illustrating his point: "Art is not for all time; on the contrary it is determined by its epoch, and it expresses, Marx will say, the privileged values of the dominant class." This (very crudely worded) statement of a relation between art and social classes is passed off as if it were identical with the idea that "there will be no art in a just society." It is an aesthetically beautiful illustration of the unity of vulgar anti-Marxism and vulgar-Marxism.

THE TWO-HEADED CORRUPTION

I am not sure what it would prove, contrariwise, to recall that Marx was virtually a cult-worshipper of Shakespeare's poetry, read Aeschylus in the original Greek periodically for refreshment, and was a fervent admirer of Goethe, Heine, Balzac. . . . It is more important to point out that Marx's writings teem with the thought that the socially reactionary system of capitalism holds back, distorts and represses the cultural advances possible for mankind.

It was Marx, in the *German Ideology*, who criticized "the subordination of the artist to local and national narrowness" and "the subordination of the individual to a given art," looking forward to the day when the "division of labor" in society between artists and non-artists would disappear. (He almost raises the slogan of "Every man a painter!")

THE TWO-HEADED CORRUPTION

But it is not Camus' excessive ignorance that we wish to stress. It is his willingness to display it so egregiously. On the other side of the Iron Curtain a picture is painted of Western civilization, by official government propaganda, and Western intellectuals hold their heads murmuring "Barbarism, barbarism!" quite rightly. On this side, the most fantastic things can be said of Marxism, in highbrow publications as in the Hearst press—not by intellectuals under the whip of a despotism but of their own "free will." The corruption is different, but which is the greater?

But it is not Camus' excessive ignorance that we wish to stress. It is his willingness to display it so egregiously. On the other side of the Iron Curtain a picture is painted of Western civilization, by official government propaganda, and Western intellectuals hold their heads murmuring "Barbarism, barbarism!" quite rightly. On this side, the most fantastic things can be said of Marxism, in highbrow publications as in the Hearst press—not by intellectuals under the whip of a despotism but of their own "free will." The corruption is different, but which is the greater?

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 25

June 23, 1952

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, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

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.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own Labor and Socialist Library.

SEND FOR OUR FREE BOOK LIST.
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

THE CRISIS IN FREEDOM, by Alexander Meiklejohn.—The Progressive, June.

Professor Meiklejohn, the noted liberal educator and author, is among the few prominent intellectuals of the country who have not spared their fire in denouncing anti-democratic trends in the U. S. In this article he reiterates his belief in democratic processes, as against "current practices of the government" and of educational institutions, as being "far more efficient, far more dependable in time of danger than any form of suppression." With the words which we have italicized he takes a stand basically opposed to that of growing numbers of liberals who seek a rationalization for going along with official witchhunt policies. He sums up as follows:

"But now, as against these principles of freedom established by the First Amendment, there has descended upon the mind and spirit of the United States a loss of faith in these principles which has begun, and which threatens to complete their destruction. By current practices of the government, and, incredibly, by action of our institutions of education, the freedom of mind, the independence of judgment, of the governing people are being mutilated and denied.

"What is the purpose of these invasions of our freedom? They could be carried on, I am sure, only by a nation which has lost its sense of what political freedom, of what political decency, is. The avowed intent of these practices is to protect the minds of our citizens from ideas

which are too "dangerous" for "them" to hear. Do we Americans wish to be thus "mentally" protected? Are we afraid of ideas? If so, we have abandoned the experiment of Self-Government. Any man or any nation which is afraid of ideas, of any idea, is unfit for the great venture in freedom and personal independence which is ordained and established in the Constitution of the United States.

"In protest against all these attempts, political or educational, to protect freedom by suppressing it, I wish to declare my confidence in the shrewdness, the sanity, the practical efficiency, of our American plan of Self-Government.

● The Constitution, with its First Amendment, is not visionary and unrealistic. It is wise and prudent.

● Our free institutions are not weak and untrustworthy things which break down in time of stress, which must, therefore, be propped up and supported by devices borrowed from their enemies.

● Freedom of belief and of expression is not hostile to Security. We need not choose between them. On the contrary, Freedom, as a mode of life, as a form of government, is far more efficient, far more dependable in time of danger, than any form of suppression. It is, in fact, the only governing form which, in a world of rapid social change, gives promise of permanence and stability. If we keep faith with it, nothing human can destroy it. As we lose faith in it, we are destroying it."

FROM THE STALINIST JUNGLE

A New Russian Fabulist Is Out on a Limb

The modern fables below are from the Moscow illustrated weekly *Ogonyok*, by a new satirist, M. Malishevsky. They are written in the tradition of Krylov, the "Russian Aesop," whose satires in the form of fables pictured the contemporary life of tsarism.

It is not at all unusual for the Russian Stalinist press to publish material pointed against bureaucraticism in general; on the contrary, bureaucraticism is one of the few allowable subjects for humor as well as the constant butt of serious journalism, as long as it treats of bureaucraticism as the failing of individual and anonymous bureaucrats. In this way the regime which is the most bureaucratic in the world attempts to combat the evils resulting from its own inherent contradictions.

But the magazine East Europe, from which the specimens below are taken (May 22 issue), thinks that Malishevsky's writings in this field have a new sharp edge to them. "His allegories are so revealing," it writes, "that sooner or later he is bound to be whisked away to the inhospitable regions of the Soviet empire."

It may or not be so that Malishevsky has crossed the delicate borderline between official "anti-bureaucratic" propaganda within the framework of "Stalinist self-criticism," and implied broader criticism. But there can be no doubt that they are revealing, whether or not the Russian bureaucracy will feel that the fables come too close to home.—Ed.

The Nightingale's Song

They made a record of the nightingale's song.

"Cut out this trill," said the Sparrow. "They might think that we had not been consulted."

They cut out the trill and then put on the record again.

"Cut out those modulations," said the second Sparrow, "they might say that we had no control over them."

They cut out the modulations, and put on the record again.

"Cut out the high notes," said the third Sparrow, "they might say that we had not planned our record properly."

They cut out the high notes, and put on the record again.

"Hey! Isn't it now a true nightingale's song? It says 'Peep! Peep!'"

The Skylarks' Advertisement

One evening the Skylarks flew in and brought the editor of the *Forest Journal* an advertisement, so short and to the point that he could not find fault with it. It read, "We sing tomorrow."

The Bluebird, editor of the *Forest Journal*, looked and looked, but nothing could be either added or cut. "Tomorrow" could not be replaced by "yesterday"; "we singing" could not be replaced by "we listen."

So he ordered the advertisement to be printed in the reverse.

Clever Bear

The Badger's wife came to see the Bear. She asked him to give her 500 rubles so that she could have her husband cured. The Badger was ill, and he might die. The Bear thought and thought—and then refused.

"Why do you refuse?" asked the Badger's wife.

"How can I give you the money?" said the Bear. "The Badger is alive. They would say that I had squandered the money. Anyhow, he might recover."

The Badger's wife wiped her tears and went back home.

Three months later she came back to ask the Bear for money for the Badger's funeral and for a subsidy for herself.

"Good!" said the Bear. "Your situation is bad. What a pity about the Badger dying. What a fine Badger he was. We must help you, we must."

And he gave her a check for 500 rubles for the Badger's funeral, and another 500 rubles for a subsidy for herself.

"Thank you very much," said the Badger's widow, "but do tell me this: why did you not give me 500 rubles when I came to see you the last time? The Badger would still be alive if you had."

The bear answered: "I would be very glad if he were. But just think: illness is a very doubtful affair. Today you are ill—tomorrow you might be healthy. How can you risk to give anyone money because of illness? But once a

person is dead, that is quite another matter. Then you are sure. In the case of death you can always spend money. And for you it is also better this way. A thousand rubles are more than 500 rubles."

The Incubator

The Hens had set up a collective incubator. It received eggs from all Hens, and a Turkey was appointed receptionist. He received and received eggs—until one day he suddenly said, "I will not accept this egg."

"Why?"

"I just won't that's all."

"But why?"

"They might say that it is a duck's egg."

"Yes, I know that it is a hen's egg, but they might not think so."

"But who would think that—everybody can see that it is a hen's egg."

"Well, you would not think it; I would not think it; but there may be a Pheasant who might think that—and worse."

BOOKS RECEIVED

Published June 25, by the New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books: HEREDITY, RACE AND SOCIETY, by L. C. Dunn and Th. Dobzhansky. Newly revised. A Mentor book, 144 pages, 35 cents.

THE TROUBLED AIR, by Irwin Shaw. A Signet Giant, 352 pages, 35 cents.

PRESSURE, by Charles Francis Coe. A Signet book, 144 pages, 25 cents.

WALK ON THE WATER, by Ralph Leveridge. A Signet book, 240 pages, 25 cents.

THERE'S ONE IN EVERY TOWN, by James Aswell. A Signet book, 144 pages, 25 cents.

You're Invited

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

Youth and Student Corner

ACLU Conference on Academic Freedom

By MEL HACKER

There have fortunately been a number of pro-democratic backlashes against the relentlessly grinding intimidation of déviant ideas and academic freedom in this country. One such reply was the Conference on Academic Freedom sponsored by the American Civil Liberties Union. This conference also revealed many of the insights, as well as confusions, to which patriotic liberals have arrived in their support of civil freedoms amid the pressures of a war economy.

Professor H. H. Wilson of Princeton was the only speaker who directly tied in current repressions with the cold war when he emphasized that the issue of academic freedom, "of who should teach and what should be taught," becomes more vital as the normal pressures are intensified by the cold war. Referring to the national concern over corruption in Washington, he said the really significant corruption is "revealed by our willingness to pervert both our institutions and our ideals, by our loss of confidence in ourselves, in one another and in the democratic process."

Caught in the Cold War

Asserting that "the schools and colleges are caught in the gigantic power conflict" in the world, he offered as evidence of such pressures:

- (1) student apathy toward any kind of political action;
- (2) "reluctance to do a term paper on the state of civil liberties because of FBI questions of a student's thesis";
- (3) gossip that if planning on government careers it is advisable to take (or not to take) courses of certain professors;
- (4) avoidance by teachers of controversial subjects and ideas, their escape into elaborate "methodological" discussions and the sale of their services to governmental agencies and corporations.

Academic freedom, stressed Professor Wilson, was the keystone of a free society based on the conviction that progress in every field, and even the survival of society, depends on human creativeness and independent criticism and analysis. This concept was opposed to American education treated primarily as a device for stamping "Made in America" on a diverse people and as an effective means of housebreaking the young, for indoctrination and only secondarily as an institution for encouraging independent thought.

Liberal Rationale

In accordance with the principle of free discussion at the conference itself, the next speaker introduced was David Ashe, former president of the United Parents Association of New York City, who declared that the principle of academic freedom did not include the right of Communist Party members to serve as teachers in the schools. He emphasized that anti-democratic conspirators had no right to teach immature and impressionable young American children and destroy "the very foundations of their government." By declaring the Communist Party a "conspiracy" Ashe shelved any need to consider it as a political group with political ideas to be considered freely in this country.

But Ashe still thought of himself as a liberal and therefore: "A Communist or a Gerald L. K. Smith may, in the exercise of freedom of speech, peddle his anti-democratic doctrines. But no definition of civil liberties requires that the government carry his platform for him or supply him with an audience, particularly an audience of young and impressionable children." It may well be supposed that without too much soul-searching, Ashe might come to expand his views to include the non-employment of various groups of pacifists and socialists in schools, films, radio, government service, and industry.

Why wait until a teacher commits an overt act? he asked. That would mean a spy system. And so he cleverly thinks to avoid spy systems by simply banning all suspect Communist Party members from the public schools as unfit to teach.

He not too consistently opposes the Feinberg Act because its loyalty reports and investigations would create an atmosphere of fear and intimidation among teachers. Instead he came out in sup-

port of the Jansen proposal; this support involved him in a catfight with the audience during which Socialist Party representatives played a rather reprehensible role.

A Use for Norman Thomas

New York City Superintendent of Schools Jansen is currently conducting a witchhunt in the city's schools based on the proposition that any member or past member of any "subversive organization," or anyone who has ever engaged in an "illegal act or conspiracy," is unfit to be a teacher in the New York public schools. Dr. Jansen is a very widely read and learned man and has read many subversive lists and has become fondly attached to all of them. Armed with this precise resolution Dr. Jansen has attacked many Stalinist members of the Teachers Union and has even forced some of them to lean for protection upon the notorious Feinberg Act, which at least doesn't penalize them for past membership in groups.

A clause including fascists among those unfit to teach was deleted through the efforts of George A. Timone, an ex-America Firster who is a prominent member of the New York City Board of Education.

Criticized by many in the audience, Ashe defended his position by quoting Norman Thomas in favor of the ousting of Stalinist teachers from the public schools. Not to be outdone, Samuel Friedman, a leader of the Socialist Party and its current vice-presidential candidate, gave out with a long (and usually perfectly valid) anti-Stalinist speech, attacking the Stalinists for not having the courage to be martyrs by admitting at all times, despite threat of loss of job, their membership in the Communist Party. Friedman is fully aware of the Stalinist totalitarian menace but he breathed not a word of criticism of Jansen or of the cold-war suppression of civil liberties and academic freedom on this side of the Iron Curtain.

Out of the Woodwork

Awards were presented to the trustees of Sarah Lawrence College for their defense of academic freedom, of the concept of the college as a marketplace for ideas against vicious American League attacks. We must note here that Dr. Harold Taylor, president of the college, retreated from the concept of academic freedom while attempting to defend it. Though favoring liberal and dissident opinion on campus he was forced to assert to his trustees that of course Sarah Lawrence College would never knowingly employ a Communist Party member, though the college would also never probe into the political allegiances of its staff members.

The Ohio State University chapter of the American Association of University Professors was honored for its struggle against screenings and restrictions on outside speakers. The Group for Academic Freedom at the University of California was honored for its continued fight against the imposition of loyalty oaths there, "against the devastating effect that such a discriminatory oath would have in impairing the role of a university dedicated to arriving at the truth by a free flow of ideas."

We agree with Professor Wilson when he calls academic freedom the fundamental obligation of a teacher to a democratic society, not a personal interest or luxury. The cold-war hysteria further restricts ideas within our conservative society.

Meanwhile, as Professor Wilson notes, "This encourages the primitives to come out of the woodwork and attack all public education." These primitives, led by McCarthy, the American Legion and the NAM, Allan Zoll of the National Council on Education, various church groups, the forces supporting the Smith Act, loyalty oaths, the Feinberg and Jansen approaches do not believe in free education but in the use of the educational system for their own reactionary indoctrination and the subversion of the democratic process of the free investigation of the truth and the free flow of ideas.

Get Acquainted

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE
114 W. 14th St.
New York 11, N. Y.

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

NAME
ADDRESS
SCHOOL (IF STUDENT)
CITY ZONE..... STATE.....

Horatio Alger as Stalinist Hero:

By RICHARD TROY

Stalinist Russia was once characterized as a "reactionary's dream come true," and the more one studies the lands behind the Iron Curtain the more one is convinced of the ironic truth of this witticism. Each new research digs up facts more appalling than the last. Policies and patterns are uncovered which the wildest reactionaries in the West would not even dare to suggest.

The Harvard Russian Research Center has just issued a book entitled *The New Man in Soviet Psychology* by one of its top researchers, Raymond A. Bauer, a well-known psychologist. The volume is a rather dry and scholastic description of the enormous changes which took place in the basic ideology of Stalinist psychologists in the early 1930s. But the material presented is so potent, so clear, that the confused analysis which Bauer gives cannot obscure the significance of the great social metamorphosis which he describes.

The epochal changes of those years can be summed up in this fashion: The social ideology of 19th century capitalism has been revitalized and modernized by the Russian psychologists under the name of "socialist psychology." Like Stalinism itself, it is not merely the repetition of out-moded ideas but a peculiarly new and totalitarian adaptation of them. What it means, in practical terms, is that nearly every hard-fought gain in the past half century of psychological thought has been wiped out and replaced by ideas which, despite vast differences, bear a certain resemblance to the ideology of Horatio Alger.

Free Will for the Enslaved

But, like Stalinism itself, these ideas are clothed in an apparel so apparently sophisticated that keen scholars like Bauer do not fully grasp what is happening, nor why. But, as we have said, he brings enough material together so that those who are more sensitive to the realities of Russian Stalinist life, can glean the true meaning.

The most notable and the central fact of the new psychology of Stalinist Russia is that the concept of the "environment" as a determinant in personality formation has been pretty much rubbed out. The individual is where he was centuries ago in the abstract philosophizing of bygone philosophers, a free-wheeling agent from birth with complete control over his own "will," no longer subject to the pangs of past experience.

Naturally, the Russian psychologists are not foolish enough to phrase it in this manner. But that this is the trend is evidenced by the sharp criticisms leveled, for example, at the "attempts of certain psychologists to find such a dependent relationship as that, for example, between the individual characteristics of the unsuccessful school children and the sizes of their living quarters, the average number of times a day they had a certain type of food," etc., etc.

"Slandering" the CP

Bauer writes, with all-too-rare illumination: "In other words, it is precisely those 'social-productive relations' and economic factors which Marxists stress so much as determinants of personality in a capitalist order which are excluded from consideration in the modern Soviet system."

Attempts to form correlations between individual personality and social background were declared henceforth to be "pseudo-scientific." A man's talents and deficiencies were of his own making. As the Stalinist psychologists put it, "a man takes part in the shaping of his own character and he himself bears responsibility for that character."

And as proof of the capacity of the individual to make his own character into a successful unit the Russian teachers are instructed, according to Bauer, to use "the example of fictional and actual persons—invariably Russian or Soviet heroes—who have been particularly successful in lifting themselves by their own bootstraps."

Outlawry of Freud and 'Unconscious' Is Only

This strangely familiar "bootstraps" refrain is at the core of the new Russian psychology. Everyone has an opportunity to "lift himself up by his own bootstraps," and hence those who do not succeed in so doing have simply failed to mold their character in such a way as to make it possible! To attribute failure to environmental factors—in a country where slums are still prominent in many large cities—is to commit a rank heresy.

In fact, it goes further. To do so is to slander the Communist Party, for, as they have said, the CP is responsible for the environment!

At the Other Pole

In the middle thirties a group of psychologists suggested, after long research, that the reason a great number of Chuvash children (one of the most backward nationalities) had failed in school was due to the primitive nature of their early years. For this the psychologists were severely attacked; they spoke "from the point of view of the counterrevolution." Their report—in which it was shown that the general intelligence of Chuvash children was lower than that of Great-Russian children—was suppressed. No such reports have since appeared.

What is, of course, most indicative about the reactionary turn of Russian psychology is that, under the early revolutionary government, there was fostered a brand of psychological thought—radical behaviorism—which stood at the opposite pole. Behaviorism was a psychological school, prominent in the 1920s all over the world, which rejected the role of the consciousness almost entirely and viewed the individual as a product of his social climate. It has been superseded in the West by more sophisticated and dynamic conceptions; the individual is no longer so passive an instrument of his surroundings.

However: Whereas the Stalinist rejection of behaviorism entails a wholesale abandonment of the environment the Western rejection of behaviorism signifies only the assumption of a more dynamic view of the relationship between the two forces.

Since 1930. . .

In the 1920s—when a criminal in the USSR was treated as an unfortunate product of socially backward conditions—it was assumed that men as a whole would improve only when the environment around them did so too. As Bauer writes, "It was . . . thought that the reshaping of human nature would take place automatically as the institutions of society were changed." This reshaping would follow because the individual responded to the contours around him. If the individual had not been reshaped this was proof, consequently, that the environment had not changed. "It was good Marxism," writes Bauer, "to think in terms of social causation of undesirable as well as desirable personal characteristics of behavior."

Since 1930 this has all been changed. There is a two-fold development. First, the environment is no longer held responsible for the production of undesirable behavior. Stalin's famous 1935 declaration that "socialism" had arrived meant that the social basis for crime had been eliminated and that "any subsequent deviations from the moral norm are evidence of the capitalistic remnants in the consciousness of men," and each man could be held responsible for carrying these remnants. Just as capitalism does not hold itself responsible for the creation of revolutionary movements so Stalinism declares "capitalistic remnants" an alien importation.

Self-Made Men

The second aspect of the development—running parallel—was to heap great rewards and laurels on those who lived up to and exceeded the newly established "moral norms." This, of course, is in contradiction with the other dogma that the "socialist" environment itself had pro-

duced the new Soviet Man. But capitalist ideology had many of these same apparent contradictions; they withstand all analysis.

In Russia the Horatio Alger types became the "heroes of labor," the great Stakhanovites, the heroes of Russian history, etc. Small wonder that the revolutionary anthem *The Internationale*, whose Russian version says that "nobody will bring us liberation, neither a tsar, nor a God, nor a hero," was ultimately dropped.

The uses to which the new psychology might be put were many. The most obvious is the Horatio Alger theme: Those who have reached the top are lauded as, so to speak, "self-made men," who are on top because they deserve to be, by dint of hard work, diligence, determination, Bolshevik vigor, etc. Those who are on the lower rungs of the vast Stalinist ladders are there because they lack these qualities. And the fact that they lack these qualities has nothing whatever to do with the System which, by definition, gives everyone an equal opportunity, but rather is due to their "self-made" unwillingness to work devotedly, their own laziness, their own failure to take advantage of the opportunities afforded them in the "land of opportunity," or because they maliciously carry over "vestiges of capitalism" from the dead past.

Counter-Revolutionary Unconscious

The emphasis throughout is on the allegedly conscious will of the individual concerned, the individual who consciously pursues a path of virtue and rectitude. The term consciousness is really another word, in the sense that the Stalinists use it, for the old term "will," a concept long discarded with scorn by Western psychologists.

Inevitably, the very idea of the existence of an "unconscious" or "subconscious" had to be wiped from Russian texts. To have an "unconscious" existence is unworthy of a Soviet Man! And here the Russian psychologists capitalize on the most vulgar mass prejudices against Freud and other pioneer Western psychiatrists, suggesting that there is something degenerate about the "unconscious." But this follows naturally from the whole official Stalinist ideology.

Western psychologists, roughly following the Marxian dictum that "existence precedes consciousness," concentrate upon studying those human experiences (unconsciously undertaken) which produce a specific type of conscious mental life. The Stalinists follow the exact opposite procedure, only they leave out the unconscious (and the experiential) entirely.

Child Training

In 1939 there appeared the following lines in the Russian press. No doubt the writer for the Komsomol paper for which this was written was too frank, too honest, in his presentation and may have been castigated later, but nevertheless he expressed the essence of the new Russian view:

"Pseudo-Bolsheviks, such as Bogdanov or Lunacharsky . . . asserted that for the establishment of socialism definite economic conditions were necessary which could not be replaced by slogans or ideas. Vulgarizing Marxism, they fell so low as to assert that consciousness was subordinate to existence, while true Bolsheviks held the opposite view and emphasized the explosive and transforming capacity of progressive ideas. . . ."

("Reactionary ideas" apparently are excluded from this analysis; only a "true Bolshevik" can rise above mere existence!)

However, the "progressive ideas" do not naturally adhere to the budding, young Soviet Man. But he does not gain them through daily experience. Rather, the only outside influence which can be brought to bear on a child is what the Stalinists call "training," and by that they mean formal school education, the exact precepts

The 'New Psychology' in Russia

One Aspect of Return to Past in New Forms

of the teacher, not the experience of the pupil.

"Training [a Russian psychologist writes] is the basic form of influence which the social environment exercises on the psychic development of the child. This constitutes all the social activity that is directed at the nurture of the juvenile generation, the creation of conditions for their development, the communication to them of necessary knowledge, the development in this generation of a definite ideology and of norms of social behavior."

The "socialist" environment, then, is only responsible for those ideas which its teachers consciously impart to the child. This is analogous to the parent who, on seeing the child misbehave, says, "How many times have I told you not to do that." To the parent, the child's misbehavior is not a function of the parent's home, since she has told him many times not to go astray, but of the child's own will, his own self-created personality. For this the Stalinists have invented the term "self-training," a character-determinant which accounts for the child's own rising and falling above and below the "moral norms." These developments are seen with special vividness in Russian teaching technique, about which the Western world is already fairly familiar.

Labor as Cure-All

"The basic principle of modern Soviet didactics," writes Bauer, "is the principle of conscious understanding. The basis of this principle is that the child learns better if the teacher proceeds from the explanation of general principles to practice rather than starting with practice and either letting the child infer these principles or explaining them to the child later. The motto 'learn by doing' is rejected."

Another area in which the consequences of the new Russian psychology are neatly portrayed is in the therapeutic program laid out by Russian psychiatrists for distraught and neurotic individuals.

Since law forbids their delving into the unconscious, and since they cannot attribute a malady to anything so profound as childhood (or even adult!) experiences, the diagnosis of an ailment is necessarily of incredible superficiality. This is evidenced by the prescribed cure for most mental illnesses: work-therapy or long vacations. A Russian psychiatrist (Khoroshko) speaks:

" . . . a full load of work, with their free time occupied with sports, music, painting, photography, or other hobbies . . . a person who suffers from obsessive neurosis must always be occupied. He must not be afraid of work. He must take care of others. More than anything else, he must live for public interests. . . . He must learn to live on his own independent strength. . . . He may come to the doctor for advice or reassurance, but not often. The work of changing oneself takes a long time—perhaps a year."

Logic of the Work House

In short, he must not be "coddled." "The patients, themselves, should under no circumstances be permitted to decide the nature, conditions, or time of work . . . the fact that the program is compulsory compels the patient to actively work to overcome his inner resistance. . . ."

The problem is entirely up to the individual, who is putting up "inner resistance." The state has a plan to break that "resistance," that is, hard work. And as Robert Martin Adams, in a fine article in the *Antiach Review* on this topic remarked, "the logic of the therapy reminds us strikingly of that used to justify the workhouse in the days when mental disease and social despair were alike written off as laziness."

Since, as we have noted, for the Stalinists a man is what he makes himself, it follows that the neurotic is so because he wills himself that way. This is his "inner resistance." The problem

of curing him then becomes one simply of forcing him to decide, in his own conscious mind, to give the game up, to "come to his senses," and the best way to effect this change is to give the patient "a full load of work" and keep him generally occupied. The hope, as Adams interjects, is that, at least, if he is not cured, his work-power will not be wasted for the "construction works of communism."

Taking Their Minds Off . . .

As Adams also points out, the ideas lying behind this therapy are not at all new; they go back many centuries to the origin of the Protestant-capitalist ethic. Even today it is not uncommon to hear someone say that what So-and-so needs is a "good, tough job to take his mind off his troubles," or "he shouldn't think so much about himself." These statements express attitudes which modern psychologists have struggled to overcome. To a certain extent, they have succeeded, that is, everywhere but in Russia, where the ideology of the workhouse has been codified into the official ideology.

The assumption of the supremacy of the conscious will over the unconscious substratum warps the entire fabric of Russian Stalinist intellectual life. It leads the psychologists to denounce the experimental data which suggested that the old distinction between men and beasts—one being "rational" and the other not—was unsound. The Aristotelian definition of man—the "rational animal"—has been woven into the Stalinist ideology under a new disguise.

And just as Aquinas exploited this definition for his philosophy, so the Stalinists have for theirs. And from such a definition the most vulgar concept of "free will" easily and naturally emerges. The Stalinists do not specifically endorse such an idea of "free will," but, in practice, of course, it is a cornerstone of the new ideology.

Uprooting Marxism

Basically, it signifies the abandonment of that type of contextual thinking so characteristic of Marxism. Marxists have been traditionally scornful of the idealist concept of "free will," not only in the academic philosophic sense but from the viewpoint of political-historical analysis.

The results of this abandonment appear in every vein of Russian Stalinist life. For example, Zhdanov, in his famous attack on the philosophy of the historian Alexandrov, denounced him for suggesting that various elements "in Marxian philosophy could be traced back to the work of pre-Marxist philosophers. . . ." Alexandrov, in short, was criticized for attempting to place Marx in an historical context.

Or, again, the result is seen when the historian Rubenstein, in his 1948 self-criticism, said that his main fault had been his presentation of the theories of Lenin and Stalin as "the outcome of previously existing progressive historical thought instead of interpreting it as the foundation of an entirely new revolutionary science of history." (One is here reminded of Lenin's own words: "It is not through any WILL of ours," he wrote, "but owing to historical circumstances . . . that this detachment finds itself in advance of other detachments of the international proletariat—not because we wanted it but because circumstances demanded it.")

From Whom All Blessings Flow

The tone is entirely reversed today. In *Pravda*, for example, we could read several weeks ago: "The Soviet people greeted with great satisfaction the decree of the Council of Ministers and Party Central Committee on a new reduction of state prices for foodstuffs, which reflected the constant solicitude of the party and government for the material and cultural welfare of the working people."

Of what is the decline in the price of certain consumer goods a consequence? Not the increased productivity of the working class, not the more extensive use of time-saving machinery, not the increased exploitation of natural resources . . . but the "constant solicitude of the party and government for the material and cultural welfare of the working people." The price reductions were, in other words, a gift from the "party and government" to the people, a gift which they needn't have given, but did, owing to their conscious will, their own desire to please the masses. The same theme is ever-recurrent. The psychological theories about which we have spoken are only an elaborate justification for the arrogant policies of the new Russian ruling class.

No Thorns—No Roses

The great American myth, unchallenged until well into the 20th century, that all men had equal opportunities to rise to the top of the heap has been partially punctured by the social scientists of our times. Their analyses of the impact of environment on the individual led them to a more skeptical view of the American myth. The fact that a certain class, by the nature of its position, could develop a system of privileges which might ensure its continued rule, has been established. Thus much of the earlier contempt for the unemployed—"anyone with any gumption can find a job"—has been dissolved under the impact of social science. Unemployment insurance is accepted, at least in principle, in this country as a result. The ruling classes are not happy about these developments, but are resigned to many of them. However, the antagonism of sections of the ruling groups to the "professors"—who point out, for instance, that juvenile delinquency is largely a product of overcrowded conditions and consequent resentments rather than the innate immorality of the depraved classes—continues. Reactionary forces in this country have always felt the probing social scientist a thorn in his side.

The Russian ruling class is disturbed by no such thorn. In the early 1930s it ruthlessly picked them out of its skin and has not been molested since by snooping pollsters, questionnaire-takers, standard-of-living correlators and their ilk. The gathering and computation of such data has been strictly forbidden since 1936. There are no sinister psychologists who try to study the impact of bureaucracy, hard labor or high income on the individual. It is all *verboten*.

The Final Lie

Instead, the social scientists devote their chief efforts to the construction of the monstrous justifications for their own utter suppression. The dogma that everyone in Russia has an equal opportunity to reap the rewards of society cannot be questioned. It is reinforced by the correlative dogma that an individual is determined, not by his surroundings, but by his own conscious determination.

One often reads in the Russian press such things as this: "All the conditions necessary for the creation of music in keeping with the glorious character of the Stalinist epoch are present today." Hence, it is said, there is no reason why such music is not forthcoming—except, that is, the usual stuff: "lack of vigilance," "loss of touch with reality," "indifference toward the aspirations of the people," etc. They can say nothing else; the very way in which they pose the question makes an answer impossible. Since the environment provides no place for the production of such deficiencies, they are obviously the result of personal perversity, or, at best, a "lack of will power."

Last of all, the official Stalinist endorsement of this psychology gives the final lie to the persistent theme of Stalinists and their apologists that Russia is, at least, heading toward a society in which men will be paid according to need rather than deed. The new Stalinist psychology—which takes men out of their social context and judges them on their "Bolshevik will"—is heading, at a mighty fast clip, in a very different direction.

'Make Ourselves Feared' — —

(Continued from page 1)

nate officials, and not of the foreign ministers of Russia, Britain, France and the United States.

At the moment it is not at all clear what were the original intentions of the French cabinet, or how much these were modified by American pressure. It is quite clear, however, that the effect of the French action was to hearten everyone in Europe who fears that the present American course is slamming the door on any hope of a compromise with the Stalinists in Germany and therefore in Europe as a whole.

BLP SPEAKS UP

On the same day that Nehru made his speech to the Indian parliament, the British Labor Party issued a statement on foreign pol-

icy which is to serve as the basis of discussion for the party congress this fall. The statement called for a delay in the ratification of the Bonn and Paris agreements on West Germany, and pledged the party to work for the admission of Stalinist China to the United Nations if and when Labor is returned to power.

This statement is thought to be a compromise between the Bevan and Attlee tendencies in the Labor Party. It avoids direct discussion of the magnitude and speed of British rearmament. However, it reverses the policy of the Attlee government on German rearmament. It comes out flatly for postponing the rearmament of West Germany until after an election has been held in that country to establish the will of the people on the issue, and calls for a four-power meeting to arrange for free elections in all Germany as a prelude to unification.



"Socialized Medicine" for Capitalists

"The Wall Street Journal recently stated more than 400 corporations today have plans of one sort or another providing for medical aid for their executives. The plans range from yearly examinations to free treatment at outstanding clinics.

"The chief executive officers of many corporations reported that the plans were very worth while and were proving 'good investments' for the company.

"L. E. Judd of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, for example, was quoted as saying: 'My formula for success ranks health as No. 1. The interest of the company requires that its key personnel be of good health and it is logical that we should have a comprehensive, smooth-working program to this end. This program has saved Goodyear many millions of dollars by giving us efficient personnel.'

"I don't suppose that this is 'socialized medicine' but I am not sure just what it is. If management finds it advantageous to give free medical services to the top brass who, presumably, could afford to pay for medical care, it is hardly surprising that workers with incomes not too much above subsistence levels should insist that they need protection against the exigencies of extraordinary medical costs.

"Incidentally, is it another tax-dodging device for the corporation to pay medical expenses for their executives?"—Robert P. Vanderpool, business columnist, in Chicago Sun-Times, June 12.

Hush Slush Fund

The United States Chamber of Commerce cheered when the Taft-Hartley Act required trade unions to supply full financial accounting, but it refuses to account for the source of 94 per cent of its own funds.

The 3200 affiliated local chambers of commerce supply only 6 per cent of the organization's money, admit the C. of C. men in their marble palace headquarters in Washington. But about that other 94 per cent, "The Chamber won't tell anyone, not even its own members," say the same men.

Labor (June 14) asks:

"How much money did big oil companies give the Chamber in return for its current action in urging members of Congress to override President Truman's veto of the offshore oil 'give-away' bill?"

"How much money did the 'Rich Men's Lobby' contribute to the Chamber before it recently approved the 'general principle' of the 'Millionaire's Amendment,' which would put a 25 per cent ceiling on federal income, estate and gift taxes? . . .

The Naughty Boys Got Caught

Why monopoly flourishes under the anti-trust laws:

General Electric, Westinghouse, two smaller corporations and six of their officers were recently convicted in a federal court in Cleveland of conspiring to monopolize the street-lighting equipment industry, dividing up the market, fixing prices and suppressing competition.

The "punishment": GE, Westinghouse and another company were fined the tremendous sum of \$15,000 each. The other fines were still lower, down to \$1000.

The fines, no doubt, were paid out of the petty-cash box.

No businessman has ever been sent to jail for violating the anti-trust laws.

Billion-Dollar Club

There are 60 corporations now in the billion-dollar club.

The billion-dollar club is the select list of companies with assets of that amount or more. The number is at a record peak.

In 1929, once regarded as a boom year, there were only 20 corporations in the club. By the time of Pearl Harbor, end of 1941, there were 32.

Combined assets of the 60 giants, according to a UP survey, in 1951 climbed about 7 per cent to a record \$157,782,991,606, headed by Metropolitan Life Insurance with over \$10 billion.

This statement is directly in line with the position of the leadership of the German Social-Democratic Party which feels confident that if an election were held at the present time, with the rearmament of West Germany under the provisions of the Bonn contractual agreement as the chief issue, the Adenauer government would be decisively defeated. The BLP's stand has made a strong impression in Germany itself. This is attested to by the fact that Adenauer found it necessary to denounce the BLP's statement as "an unheard-of intervention into German affairs."

ADENAUER STYMIED

In Germany itself, Adenauer's chances of obtaining a quick ratification of the contractual agreement seem to be close to zero. Opposition inside his own party, and in the parties allied with it in the cabinet, keeps cropping up. Of course, the Stalinists are contributing as much as they can to the popular opposition to the militarization of West Germany by making it perfectly clear that this will be taken as a hostile act and will preclude the unification of the country. At the same time, they continue to dangle the bait of unity before the eyes of the German people, to whom this looms as far more vital a matter than their integration into the American military bloc.

The essential point, however, is not the Stalinist maneuvers but the intense desire for unification and complete equality of the German people. Although neither the Social-Democrats nor the right-wing groups which oppose ratification of the contractual agreement have any illusions about the aims of Stalinist policy, they are determined to use every means available to prevent the creation of a situation in which West Germany will be irrevocably bound up with the American bloc because this means that the only possibility of unification would be through war.

MARKING TIME

The uneasiness and reluctance of the peoples of the non-Stalinist world to go down the line with American policy, which finds expression in such events as those of this past week described above, is heightened by the uncertainty on what American policy is, or rather will be. Until the elections in this country have been held, no one can really know what to expect from the post-November government. The tendency of the European cabinets is, naturally,

to avoid making decisions or commitments which might be affected by a change of administration here, which means that their tendency is to do nothing. This further intensifies the feeling of frustration and fear, bordering on hatred, which is the prevalent attitude toward America in the rest of the world.

"DESTINY"

And the American government does not appear to be capable of doing anything to dispel this feeling. Unable to present a political alternative to Stalinism on a world scale, it tends to rely ever more heavily on the discredited ruling classes in Europe and Asia. The efforts to bolster the tottering capitalist governments by economic means tend to have decreasing effects the farther we get from the last war, and the only answer is to prop them up by means of concentrating on the production of armaments.

Thus, Truman dedicates the atom-powered submarine, figuratively brandishing the new engine of destruction in the face of the world.

Thus, the only recent American victories have been on Kofe island, where three regiments of fully armed troops, with flame-throwers, tanks, and grenades have finally succeeded in subduing unarmed prisoners after a week of pitched battles. A few more such victories, as the saying goes, and we are lost.

Thus, Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn, in a speech opposing cuts in MSA appropriations, told Congress recently that it must not skimp the money for "making ourselves strong, making ourselves feared."

The United States has all the resources for "making ourselves feared." It is not strange, however, that the more the American imperialist power is feared, the more it is hated, even by its allies.

"Destiny has a rendezvous," said Rayburn, "and it is with us." It is precisely fear of that destiny which the rival powers of Washington and Moscow are preparing for the world that overflows from the peoples through even such comparatively mild warnings as Nehru's.

Not in the Headlines

The Nation's Will

At a press conference held during the California Bankers Association in San Francisco last month, Professor Melchior Palyi explained the agreement with West Germany, which in his opinion, of course, was necessary to ensure European stability. But in the course of it he admitted that Chancellor Adenauer's action in signing the treaty does not represent the will of the German people.

"If the proposition were put to a ballot, four-fifths of the 48 million population of West Germany would vote it down," he said. (Los Angeles Daily News, May 27.)

Something to Vote For

A note for those who lament the low percentage of people who vote in American elections:

NLRB figures show that in union-shop elections, 88 per cent of the workers eligible to vote actually cast their ballot. This is considerably higher than the proportion of voters who go to the polls in a national presidential

election. Maybe people vote when they have something to vote for.

The Right to Steal

"Free enterprise means the right of a man who happens to luck up on a business to steal freely from his customers, from his state and from his government without any interference whatsoever."

That definition was given by the chief legal counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Thurgood Marshall, at the May convention of the United Packinghouse Workers (CIO).

Take Your Choice

"The so-called big money families of the country are sharply divided between Taft and Eisenhower. Within the Rockefeller and Ford families, Eisenhower is quite popular, while some others in the oil, chemical and auto fields are strong for Taft."—U. S. News & World Report, June 13.

Who's Coddled?

The Federal Bureau of Prisons has added its testimony to the picture of conditions in U. S. prisons which was spotlighted by the recent series of outbreaks in state penitentiaries.

"In too many institutions," the bureau said, "thousands of men are herded together in stultifying idleness. Of others, we hear grim tales of prisoners who cut their leg tendons or practise some other form of self-mutilation to avoid long hours at grueling tasks.

"And perhaps most disturbing of all his been the continued use of the lash and other brutalizing corporal punishments in a few institutions.

"Of the more than 150,000 prisoners in state institutions for adult offenders, only a small percentage, we believe, are touched regularly by any appreciable constructive or rehabilitating influences."

In some local jails, the bureau added, the conditions of filth are unbelievable.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

Berle Scores Truman — —

(Continued from page 3)

Dr. Goldstein's subject, "A Moral Approach to Politics," was somewhat ticklish for a spokesman of the Liberal Party. He rightly stated that the "plague spots are bipartisan" and that neither major party is interested in breaking the McCarthy-McCarran hold on American politics. His conclusion that "only the Liberal Party holds that possibility" ended right there, despite the interesting questions which it raises regarding the party's deals, compromises, and support to the two plague parties.

ALL ABOUT MORALITY

Unfortunately, Dr. Goldstein felt no moral imperative to explore this question further, but instead discussed the moral standing of the United States abroad. He deplored the fact that the peoples of the world identify the United States with their lords and oppressors, but again there was no analysis of why this had come about. He boldly advocated for them an "economic revolution" (no details given) to be followed by a "political revolution"—unlike the sequence America followed. Whether Dr. Goldstein meant that American capitalism

should export its pattern abroad and that then some form of representative government would be set up was left to the imagination of the listeners. Like Benton, Goldstein also cited American revolutionary tradition (alas, always in the dim, dim past) and charged that "if Jefferson were alive today, he would be denied a passport for travel to Europe—not in the best interests of the American people."

Perhaps the most refreshing political notes at the dinner were uttered by the folk singer, Richard Dyer-Bennett who sang two folk songs not inappropriate to the background of these speeches. One old English ballad recounted the switchings of a vicar in politics, religion, and principles, in line with the ideas of the reigning monarchs of England. This, explained the singer, is what he hopes liberals will not do. His second ballad dealt with the unfortunate bargainings of a timid soul who began by trading off his wife and ended up with a cat. The singer urged the Liberals to "do more taking and less giving." Good advice, indeed, for the Liberal Party, to be honored in the observance and not in the breach.