

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 14, 1952

FIVE CENTS

Another British Union Declares For 'Bevanism'

By L. G. SMITH

The position of Aneurin Bevan's group in the British Labor Party was greatly strengthened last week when the convention of the National Union of Railwaymen, representing some 400,000 workers, overwhelmingly adopted a resolution attacking the present level of rearmament in Britain and the world.

This is the third major British labor organization to line up with the Bevanite position this year. In April the convention of the National Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers, with a membership of 350,000, passed a resolution for a cut in the government's arms budget by a majority of 1000 to 12. In May the Amalgamated Engineering Union, representing some 800,000 members, also aligned itself with the Bevanites on rearmament and the defense of the social services.

These developments are regarded with the keenest interest in Britain as indications of the relative strength which the Bevanites will be able to develop at the Labor Party conference this October. It should be pointed out, however, that even though the position taken by these unions on rearmament and other questions lines them up with the Bevanites programmatically, this does not necessarily mean that their delegates at the party conference would back Bevan in a struggle to replace the present leadership of the party, if such a struggle should develop at the conference.

STILL GAINING

The assistant secretary general of the Rail Union, J. S. Campbell, said in his speech that "we have no desire to join the Americans in their mission of world military conquests." Only one speech from the floor was made in opposition to the resolution, in the course of the one-hour debate. The resolution was passed by the vote of 78 out of 88 delegates.

Dispatches on the convention of another union, the National Union of Mineworkers, where Bevanite influence is also very strong, seem to indicate that it does not plan to take any stand on the issue of rearmament.

It is too early to hazard any predictions on the lineup of strength at the Labor Party convention this fall, or on the kind of struggle which will take place there. One thing is clear, however. The Bevan wing of the party is still gaining strength steadily among the working class as well as in the Labor Party branches.

COMING

a special study of the atomic-energy industry in the United States today. Don't miss it.

Hunger, War and Prices

A famine perhaps unprecedented confronts the world today, and yet hunger could be abolished. So said a top official of the UN's Food and Agricultural Organization, Florence Reynolds, in a talk before a Quaker-sponsored conference on July 3.

She said the UN group knows how to produce enough food to feed all the world but they cannot apply this knowledge because the world is divided into two armed camps.

"Thus," she added, "energy and money which might be going into the production of food on a world-wide scale goes into the production of armaments and other exigencies of war."

The talk was delivered before the annual conference of the Institute of International Relations at Whittier College.

On the other hand, here is an

excerpt from the *Wall Street Journal*, quoted on July 4 in a Los Angeles paper:

"Remember the eggs stored in Kansas caves a few years ago? The blue painted potatoes in dumps on the edge of town? And the public wrath at all this waste?"

"... The officials know there's going to be an abundance of many farm goods in the coming year. Wheat, cotton, fruit—particularly oranges—many vegetables (even potatoes), eggs, meats, turkeys and chickens are all going to be plentiful; they'll be running out of America's ears."

Now round out the picture a little more by noting that here in this country, where food will "be running out of America's ears," the prices of foodstuffs are going up, helped out generously by Congress' lifting of controls on many items.

The Progressive Party Goes Through the Motions

By GORDON HASKELL

The Progressive Party, once headed by Henry Wallace, held its third convention over the Fourth of July weekend in Chicago. In contrast to its first convention four years ago, this one attracted almost no interest in the daily press or in the nation as a whole. This time the PP had no nationally known candidate. But even more important, it had ceased to exist as a force in American politics capable of attracting a large segment of liberal opinion which is uneasy about the administration's course in foreign policy and which seeks a vehicle for the expression of this uneasiness.

At the PP's second convention in Chicago two years ago the disintegration of the party had already reached an advanced stage, and its further course was clearly marked.

Even though the Stalinist wing of the party, which had complete control of its machinery, was willing to accept some degree of compromise in order to keep the remaining liberals in captivity, the latter had already begun to leave the party in droves. Wallace made one speech and then withdrew only to be heard from when he finally broke with the party on the issue of the Korean war. O. John Rogge made a pro-Titoist speech and issued an appeal to the liberals of the land to "come on over and make us respectable." He too faded out shortly afterward. And these were the "big" names.

CP Front

Although the full platform of the Progressive Party is not available as we go to press, it is not necessary to read it in order to know what it contains. That knowledge can be got in the main by a perusal of the columns of the *Daily Worker*. The only thing which holds the party

THREE CONVENTIONS:

The Republicans page 1

The Progressive Party page 1, 2

The Socialist Party page 3

CIVIL LIBERTIES AND FASCISTS

... page 6

GOP Convention Wallows in Flood Of Demagoguery

By MARY BELL

It has been observed that the voters of this country have the choice not of seventy-odd million adult citizens for the presidency, but of two. One of these is in the process of being selected at the Republican National Convention in Chicago as we go to press.

The outstanding feature of the Republican Party, reflected in the fierce fighting in Chicago, is the split in its ranks between the forces now grouped around Eisenhower and those around Taft, and its fight for survival.

There is no question but that Taft best represents the distinct differences between Republicans and Democrats, even if so many of his congressional victories have resulted from coalitions with Democrats. Grouped around him are the Midwestern, isolationist elements, the "nationalists," the "economy in government" spokesmen, etc.

Eisenhower is backed by what is commonly called the "internationalist" wing of the Republican Party. "Internationalism" in this peculiar sense means an orientation toward Western Europe in the struggle with Russia, whereas the emphasis of the "nationalists" is directed toward the East and Middle East.

Bitter Fight

In the event of a deadlock, MacArthur and Warren stand as possibilities. The *New Leader* insists on the choice of Governor Earl Warren as the candidate most resembling a Democrat, whose nomination would give the Republicans a chance at the polls and assure "a high-level debate on the issues without endangering the continuity of the nation's chosen course." Just what the issues would be in that event is a matter of conjecture left to the reader.

The hunger for office and the patronage, spoils and perquisites of office have produced the bitter, desperate fighting in Chicago. Senator Taft has tried to have the Taft-led National Committee seat disputed delegates vote on their own

(Turn to last page)

(Turn to last page)

LONDON LETTER

Right Wingers in Labor Party Make a Bid to Counteract Bevan

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, July 2—After the Labor government lost power, it was inevitable that there would be a certain amount of rethinking in Labor Party circles.

The first to seize the opportunity was Aneurin Bevan. His book In Place of Fear was the latest statement of the views of his left-wing tendency.

The Socialist Union was formed about a year ago. It has only about 100 members of the Labor Party and four members of Parliament.

ANTI-MARXIST

First, it has completely dissociated itself from Marxism and scientific materialism. Though this has been the implicit attitude of the Labor Party as a whole, it must be remembered that the party is still a member of the Socialist International.

trade unions still talk in this language, to a greater or lesser degree. Furthermore, certain organs of the Labor Party, like the National Council of Labor Colleges, are officially Marxist.

COLD FEET

The Socialist Union has a particular appeal for people like Attlee, Dalton and others, who are essentially "Christian-socialist" or "ethical-socialist" in outlook.

When does this attitude arise? Partly, I think, from the failure of the Labor Party to attract the 2 million Liberal votes in the last

election. Partly because they feel they have pressed social legislation far enough. The enormous hostility and opposition of the newspapers and of capital gave them cold feet.

FABIANISM

Secondly, I believe, the right wing of the Labor Party has accepted the Fabian view that "property no longer equals power."

It is indeed because of this danger that the Marxists propose the road of workers' control in the nationalized industries.

The right wing reacts to this too, it seems, but turns in a different direction. For the party as a whole there is a latent historical drag upon it which prevents it from taking full advantage of the enormous historic opportunities it has had since 1945.

Partly, I think, from the failure of the Labor Party to attract the 2 million Liberal votes in the last

Progressive Party Gets A Visit from Socialists

By SCOTT AARON

CHICAGO, July 7—Among the least welcome visitors to the Progressive Party Convention last Saturday evening were a group of ten young workers and students composed of members and friends of the Socialist Youth League.

This fact became painfully apparent to the convention's officials when the ten took stations in front of the auditorium's entrance and proceeded to distribute LABOR ACTION, sell Anvil (the student anti-war magazine), and present the ideas of independent socialism to the delegates entering the hall.

The visit was a complete success. Over 550 copies of LA were distributed and at least 3 of the group spent most of the evening in "bee-hives" and discussions.

This was somewhat remarkable when one considers the composition of the crowd. Of the approximately 1500 delegates that entered the building that evening, well over 50 per cent were old-guard Stalinists.

THEY'RE INTERESTED

The average age of the delegates seemed to be well over 35. The absence of young people and students in any sizable number (15 per cent of the total, at best) was obvious, as was the very small number of workers and trade-unionists.

The distribution took place without disturbance. One older Stalinist did threaten to attack a "Trotskyite disrupter" (i.e., young socialist) but was led away before he could do so.

LOVESTONE DEPLORES

Victor Riesel, Hearst's (and the New Leader's) labor columnist, recently reported the moans of "high AFL circles" at the news bulletin published by the CIO in Europe.

One of the "high AFL circles" quoted by Riesel was Jay Lovestone, who complained that "such headlines implying that there is blood on our hands give a distorted picture of the U. S. and the other sections [of the news bulletin] concentrates on points of our shortcomings instead of selling our achievements."

The CIO European bulletin had written: "The same day that news came out of Washington that the U. S. is ready to negotiate for military bases with Spain, the report came out of Barcelona that five of the 11 members of the non-Communist National Confederation of Labor, condemned by Franco's military tribunals, had to die. They were executed."

between the ideas of independent socialism and those of Stalinism, and were favorably impressed when they learned what the opinions of the former actually were.

COMPETITION

In addition to the SYL group several other non-Stalinist organizations appeared in front of the auditorium. The largest of these other groups was that of the Socialist Workers Party (perhaps 8 people) which, in addition to other literature, attempted to sell the pamphlets of James P. Cannon.

In addition to the SWP people, several members of the IWW were present. They distributed 100 or so copies of the Industrial Worker fairly successfully but did not seem to engage in any discussions.

After the majority of the delegates had entered the hall and all available copies of LA had been passed out, the SYL group left the area in high spirits (if somewhat exhausted) and adjourned to informal discussion.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 W. 14 St., N.Y.C.

Socialism

- The Fight for Socialism—Max Shachtman \$1.00
Socialism, Utopian & Scientific—Engels .75
Socialism, the Hope of Humanity—Shachtman .10
Marxism in the U. S.—Trotsky .35
Plenty for All—Erber .25
Principles & Program of Independent Socialism (LA special issue) .10
Independent Socialism & War (LA special issue) .10
Marx as Economist—Dobb .15
Reform or Revolution—Rosa Luxemburg .50

Marxism

- The Accumulation of Capital—Rosa Luxemburg \$5.00
Studies in the Development of Capitalism—Dobb 3.50
From Hegel to Marx—Hook 4.50
Theory of Capitalist Development—Sweezy 4.50
New Data for Lenin's 'Imperialism'—Varga & Mendelsohn 2.25
Social Revolution—Kautsky .95
The Evolution of Property—Lafargue .95
Materialist Conception of History—Plekhanov .20
Role of Individual in History—Plekhanov .25
Karl Marx—Otto Rühle 1.00
Lenin on Agrarian Question—Rochester 1.75
Anti-Dühring—Engels 3.00
Materialism & Empirio-Criticism—Lenin 2.75
Theory of Marxism—Lenin .15
Living Thoughts of Karl Marx—Trotsky 2.00
And all other in-print works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky, Kautsky, Plekhanov, etc.

The Socialist Party Convention: A Compromise for Unity, Where There Is No Unity

By BERNARD CRAMER

The convention of the Socialist Party took place in Cleveland on May 30-June 1, but the document it adopted on the question which was most hotly disputed in its ranks, the war question, has only just been published.

It looked for a while as if the Norman Thomas wing of the party and its left-wing elements were preparing for a showdown at this convention. It didn't come off. Instead, perhaps the worst possible outcome took place, from the point of view of the SP itself: "a compromise" was agreed on which was carefully planned to resolve nothing.

The two questions around which the dispute had been sharpening are the war question and electoral action. On the first, the opposing viewpoints were, of course, on the one side the Third Camp advocates who wished the party to oppose the Korean war and reject all support to American imperialism in the world today.

By Default

The right wing, as it turned out, decided to make no fight on the second question. The convention duly voted to run a presidential ticket, nominating Darlington Hoopes of Reading for the top of the slate, with Samuel Friedman of New York as his running mate.

In a pre-convention article in the Call, a right-wing spokesman, Irving Barshop, explained why the Thomasites were going to let this question go by default. It is a peculiar reason, but typical of a type of thinking in the SP:

"Because we believe it likely that a majority of the delegates to the coming convention favor an electoral approach," he wrote, "and will undoubtedly support a 1952 socialist presidential campaign, we will not contest the matter of electoral policy at the Cleveland convention for the sake of a higher unity and the negative public relations involved in a fight on this question during a campaign year." (Call, May 16.)

(It is worth only an aside to point out the quite blatant bureaucratic psychology of this announcement, dressed up in curious "democratic" language. Since we think a majority is against us—he is saying—we will not ask the delegates at the convention to pass on our point of view. But there is nothing "democratic" in refusing to fight for one's viewpoint against a majority; on the contrary, the democratic process can best be served by a full, frank and clear counterposition of views before the assembled representatives of the party militants.

A Showdown Loomed

One may guess that the right-wingers were all the more willing to forgo standing up for their position on this point because they believe that another experience with presidential campaigns—and one without Norman Thomas to bear the party banner—will put the quietus on any lingering illusions about the SP's ability to act as an electoral instrument.

Indeed, some sections of the SP were menacingly demanding a showdown on the war policy, in words at least. These were, notably, the Reading local, the California SP, and the youth group, the Young Socialists (YPSL). In January the Reading comrades had adopted a resolution which left little room for compromise, if one took it seriously.

It is part of the election platform, published in the Reading Labor Advocate for June 20 and 27. The national office of the SP and its national organ, the Socialist Call, have not yet published it. The Labor Advocate is the local SP organ in Reading, Penna.

The Reading resolution spoke of the "state of confusion" in the party, which is "split apart by conflicting loyalties." It made the war question primary, the electoral dispute derivative. It said that "the real issue of this [coming] convention" was "whether the Socialist Party shall have any further reason for existence and how that existence can be made worth while."

"On the issues of the day that would mark us off as being apart from the governing bodies of our nation," it said, "we have been politely silent and in some instances collaborative. We have indeed had little reason for existence except as a tradition and a muddling hope."

If a satisfactory program and National Executive Committee are voted, it continued, "those who are busy apologizing for American imperialism, and who want us to become a national coalition in the manner of MacDonald, may leave the party. But at least we shall have a Socialist Party that is socialist, and has not betrayed the heritage that we have the privilege to uphold."

Left-Wingers Back Down

Recalling this statement is itself sufficient commentary on the convention that actually took place, and on the "compromise" which the Reading delegation accepted. Getting Hoopes nominated for the presidency was surely not any compensation in their minds.

The California state SP had also passed staunch resolutions before the convention, particularly for a Third Camp war policy. Just before its delegates left for Cleveland, the state committee "instructed delegates from California to vote for resolutions representing the spirit of the 1951 California convention," as well as the coming Far Eastern socialist conference and the Third Camp in world affairs." (Socialist Advocate, state SP organ, June.)

A month before this, the youth group's national convention had voted Third Camp resolutions on the Korean war.

This leftish coalition collapsed at the convention itself, in a manner altogether familiar to those like the present writer who have gone through the SP school. The convention resolutions committee included only two pro-war Thomasites, but the committee agreed to present a perfectly meaningless draft for the sake of "unity." So empty was this committee draft that it was not even accepted for the purpose of compromise, being considerably amended from the floor without essentially changing its nature. A Third Camp motion presented by a YPSL leader was rejected.

What happened was that the right-wing leaders made it clear that if a forthright anti-war resolution were adopted, they would walk out of the party. With this gun at their temples, the would-be left-wingers wilted, even though the Reading resolution had bravely discussed this very eventually (if they knew their Thomasites, one sees). We will not here press the obvious comment on the very democratic SPers who love to talk so much about the dictatorial and bureaucratic methods of "Bolshevism," about which they know very little.

Even with the emasculated document before them (which we will discuss in a moment), right-wingers Barshop and Aaron Levenstein still attacked the version on the floor, on the ground that it did not sufficiently emphasize its anti-Stalinism—they meant, of course, did not sufficiently support American imperialism against the Stalinists.

The statement on the war question was presented merely as part of the general election platform. No separate resolution on this far-from-minor issue was adopted at all, even though separate statements were voted dealing with closure rule, the UN genocide convention, the right to strike for government employees, etc. But this is the least of it.

Results of a Compromise

The really marvelous thing about the document is that it manages to present a statement on the war question in the year 1952 without even mentioning the Korean war, namely the war that is actually going on. On second thought, we had better modify that: somewhere in the middle is the sentence: "And the bitterest failure [of American policy] is that, seven years after V-J Day, war continues." Fortunately, we all know where it continues, since we read the newspapers. It could qualify as a "mention."

Otherwise the platform puts the SP squarely on record against war in general, and in favor of socialism to ensure peace. Capitalism is an obstacle to peace and a root cause of war. Socialism can solve the problem. Etc.

There is no such animal as American imperialism, according to the platform, which refers to "the unwillingness of the privileged nations to deal fairly with the peoples of the have-not nations," although it also avers that "colonialism has been largely overthrown." It would seem that "in the early post-war period," U. S. policy was going in many good directions but it then took a turn for the worse. "A foreign policy increasingly based on military expediency and American dominance is in the making" (our emphasis). The United Nations must be strengthened; we must "democratize the United Nations, as well as strengthen it to deal with aggression, by eliminating the unilateral veto in the Security Council."

Even when it is on solid, if aged, ground—the proposition that capitalism is a root cause of war—the statement finds it possible only to present an agitational crudity in support of its view. It explains "that capitalism

keeps its creaking economy going through preparation for and participation in war. Therefore, the very existence of capitalism constantly threatens the world with war." (Our emphasis.) It is saying that the war potential in capitalism stems from the bourgeoisie's desire to maintain war prosperity, a devil-theory of the causes of war which LABOR ACTION discussed last week in connection with Galbraith's article. It falls into this vulgarism only because of its desire to avoid any mention of imperialism, which is the real war drive inherent in capitalism.

Though the compromisers seek to avoid saying anything about the concrete problems of today with regard to the war by repeating mere socialist generalities about war, they find that they can no longer in fact repeat even the socialist generalities. For socialist politics flows from socialist theory, and a movement cannot abandon socialist politics without also cutting the guts out of the theory.

It is easy to see why this sort of thing satisfies no one in the SP. It does not really give the right wing what they want—a straightforward, tough social-imperialism—and the left-wingers can accept it even as an empty compromise only by swallowing hard and reassuring themselves that there is nothing really very, very bad in the statement if you interpret it strictly enough. It is written so that California, Reading, the young socialists and their comrades can campaign for Hoopes with an anti-war appeal, and so that the Thomasites can campaign for him (if we give them the benefit of the doubt and grant that they will campaign at all) on their own platform. This is embarrassing (but not as much as National Secretary Myers' facetious suggestion for a campaign slogan, "Whoops for Hoopes").

The presidential candidate, from Reading itself, will not make the campaign less embarrassing for the militants. In his "acceptance speech," Hoopes began his no doubt arduous task of making his way over the eggshells in order to discuss the war question. "The Communists," he said, "are telling the down-trodden and oppressed peoples that the Western powers are the cause of their suffering." (What Hoopes is telling them, he doesn't say.) And: "In China the United States played into the Communists' hands by backing Chiang's corrupt regime, and the Communists took over." (A deplorable mistake, no doubt.) And: "If the United States is to play its proper role in the struggle against Communism, we must accept responsibility for the moral, as well as the military, political, and economic leadership of the free nations." (Our emphasis.)

Not Tied to SP

Even if one leaves aside one's views on the war question, the tragedy of the SP, acted out in this convention, is quite clear. That is, its bankruptcy is not, first of all, due to the fact that it has failed to adopt our views on the war, the Third Camp position. It is that it cannot adopt any position; it is paralyzed. It can say nothing clearly to anyone. It can only repeat emasculated generalities about socialism—perfectly fine generalities, many of them at any rate, but deprived of all living meaning by its inability to give them concrete political application.

But if we examine this paralysis more closely, it is evidently not unconnected with its failure to adopt an anti-war stand. For the alternative to coming out with such a policy, is to go along with the operating policy of Washington—and this equally deprives it of any distinctive reason for existence. We could not point this out any more clearly than the Reading people themselves.

It is true that these are hard days for socialism in the United States, the capitalist aristocrat of the world, and it would be absurd to claim that the Socialist Party could recapture some of its old glory if only it came out against the war. That is not the point. The problem before the SP is not, immediately, how to regain Eugene Debs' mass following—it is how to exist. The special crisis of the Socialist Party, as distinct from the situation of the socialist movement in America as a whole, is that it cannot find any reason for existence.

The Reading Labor Advocate, in an editorial (June 20), waxed somewhat indignant at the temerity of Daniel Bell, in his Life article on the SP convention, in "burying socialism" all over again, like so many of his predecessors since the days of Marx. "We are not dead!" it exclaimed, and it makes a point:

"It is just possible that the Socialist Party as an organization will die," it concedes. "When that time comes, we ourselves will do the burying. Only we who have suffered and fought the fight have that privilege. We ask only the courtesy of permitting us to mourn in private."

"Fortunately, for the world, the cause of socialism is not tied to the welfare of the American Socialist Party, and so we predict that despite our obituary, Life will continue to devote still more pages to the advancing cause of socialism the world over—and yes, even in America!" No, the cause of socialism is not tied to the SP, nor to Norman Thomas; nor is the fate of the SP, even in these days, an earnest of the future of socialism. It warns rather, most clearly, of the fate of those who think to make their already quite pink socialism more "practical" and "realistic" by throwing overboard the ideas, ideals and principles of genuine socialism itself; who think to bridge the gap between socialism and the masses by dissolving the ideas of socialism in the general imperialist ideology which engulfs the country today.

Socialism lives, and can live only, as the banner of the struggle against both capitalism and Stalinism and their imperialisms. That is true both for the left-wingers in the SP and for us of the Independent Socialist League.

On the Los Angeles Labor Front

By LES WRIGHT

LOS ANGELES, July 1—Cyrus S. Ching, federal mediation chief, summoned representatives of American Aviation and of the United Auto Workers (CIO) to the nation's capital for "peace talks" on June 30 in an effort to avert a threatened strike of 27,000 workers at the big aircraft plants here in Southern California and Columbus, Ohio.

Although a strike vote had been taken, the UAW agreed to continue production temporarily under a "voluntary extension" of present wage rates until negotiations end. The government stepped into the picture immediately when it appeared that a strike was imminent, declaring that "vital defense production" would be crippled in the event of a strike, including certain aircraft "necessary to prosecute the Korean war."

The union demands 26 to 28 cents per hour more in wages for various job ranks, noting that aircraft wages run far behind those in the auto industry. Late

reports say the union is preparing for a strike.

SIC TRANSIT . . .

AFL operators of the Los Angeles Transit Lines, who had planned to strike if the company did not raise its wage offer, settled for a 20-cents-per-hour increase plus a cent more on December 1. The company had originally offered 15 cents, and the union had asked for 35 cents. Negotiations broke down until the company was certain that the union would actually strike.

The new increase is considered to be fair or better by labor, but there is a dimmer aspect of the situation. The company has decided to tie the wage increase to another transit fare boost. Only a few months ago the transit company won a fare boost that upped normal rides from 10 cents to 15 (or two for 25), plus a new zoning system with additional fares running 5 cents up.

This increase was battled unsuccessfully by labor spokesmen, liberal civic groups and some city councilmen. Now the company wants to eliminate the two-tokens-

for-a-quarter discount and add 2 cents for transfers in the same zone. These fare-increase demands come so regularly for one of America's poorest and slowest transportation services, points up the need for a municipal transit authority. Los Angeles owns its own water and power works, which neither the transit company nor other businesses object to, because they benefit from the cheaper rates. When the same argument is applied to the transit lines, the private owners and their public champions yell "socialism!"

UMW COPS IT

Workers at the U. S. Vanadium plant and mine near Bishop chose John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers as their bargaining agent in the second of two recent elections. The first election resulted in the defeat of the Stalinist-influenced independent Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers union whose contract ends on July 9. The UMW victory was the first in a reported drive to extend the catch-all "District 50" to West Coast mines, chemical plants, and smelting works. Most UMW Western locals are east of the Rockies.

The strange thing about this election was that the UMW, since its officers never complied with the Taft-Hartley provision on loyalty oaths, was unable to use the NLRB offices, whereas the Stalinist-led unions are unaffected. At this election, an impartial arbiter was used.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 W. 14 Street, N. Y. C.

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

Get ALL your books from Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y. We can supply you!

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.

Subscribers - Attention! Check your NAME-ADDRESS-CITY-ZONE-STATE appearing on the wrapper. If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

16-28

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

RENEW NOW!

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 ZONE

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 STATE

MARXISM for TODAY

Dorothy Thompson Comes Out in Favor of Logic

By PHILIP COBEN

Dorothy Thompson, the columnist, has been traveling around the Middle East. Her observations on the politics of Arab nationalism do not, *per se*, come within the jurisdiction of this department, but in her June 19 column she enunciated, in passing, a theory of history which does.

Perhaps it's unfair to take a daily journalist on a point of historical theory, even though she asks for it. She can hardly be expected to do herself justice in two sentences in the midst of a workaday stint. We would merely claim that, because of her very brevity and simplification, she translates into transparent formulas what is elsewhere wrapped up tightly in academic obfuscation.

Miss Thompson is writing about the Middle East's "revolt against imperialism" and its "demand for self-government and self-determination." This is what she says:

"Its roots are pre-eminently psychological, and its impetus is subjective, emotional, and therefore irrational."

"This being true of all great movements that have affected history, arguments in logic bounce off them with complete ineffectuality."

PLAYING WITH IRRATIONALITY

This sweeping theory has a couple of great virtues: it not only puts its holder on the side of logic, rationality and the angels—an enviable position—but it makes it very easy to understand history. That is because it leaves very little to understand, if the roots of all great historical movements are simply irrational. It shares this virtue with other theories—for example, the one that history is a record of the will of God, which in turn passes understanding, by definition.

When she writes that "its roots are pre-eminently psychological," is she saying anything? It would seem to mean: "This movement has its roots in the ideas which fill the people's minds." But put this way, it is next door to a truism. Of course, people act on the basis of ideas in their heads, whether those ideas are good or bad, rational or irrational, conscious or unconscious, etc. In the same sense, the roots of all of Dorothy Thompson's activities are also "psychological," and the same is true for everybody else. But very plainly she is using the label with derogatory intent and has something else in mind. I should guess that the word "psychological" in this context is intended to have the connotation of "due to a psychological disorder," or psychopathological, though one may doubt whether she would be willing to write that down. In any case, one who stands so firmly on the ground of rationality and logic should not write so loosely in the very act of formulating the indictment.

Similarly: the motive force of all human actions is "subjective"; and very few people, if any, succeed in eliminating "emotional" responses and overtones from the most logical and rational thought processes. It is not even desirable.

But for Miss Thompson, "psychological," "subjective" and "emotional" add up to—"irrational." The least that can be said is that the logic of this step bounces off us.

But this is playing with her words in somewhat the same way that she herself does. Its usefulness is only to show that such tiddledewinks get one nowhere.

WHAT ARE THE ROOTS?

It is true that human beings act on the basis of the ideas in their heads, and therefore it is true that the motive force of historical movements is the ideas of the times and the people. But this is not yet an idealist interpretation of history. The Marxist takes his departure by asking a further question: *What are the roots of these ideas that exist in the people's minds at a given time and place,*

under given historical conditions?

Miss Thompson seems to believe that the roots are to be found in logic or illogicality, rationality or irrationality. Let us see. We need only take the three examples she herself gives, in the very same column, of presumably bad logic by the Arabs she spoke to.

One was a former employee of Anglo-Iranian Oil in Iran, a graduate chemical student with honors from a British university. He told her: "I never rose in this plant above a superior clerical supervisory position—hiring personnel. No Iranian, whatever his qualifications, ever was in a position to give orders to an Englishman. And this in our own country! I will never again work for the British. I'll starve first."

Very subjective, very emotional—but "irrational"?

Another in Khartoum, British-educated and an admirer of British civilization, wanted the British to get out of the Sudan. He explained that although he was invited to British homes in England, "In the Sudan, where the British are our guests, I have never been admitted into a British family household."—"They think they are better than we." So said also the third.

Resentment against social discrimination (such as the last two complained of) is generally associated with economic discrimination (such as the first pointed to) and also with political discrimination where that is still possible for the "master race." All of this is presented as documentation for the "irrationality" of the nationalists, in view of the opinion held by Miss Thompson that Britain has "performed an outstanding job in the Sudan and Egypt" and consistently protected the chief Egyptian interest—namely the waters of the Nile—from "unfriendly hands."

We are not here interested in the naively imperialist psychology of this American columnist who is here looking down on the benighted Arabs from the heights of her logic; who does not even appear to understand that for a subject people it is the imperialist interlopers who have the "unfriendly hands," for it is their hands that the people feel on their necks.

MATERIAL INTERESTS

We are interested only in the fact that, on the basis of her historical view, Miss Thompson looks for rationality versus irrationality—and is not at all concerned about something which falls outside of both. And which also happens to be what her Arab acquaintances were talking about.

That is material interests. A native chemical engineer who cannot rise above a clerkship—like an American Negro college graduate who on occasion has to get a job as a menial because of the color of his skin—is defending the material interests of his own people and of himself when he fights for self-government and self-determination or against discrimination. This is "irrational" from the point of view of the imperialist master or exploiter who has his own material interests to further. It is "illogical" from the point of view of those who benefit by his subjection. Such people, as well as others who naively think within the same framework, can get very "objective" about the "psychology" of the native who somehow "resents" the situation and even gets "emotional" and "subjective" about it; what they cannot see is their own "psychology."

"Logic" has its limits of application. Where survival is at stake, it becomes difficult for one to prove to the other "logically" that self-sacrifice is rationally demanded. In any case, great historical mass movements are not driven by the altruistic considerations of self-sacrifice that might affect unusual individuals, but by considerations of material interests of classes and peoples. In this context, even self-sacrifice flows from this consideration plus a generalized long-range perspective.

This is what Marxism finds at the root of the ideas that fill a people's minds. This is what is at the root of anti-imperialist nationalism in the world today.

This is not to say that irrationality, in the ordinary sense, does not play a role. Individuals (as Dorothy Thompson proves) can be illogical; movements can go off, for greater or lesser periods, on harebrained tangents. But (1) this is merely one of several reasons why the correspondence between objective material interests and actual historical development is not a smooth curve; and (2) one must remember that irrationality often has its causes too, to the social scientist as well as to the psychologist.

The trouble with Miss Thompson's stab at a theory of history is the very question she asks: logical or illogical? Within this framework one can say relevant things about ideas, but one cannot probe their roots. It is a type of historical idealism. The Marxist's question leads to historical materialism.

Readers Take the Floor . . .

More Comment on The Kristol Article

Following are further communications received on the article "The Anti-Anti-Witchhunters: A Study in Totalitarian Liberalism" in our June 16 issue. The letter in this readers' column by Conrad Lynn, to which Kristol refers, appeared June 30. Alan Barth is the author of The Loyalty of Free Men.—Ed.

To the Editor:

I am late in saying so because I have been out of town, but I very much appreciated your kindness in sending me a copy of LABOR ACTION with Hal Draper's article on "Totalitarian Liberalism."

I think that the piece takes Mr. Kristol apart very effectively. In addition, it makes some extremely significant points of its own.

Thank you for letting me see it. Alan BARTH

To the Editor:

It strikes me that Conrad Lynn's parenthetical remark—"that Kristol only signed his name"—is outside the bounds of fair comment. It is not only untrue; it is absurd. Perhaps such a rumor does exist; perhaps Lynn invented it for the occasion; in any case, no responsible editor should give it currency.

I'm sorry, but I cannot spare the time to reply to your polemic. Irving KRISTOL

Pavlov vs. Horatio Alger in Russia

To the Editor:

Richard Troy's article on Russian psychology was excellent. It, however, suffers from oversimplification.

About four months ago I suggested to Hal Draper that someone write a piece on the Russian development of an attitude of "free will" approaching the "soul" of religion. He pointed to the to-do the Stalinists make of Pavlov and conditioning. Not having Troy's facts, this reference to Pavlov floored me.

I would like Troy or someone else to explain how the Stalinists handle their "free personality" and conditioning.

Al FINDLEY

Quick, Fenwick, The Needle!

To the Editor:

There was a time when I could read almost anything—the sermons of Calvin and the Congressional Record, the novels of Proust and the fine print in insurance policies, Burma Shave signs and the Militant.

But as almost everybody has said, art is long, life is short. As I have grown older I have become more discriminating.

Consequently, I am not sure that I am completely up to date on the latest tortured thinking of the Socialist Workers Party.

I know from a recent article by Farrell Dobbs, for example, that the SWP bitterly condemns the U. S. tactics in the Kojé Island disturbances and that it is for the repatriation of all North Korean and Chinese prisoners whether they want to return to the Stalinist areas or not. This is, of course, simply the Stalinist line.

But on the other major propaganda weapon currently being employed by the Stalinists on a world-wide scale there has been, so far as I know, not a single word in the pages of the Militant. I refer, of course, to the Stalinist charge that the UN forces have been resorting to bacteriological warfare in Korea.

Isn't it high time for another letter to Truman?

Or at least another "J'Accuse!"

from Art (Emile Zola) Preis?

Or even a few more homey thoughts in Ye Olde Spittone Philosophic Style from the editor of the Militant?

Or why not simply an article clipped from *Vérité*, the paper of the French Trotskyists, who, polemical Flit-guns in hand, have heroically taken to the barricades in a propaganda counter-attack against *la guerre microbienne*?

What delicacy restrains the SWP on this question?

The omission is all the more singular in that the SWP, perhaps alone of all the small radical groups, has among its members a lay expert on the bacteriological world—no less a person than James P. Cannon himself.

Older readers of the radical press may recall his article, "The Pathology of Renegacy," published in the June 1940 *Fourth International*. Its approach is sufficiently indicated by an introductory passage in the article: "In my week-end reading I altered some of the chapters of *The Microbe Hunters*, which I read for pleasure and instruction, with an examination of some of the latest effusions of numerous fugitives from Marxism, which I read without pleasure in the line of duty. Both readings, however, could be properly classified under the same head: the study of harmful bacteria."

I hope that some summer weekend in the near future, between the games of solitaire, Cannon, who has recently had so much to say about Chambers and so little about Hiss, will brush up on the latest developments in the field of microscopic investigation and do a real political think-piece on the Russian charge that the UN forces are using bacteriological weapons in Korea.

I am sure that such an article will provoke the same titters as did Cannon's original excursion into science.

In a world where there isn't much to laugh at, I hasten to add, such an article would have its rights.

J. M. F.

Ukrainians and Labor Action

To the Editor:

Probably you will be interested in these facts:

The constant efforts of your paper to inform the American workers and general public on the problems and ideas of the Ukrainian national anti-Stalinist liberation movement has found a special appreciation among the Ukrainian emigration throughout the world. Ukrainian workers, who came as immigrants recently to this country, have found in your paper one of the very few supporters of their cause, if not the only one, which clearly understands the problems of the struggle against Stalinist-Russian imperialism and the true will of the Ukrainian people to be free from any sort of exploitation, be it Stalinism, capitalism or a Keresky Russian empire supported by the latter. The Ukrainian workers in this country are only very astonished to see your tendency on the list of "subversive" anti-democratic groups. We believe that you are the true democrats, and not those who placed you on that list. To be against the capitalist system does not mean in our opinion to be against democracy; capitalism and democracy are completely different things.

To show the appreciation by the progressive circles of the Ukrainian emigration of your efforts to clear up and support the Ukrainian liberation movement, please note the following: Several articles from your paper, dealing with the Ukrainian problem, have been recently reprinted in several Ukrainian papers, followed by grateful editorial comments. In the bimonthly *Suchasna Ukraina*, published in Munich, Germany, there were recently reprinted in

(Turn to last page)

Youth and Student Corner

DISCUSSION: What Should Be Done About the Catholic Schools?

We publish the following letter from a reader as a contribution to a discussion of the problem which he raises. We are, of course, interested in such questions even though our main emphasis is political.—Ed.

To The Editor, Youth and Student Column:

The violent disagreements which have been recently displayed by partisans of public versus private school education have, I note, been entirely ignored by both LABOR ACTION and the Youth and Student Corner. Bearing as they do upon broad issues of theoretical interest—as well as very real and immediate questions of public policy—these controversies would seem to demand the closest attention from any group which claims to speak for progressive and social policies in education. By concentrating almost exclusively upon issues of academic freedom, the Youth and Student Corner has appeared to reflect an extremely narrow conception of the tasks which devolve upon the social critic of our educational system today.

In addition to the problem being raised in this letter, I have looked in vain in LABOR ACTION for a thoroughgoing evaluation of recently renewed controversies over "progressive" versus "traditional" education, a critique of the misleading Warner school studies on the effect of class background on teaching attitudes, or an examination of current proposals for the democratization of school control. Could it be that the Youth and Student Corner is uninterested in such questions?

What do the recent discussions at the American Association of School Administration reveal? What lies behind the attack by President Conant of Harvard on private schools?

For several decades, there has been an ever-increasing proportion of students attending private parochial schools. The overwhelming bulk of these students are Catholic, and the increase reflects as much the general increase of school attendance among low-income groups, among which Catholics are a large proportion, as the steady increase in the proportion of Catholics in the total population. Lutheran and other sectarian Protestant denominations have seen an absolute increase in the size of their parochial school attendance, but when measured against population growth, their religious school attendance has shown a steady decline.

WHAT CATHOLIC EDUCATION AIMS AT

The extent to which the growth of Catholic schools has taken place is indicated by recent figures which show that 27 per cent of all students in the United States attend such schools, which in turn operate on a record budget of \$3.3 billion yearly. Furthermore plans now under way contemplate the expansion of Catholic school facilities to the extent where they will be capable of handling up to 40 per cent of the nation's primary school students, and a somewhat smaller proportion of high school and college students.

In contrast to an earlier period when less than 10 per cent of the nation's students attended Catholic schools, this is a tremendous increase. From it, and from the tremendously increased school power of an educational structure which is entirely separate from and almost completely outside of the control of public educational authorities, flow the current ambitions of Catholic school administrators for financial support from the public coffers. Catholic political theory has never accepted the status to which private schools have been relegated. By one legal stratagem or another the Catholic schools have sought to break down the legal and constitutional barriers against state aid to sectarian institutions. In this one area the Supreme Court has, in recent years, gone out of its way to define in a fairly strict manner the constitutional barriers to state aid.

Liberals, of whom Paul Blanshard is the best example, confine their efforts to advocating the maintenance of existing barriers between church and state. As far as it goes this is an excellent program and deserves the wholehearted support of socialists. But for socialists, the question becomes one of the desirability of religious education as such. It is a fallacy, typical of the liberal mind, that religious free-

Another View: On Religious Freedom and Educational Standards

Following are some comments as a contribution to discussion on the positive proposal suggested by our correspondent Thistlewaite: compulsory attendance at public schools. The question is a very interesting one, but I incline to believe that his remedy for the evils of the Catholic school system goes too far.

Religious freedom, he says, does not mean the freedom to indoctrinate. That's a little vague; "indoctrinate" is a useful term when one is discussing educational methods, as he does in other parts of his letter. But when used in a discussion of religious freedom (which is a political concept) it is too often used as a derogatory synonym for "propagate a point of view." It might help if we first defined religious freedom positively, from the socialist point of view.

I think it can be put very simply. We are for complete separation of church and state, and for full democratic rights for any church to propagate its point of view as a private organization with the same rights as any other private organization. Complete separation of church and state does not exist in America; it would mean that the church, or any combination of churches, would have no more legal rights than (say) any other non-profit institution. (This is not always the case now.) But religious freedom is the other side of this proposition. I do not see how any socialist can advocate depriving the church of any legal right enjoyed by any non-religious institution.

A proposal for compulsory attendance at public schools only, then, raises first of all the problem of private schools in general, not only religious schools. At this point I do not find that Thistlewaite's proposal is clear. He seems to recognize a "legitimate role" for private secular schools. So would I. It is true that under capitalism these tend to be available only to the wealthier. I would maintain that a socialist educational system would eliminate some of the legitimate reasons for their existence today, and diminish the less savory reasons for their existence (like pure snobbery). But this is not yet an argument for abolishing them by law; at most it might lead to a prediction that they will tend to wither away.

It seems to me that a general prohibition of private schools (let us say, under socialism) would flow from the conception that the

dom must necessarily mean the freedom to indoctrinate. For this is the special purpose of Catholic education, as differentiated from its general function of building up an homogeneous and group-conscious religious community.

Catholic education does not consist, as is frequently represented to be the case, of teaching the ordinary skills and knowledge plus special courses in the religious doctrine and precepts of Catholicism. The first point which must always be made regarding Catholic education is that it is inferior even to that of the miserable level of most public schools. For the most part Catholic schools do not exist even to train pupils in the skills considered essential by public school authorities.

Rather, their aim—from the very beginning—is to inculcate those special attitudes, values and beliefs which characterize and differentiate Catholicism. Beginning with kindergarten, where prayers are taught by rote, through a grade-school system which stresses catechism and saintly biography, right up to the high school which teaches Catholic "history" and "moral philosophy," Catholic education consists of indoctrination of Catholic attitudes and values.

COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE AT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

And the important aspect of this indoctrination is that it is taught under circumstances in which no alternative viewpoint is considered as other than "heresy" or "wickedness." Can anyone imagine the furor which would be created if a Stalinist high school teacher were revealed as having forbidden any pupil to consult works other than the "classics" of Stalinism? We know that such a system prevails in Russia, but here in the United States there exists an entire educational system not one whit less dogmatic, or less intellectually authoritarian. To think for oneself, to investigate problems of ethics, morals, social relations or theology in an open-minded, rational manner, this is forbidden and proscribed by Catholic schools. And the result, even more than in the case of the public school graduate, is the ignorant, bigoted and narrow-minded Catholic adult. For not only with regard to the special idiosyncrasies which mark the Catholic view on birth control, divorce and similar questions, but also in terms of broad attitudes about science, knowledge and social values, the Catholic-educated person is steeped in medieval lore and dominated by the parish priest's outlook.

The objection may be raised: Don't people have a right to choose their own brand of ignorance? Why should Catholics not have the privilege of having their children indoctrinated with their own brand of opiate? Such a viewpoint ignores the actual pattern of social pressures in the Catholic community. Many Catholic parents who would be more than happy to have their children attend public schools are subjected to very real and overwhelming pressure to place their children in the local parish school. For these Catholics it becomes a question of how to protect them against their own institutions. From the child's point of view, which in this case should be determining, it is the problem of insuring adequate sources of information and a climate of free inquiry. This can never be obtained under conditions of church-dominated education.

How to guarantee educational liberties while maintaining religious freedom, that becomes the crucial question. For our part we believe that the only democratic—not to speak of socialist—answer must be compulsory attendance at public-supported schools. This does not exclude additional religious training (the right to which we freely grant), but it would ensure at least the opportunity for a much broader and enlightened choice of intellectual orientation. The main aim must be to reduce the educational power of religious schools, above all Catholic ones.

In advocating compulsory attendance at secular schools we are not overlooking the fact that from an ideal socialist standpoint the public schools are only one degree less reactionary than Catholic schools. Nor do we ignore the whole area of what constitutes the legitimate role of private secular schools; under capitalism the exclusive privilege of wealth. But for the main question of what should be our position as regards Catholic education, we must become the outspoken advocates of compulsory attendance at public schools.

Mortimer THISTLEWAITE

state must have a complete and unchallenged monopoly on education. I will only say that I do not see this as a necessary principle at all in a democratic society.

But if all this is breaking in an open door, and our correspondent wishes to legalize only Catholic (or perhaps religious) schools, then he will have to explain why one private group of citizens should have the right to run a school, and not another private group organized as a church. I can see only one way of approaching this problem.

PUT TEETH INTO EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS

Thistlewaite's main motivation, after all, is the fact that Catholic school education is very bad, educationally, regardless of one's acceptance or rejection of its special dogmas. Certainly, even today the state assumes the responsibility of checking on and approving the educational qualifications of those schools which it admits as substitutes for the public schools. We need not discuss why the present government cannot be expected to put any teeth into this role and why it permits the dismally low level of Catholic parochial schools. But until it (or the better government we advocate) does at least this, it can hardly be expected to close the Catholic schools down completely—on educational, not anti-religious, grounds.

It remains to ask whether the Catholic Church, with its own dogmas and special versions on numerous questions affecting science, literature, the arts and virtually every other subject in the school curriculum, could possibly set up a school that could conform to the standards of progressive education and modern knowledge. That is for them to work out, though it is easy to answer No offhand. In any case a special law against Catholic schools would either be unnecessary (under proper government supervision) or impossible (under the present government).

The Catholic Church, in any case, like anyone else would still have the undisputed right to run its private schools or classes for pupils who may also attend public schools; it also has the right to "indoctrinate" in these institutions.

Hal DRAPER

Civil Liberties and Fascists

Two Recent Cases Once More Raise the Problem for Socialists

By HAL DRAPER

The present witchhunt, which is directed primarily but not only at the Stalinists, has been for many a test of their belief in principles of civil liberties which they have praised and advocated in the past. We know how many liberals have failed the test. This week we want to come back to an aspect of the question which some use in justification of their retreat. It is asked challengingly: "Well, would you also be for guaranteeing civil liberties for fascists? And if not, why be easier on the Stalinists, who are just as much totalitarians?"

It is a perfectly fair question. Not only liberals but socialists have stumbled over it in the past, as we shall discuss. And unless one thinks through it, no consistent position on the general question is possible.

The position of the Independent Socialist League and of LABOR ACTION is that we are opposed to the imposition of any legal restrictions by the state on the free expression of OPINIONS, including vile and reactionary opinions which we fight uncompromisingly all the way down the line. This applies to political tendencies which we consider to be the mortal enemies of socialism, like Stalinism and fascism, as well as to political opinions which we like.

The Limitations of Civil Liberties

LABOR ACTION has paid a great deal of attention in the last few years to the juridical problems of civil liberties in this country, that is, to analyzing the court decisions and government decrees and practices from the point of view of democracy. Such emphasis, while necessary under circumstances where important and rapid changes have been taking place in the juridical structure, through a slue of new decisions by the Supreme Court for example, might conceivably be misleading; and so at the same time, on several occasions, we have tried to make clear that our interest in the question in no way assumes any notion on our part that the main dependence for the defense of democratic rights should be on the courts and on proper court decisions.

That is one front, but not the decisive one. We are not led to this view merely by Marxist "prejudices." It happens also to be the view of men who, one might think, would tend to be most hypnotized by legalism—I am referring to the jurists who have specialized in civil-liberties law. Zechariah Chafee Jr., for instance, in his *Free Speech in the United States*, emphasizes as strongly as we might do that putting democratic laws on the books, or getting democratic court decisions, and even enforcing them, is a weak reed whenever there is a determined assault on civil liberties in practice by powerful forces.

Justices Holmes and Brandeis were not behind him on this. In fact, it would seem that the more closely one looks at the problems of civil-liberties law, the more one is pushed to the opinion that the fate of civil liberties is in the hands of forces which are not dealt with in legal decisions. The questions, in the last analysis, will be settled by the social struggle of our time.

These great civil-libertarians were not victims of

No 'Juridical Cretinism'

what might be called "juridical cretinism" (on the analogy of "parliamentary cretinism"). Even more, no Marxist could be among those who seem to think that, if only some brilliant legal formula were found, air-tight and lawyer-proof, democracy could be guaranteed. The struggle for the defense of democracy and its civil-liberties institutions is a front in the struggle against all reaction and for socialism, and this does not take place primarily in the law courts.

It is with these limitations in mind that we return to the civil-liberties discussion, once again, in order to elaborate on an aspect which we have dealt with recently mainly in passing. For while it is possible to make the mistake of thinking that good civil-liberties laws are not enough to save us, it is obviously a much worse mistake to plump for bad and self-defeating laws on the same subject under the impression that they will help.

For those who are interested, we have previously discussed the subject of civil liberties with relation to fascists in "Civil Liberties and Totalitarianism," in the *New Internationalist* for Dec. 1945; and in the following articles in LABOR ACTION: "The Terminiello Case," editorial, May 30, 1949; "Schlesinger vs. Schlesinger," July 9, 1951; "In Search of a Formula," August 20, 1951. And of course much is relevant to this question from the numerous articles we have carried on the question of civil liberties for Stalinists, since at bottom the two issues are the same as far as the primary approach is concerned.—H. D.

Some would put this on a moral basis: it is immoral to cry for democracy when our own rights are attacked and to join in the hue and cry when the other fellow's neck is on the block. We ourselves prefer to take a political approach to the problem; while morality is involved, it is not an abstract morality derived from the Golden Rule but one based on the realities of the social struggle.

The Political Crux

There is really a fundamental error implied in calling this question "civil liberties for fascists" or "civil liberties for Stalinists," even though I'm sure we have used those phrases as much as anyone, as a shorthand label, and probably will do so again. When the question is asked "Should we be for the civil liberties of totalitarians?" many of the liberals-in-retreat counter with: "Why should we support their rights when, if they get power, they will use it only to destroy ours?"

Tit for tat, and let us do unto them as they would do unto us—so goes this thinking. (Incidentally, this is also a version of the Golden Rule, with opposite conclusion, and hints at the difficulties of abstract moral principles.)

The error lies in the notion that it is the totalitarians' rights that we are primarily concerned about when we defend the principles of civil liberties. It is not. We are not defending the latter for his sake but for ours—and by "ours" we mean the masses of people who need democratic rights as an instrument in their fight for a better life. It is not at all a question of what the totalitarians "deserve" for being themselves against democracy; this is to make the question almost trivial. It is not a question of merely getting indignant about the demagoguery and hypocrisy of the totalitarians who yell like stuck pigs when their democratic rights are infringed upon, even while they proclaim their own sinister intentions once they grasp the weapons of the state; they are demagogues indeed, being fascists or Stalinists; but this is a fight on another front. This is also why no decent man will have any truck with their hypocritical "civil-liberties" fronts.

It is a question of the objective political CONSEQUENCES of and the political CONCESSIONS to the state implied in going along with restrictions which are presumably aimed at these demagogues and vicious movements.

This is the basis for the Independent Socialist position.

The Smith Case

Let us concretize this with two very recent cases in point.

(1) A couple of months ago, the Los Angeles Board of Education refused to give the use of a school auditorium to a Stalinist front organization which wanted to hold a meeting to protest the Smith Act trial of CP leaders now going on in that city. There is no question that this refusal was illegal, not justified by the law and regulations governing the use of the schools. The board unabashedly took refuge in a pure fiasco, counting on the witchhunt atmosphere to get away with it.

The incident irresistibly reminds this writer of a hearing before the very same Los Angeles Board of Education seven years ago, when the same Stalinists appeared before the board. They were there, together with some liberals, to demand that Gerald L. K. Smith, the fascist rabble-rouser, be denied the use of a school auditorium to hold a meeting.

It would be light-minded to confine oneself to saying "Serves 'em right!" or merely to use the pat coincidence as a stick with which to beat the Stalinists. It would be just as light-minded to conclude that both the Stalinists and Smith should have been denied the auditorium. The fact is that the basis on which the Stalinists made their anti-Smith demand in 1945 was a state law—which had a history of being used to prevent socialist meetings.

For one cannot appeal to the government authorities to swing its big club without appealing to one or another law or regulation. Every such law, if applicable at all, is equally a club against progressive dissenters in our society.

And in our society particularly, you are going to find that that club will be used against the genuine left (and not only against the Stalinists) a hundred times more

*The Stalinists, as a matter of fact, were Johnny-come-latelies in Los Angeles in the fight against fascist Smith. When he first appeared on the scene, their line was that of many liberals: Ignore him and he'll fade away. Instead his meetings increased in size each time. The first demonstration at his meetings, a picket line, was organized by our group in the city, and was largely instrumental in stimulating the later, and larger, demonstrations that greeted him. It was at this point that the Socialist Party came on the scene with its own typical confusionism. It actually distributed a leaflet arguing that a picket line before a Smith meeting was an infringement on his civil liberties! The whole point of the present discussion bears upon the role of the state, and the dangers of invoking state restrictions on democratic rights.

readily than it will be used against some fascist.

That is what happened in this case. In 1945 Gerald Smith was permitted to spout in a city school. In 1952 the Stalinists, who had given their sanction and approval to the right of the board to draw the line on its own say-so, were kept out of the school.

If we give the state the right to restrict the civil liberties of hated groups, we put in their hands a double-edged sword—and the sharpest edge of that sword is or will be turned against our kind of people, not against the fascist enemy. It is enough to look at experience in almost any country to confirm this. The United States not least of all, even if one scorns the teachings of the Marxist analysis of the capitalist state as the defender of the ruling class.

The Beauharnais Case

It may be properly objected: All that put the Los Angeles Stalinists in a contradiction, which may have been embarrassing, but after all it was not their earlier advocacy of the restriction which caused them to feel its brunt this time; it is a question of power.—That is indisputably true, at bottom, but all it bears on is the limitations of the whole question which are discussed in the accompanying box. Embarrassing contradictions can be ignored when overriding struggles relegate them to secondary importance, but they are not unimportant when it is a question of trying to mobilize mass sentiment in defense of democratic rights. That from the "practical" side. More than that, from the socialist point of view there is no reason thus to impugn one's own democratic principles in the eyes of the people. It is not simply a question of making out a good case in the law courts.

(2) The second case came up in a decision of the Supreme Court in May which did not get very much publicity. It could be just as dangerous as the court's more notorious decisions validating the Smith Act and the Feinberg Law.

The Supreme Court upheld, 5-4, the constitutionality of Illinois' "group-libel" law. This law made it criminal to distribute any publication portraying "depravity, criminality, unchastity, or lack of virtue of a class of citizens, of any race, color, creed or religion which . . . exposes [them] to contempt, derision or obloquy. . . ."

Read that prohibition and one should go through a double-take. If read with one thought in mind, it sounds like a laudable attempt to outlaw hate-mongering statements directed against Negroes, Jews and other minorities who are often slandered. The case is made even more pointed by the obviously fair intent. But read it again and think of the broad scope which its language immediately and directly points to!

'Group-Libel'

The majority of the court argued that the law merely made the law of libel against individuals applicable to libel against groups, and therefore was unobjectionable. But the difference should be obvious: one can discuss social questions without making illegally nasty references to individuals, but it is another matter to discuss social questions without calling into question "the lack of virtue" of broad "classes of citizens"—like capitalists, politicians, stoolpigeons, isolationists, Democrats, Republicans, army brass, white-supremacy advocates, scabs, steel barons, and even less objectionable classifications.

A dissent by Justice Reed held that the language of the statute was so vague as to permit infringements on free speech. Justice Douglas objected on the ground of the "clear and present danger" doctrine. He pointed out that under the law a Negro might be prosecuted for denouncing lynch law in heated terms. Justice Jackson also dissented, among other grounds because the defendant had not been given a chance to prove the truth of his statements. Justice Black added:

"If there be minority groups who hail this holding as their victory, they might consider the possible relevancy of this ancient remark: 'Another such victory and I am undone.'"

So wide open is the Illinois statute that the majority, while upholding it, had to specify that in their opinion it could not apply to "libels" of political parties. They had to state so because obviously its language does so apply!

Such a law, inevitably applying to an unlistable host of expressions of opinion on social questions, is a monstrosity.

It does not become any better because the case that came up before the Supreme Court was that of a vicious race-baiter, one Beauharnais. But it is this, in the minds of some, that will reconcile them to the dangerous law.

The Socialist Proposal

We Independent Socialists have a proposal for a law which would really strike a blow against the Jim-Crowers, anti-Semites and race-haters. We advocate legislation making acts of racial discrimination a criminal offense—acts by landlords who refuse to rent to Negroes, Jews, Mexican-Americans, etc.; acts by employers who refuse to hire workers born in the wrong family or with the wrong skin color; acts by restaurant owners or hotel

(Continued bottom of next page)

The Snag in the Russian Economy

By Vs FELIX

For the first time this year the text of the Five Year Plan was not published in the USSR. The reasons for this are not known. But there can be no doubt that a new five-year plan has been formulated, and that it is already being carried out. The first year of the new plan was 1951.

The following is also interesting. In the Soviet Union every plan goes into effect only when it is confirmed in the form of law, i.e., when the Supreme Council has ratified it. But neither of the two sessions of the Supreme Council debated this plan last year.

In the year 1951 we find a further powerful increase in the production of heavy industry, and a failure in agricultural production.

We know this from a speech by Beria, delivered at the celebration of the anniversary of the October Revolution. According to his account, we have the following picture of production in heavy industry, compared to 1950:

	1951	1950
	(in millions of tons)	
Pig iron	22.0	19.3
Steel	31.0	27.2
Light metals	23.4	20.4
Crude oil	42.3	37.8
Coal	284.0	260.6
Cement	12.4	10.4
Electric energy (in million kw)	104.0	90.0
Tractors (in thousands)	137.0	110.1
Combines (in thousands)	54.0	46.0

Standstill in Agriculture

In discussing the development of heavy industry in 1951 Beria said that two-thirds of the increased production was achieved by an increase in the productivity of labor: "Our industrial production increases basically as a result of the increase in productivity of labor." "Today the Soviet Union produces as much steel as England, France, Belgium and Sweden combined."

"The coal industry of the USSR covers not only the total domestic needs of our country, but also makes possible the creation of large coal reserves." The heaviest work in the mines is everywhere done by technological means.

"We have achieved even greater results in the crude oil industry. One can say without a doubt that the task set by Stalin, to increase the production of crude oil to 60 million tons, will be fulfilled before the time allotted to it."

The machine-building industry can register a big increase in production. In 1951 some 400 new types of machines were produced. They are building a steam turbine which will produce

150,000 kilowatts, which will be the biggest in the world.

The only field on which Beria reported very briefly was agriculture. He said merely that during the past years the total harvest had exceeded seven billion pood annually (one pood equals about 36 1/8 pounds). In other words the production of Soviet agriculture has not experienced any increase "for several years," including 1951. It is already known that in 1950 the plan foreseen for agriculture had not been fulfilled. The situation is particularly bad in sugar-beet production. In 1950 the plan was not fulfilled, and now, in Beria's words, "more sugar beets were harvested than in the previous year." No figures were given.

This condition of Soviet agriculture must be described as exceedingly menacing. Productivity has not increased for years, but during the same period, as Beria said, "the annual population increase is larger than in 1940, and comes to three million heads." The standstill in agricultural production over a period of several years, taken together with an annual population increase of three million people, makes the provision of foodstuffs the most difficult problem on the Soviet agenda.

Cause or Effect?

It is difficult to directly establish the reason for the failures in agriculture. Some Western experts try to connect it with the measures which increased the size of the kolkhozes. But this is not quite correct. This process has not been going on for quite two years, while Beria himself speaks of the failure in agriculture for "several years." The opposite supposition probably has more justification: The Soviets regard the steps which increased the size of the kolkhozes as a way out of the existing crisis and as a means of increasing agricultural production. At the same time it is characteristic that the productivity of labor in agriculture has not increased during the past years, despite the fact that its mechanization has assumed ever more powerful forms.

Beria said that "at the present time the machine-tractor stations carry out two-thirds of the kolkhoz field work." The machine replaces human labor, and hence the kolkhoz worker has no interest in increasing his productivity. For the machine does not help him. It belongs to the state, and the kolkhoz worker must pay the state for its work. It is not excluded that one must seek the failure in Soviet agriculture in the conflict between the relations of production and the means of production. It would be difficult to discover a different explanation, as it is possible to establish the fact that there has been a large increase in the tilled areas, in the mechanization of production and in other capital investments.

In any event, the fact remains that the condition of Soviet agriculture makes the standard of living of the population very precarious. Beria threw an interesting light on this question when he said that "on Comrade Stalin's initiative the government of the USSR has taken a number of measures toward the end of increasing the production of foodstuffs and consumer goods over and above the provisions of the plan." This kind of a declaration was doubtless imposed by the situation which had arisen in the USSR, and it only confirms the existence of the food crisis.

Clue to Living Standards

Absolute figures on the production of foodstuffs in the Soviet Union are not known. Beria operates only with percentages. But we have at our disposal the absolute figures for the planned production of foodstuffs for 1950. This plan, as is known, was not fulfilled. We do not know by how many percentage points the plan failed of fulfillment in 1951. But even if we assume that the plan for 1950 was fulfilled, and if we multiply the figures set down for this plan by the percentages given by Beria for 1951, we arrive at the following picture of the production of foodstuffs in the Soviet Union:

	1951	1950
	(in thousand tons)	
Meat	1560	1300
Animal fats	297	275
Vegetable fats	1190	880
Fish	2440	2260
Sugar	2980	2400
Flour	?	19,000

If these somewhat optimistic figures on the production of foodstuffs in the year 1951 are divided by the number of the population, we get the following picture of the food allotment available to each Soviet family (weekly—on the calculated basis of three and a half persons per Soviet family):

	Per person	Per family
	(in grams)	
Meat	144	504
Animal fats	27	92
Vegetable fats	109	382
Fish	225	788
Sugar	275	963
Flour	1755	6143

It is clear that this ration is miserable, specially when we emphasize once more that our point of departure was the plan of 1950 which was not fulfilled. The actual situation in this field can only be judged, further, when we bear in mind that the distribution of food depends on the social position of each individual, and that it therefore follows that due to the existing social contradictions the majority of the population of the Soviet Union gets less food than the average figures listed above would indicate.

On the basis of the considerations brought forward here, we see that the fourfold reduction in prices since the war has been of no practical significance, as in the Soviet Union there is a great shortage of goods, and a complete shortage of foodstuffs.

(From *Vpered*, No. 1-2, 1952)

Civil Liberties and Fascists: Recent Cases — —

(Continued from page 6)

keepers who turn away or otherwise discriminate against such minorities.

The difference is enormous. We do not advocate that an employer or landlord be jailed for having Jim-Crow opinions; we propose that he be given the limit for what he does.

There is no way, no formula, no gimmick, no trick of language, by which a law can be written to outlaw expressions of opinion which we do not like, without at the same time throwing into jeopardy the right of others to express opinions which are hostile to the powers-that-be of the status quo.

We repeat: any attempt to impose such a law, whether it is done with good intentions or with bad, puts into the hands of the state a two-edged sword. In the hands of a capitalist state it is a menace. In the hands of a workers' state it is unnecessary—and can be a menace too.

The German Analogy

As we mentioned at the beginning, the above point of view has not always been taken for granted in the socialist movement nor even among liberals. Nor is it even accepted by all socialists now.

In the Socialist Party of the '30s, in my own experience, when the spectacle of the Nazis' rise to power in Germany was the big and appalling phenomenon, it was common—also, even especially, among the militant socialists—to assert that "we don't support civil liberties for fascists." This was even more true of the Trotskyist

movement, and no doubt still is true for the SWP. We would be able to find it in our own publications of, say, ten years ago or thereabouts.

I should hazard the opinion that for the left socialists, both of the Socialist Party and the Trotskyist movement, an impetus for this view was an erroneous interpretation of what happened in the rise of Hitlerism in Germany. When expressing our own view, I still run into an objection which is worded like this: "But what would you have done in Germany when Hitler's movement was growing in strength and running rampant?" The objector is aware that the socialists called for government crackdown against the Hitler bands, and the line is mechanically transferred. There is a misapprehension here.

The situation in Germany of those years, and the demand of the socialists, did not arise because the Nazis were merely expressing unwelcome opinions. Anyone who knows anything about the events is aware that, from its very early days, the Nazis (like the Mussolini fascists) organized as terror bands to break up workers' meetings and intimidate opponents by force and violence. As long as Hitler was merely making speeches he was a cipher. He sold himself to his powerful backers by performing a more meaningful function for them.

It is almost irrelevant to appeal to the German example if it is a question only of fascist expressions of opinion. What the socialists rightly demanded was that the government apply its laws to Nazi terror. And at least as far as the left socialists were concerned, this demand was not made because they put their trust in the bourgeois governments to protect them against the fascists; insofar as Hitler's Weimar predecessors refused to take vigorous steps to control the Nazi hoodlums, insofar as

the Junker-ridden courts of the Weimar democracy blatantly favored Hitlerite criminals, and the Weimar police closed one eye to their crimes, the Marxists were able to show that the workers would have to rely on their own strength, on their own defense guards, on their own militia, and, above all, on their own revolutionary party.

They're Not Propaganda Groups!

This little historical excursion is useful to keep in mind, not only because it bears on the reasons of and the error in opposition to "civil liberties for fascists," but also for another reason. We should keep in mind that, by the very nature of a fascist movement, its role tends to turn toward terroristic action. Fascist outfits are not primarily propaganda groups; they are organized as action groups. The Ku Klux Klan is not a propaganda group; it is a terroristic movement. Gerald Smith started as a fonder of mob violence in Detroit, very early in his game; his period of rabble-rousing meetings was just a phase. The Silver Shirts, the Christian Crusaders, and other fascist scum that have at various times infested sections of America yearned to be action groups whenever they got the chance. This is the basis on which to mobilize support for government action against them.

The whole question of "civil liberties for fascists," in fact, is half an abstraction. We have tried to explain why it is bad to go wrong on it, in those instances where the question gets raised, but there is no reason for blowing it up into an important social issue in this country. If and when the struggle against fascism becomes important and open, it will not take place in the courts.

GOP Convention Demagoguery —

(Continued from page 1)
 contests. Governor Dewey, in his zeal to see Eisenhower elected, whipped his New York delegation into line to vote 95-1 for the Eisenhower "fair play" proposal. All newspaper accounts verified Dewey's high-handed tactics—including his reminder to the New York politicians that he had two and a half years to go in office—as he "steam-rollered" his delegation against the Taft "steam-roller." As he made a charge of "dictator" against Taft, the latter's rejoinder was that Dewey had been a "dictator," too. Each was refreshingly candid about the other.

Ike's Style

There had been some doubt until the current campaign whether Eisenhower was a Republican or Democrat; his Republican mantle is stained by his having made a youthful speech for the Democrats and by the never successfully denied story by New York Times' Arthur Krock that Truman had offered him the Democratic nomination.

Eisenhower has made his domestic political differentiation with his Democratic similars by calling for the use of the Taft-Hartley Act and by coming out against FEPC, both in the rather feeble, ambiguous and genial form to which the public is becoming accustomed as his political style.

Eisenhower also wears the mantle of charismatic grace supposed to distinguish all victorious military-hero candidates for office, which

seems to cling to the administrators of large-scale slaughter. No doubt he is a "popular" candidate in the personal sense; much more so than the dour Taft who had to learn to kiss infants and wear Indian headdresses. As one of the feminine attenders of the convention, who snatched a handshake from Eisenhower, said of the general, "He said good night so darling" . . .

'Internationalism'?

To underscore the importance of the two-party system, one should recall that the Democratic Party and the labor leaders who support it prefer Taft as the Republican candidate. However, the Republicans have had what Taft calls the "Me-too" candidate before: Dewey and Wilkie. They lost with them, largely because of the support of the labor movement to the Democrats.

It is not that the Democrats—the administration Democrats, that is—support the policies of Taft. It is that his nomination would emphasize the differences between the two parties, and give the Democrats a better opportunity to differentiate their more progressive domestic policy, with reference to Taft-Hartley and FEPC (providing they can get a meaningful FEPC plank in their own platform) and their "internationalism" in foreign policy.

Eisenhower from the Republican point of view would have a difficult time of it in the field of foreign relations because he has been so intimately associated with the

administration's policy. He has therefore been told to soft-pedal any pronouncements in this sphere; as someone reminded him, the administration has all the documents.

5-Star Demagogue

General MacArthur who had said "There is no politics in me," appropriately escorted to the platform by the Chicago police and of whom it was reported that he ordered five stars sewn to his mattress, "faded" for himself and spoke to enhance the chances of the nomination of Taft. But, despite the dramatic entrance, the organized cheerleading, the worked-over sonorities of the speech, the effort of the general's speech apparently fell short of its intentions. Almost every word, every phrase of his speech was pure, calculated demagoguery. He was appealing to everyone and everything: against the "schemers and planners," for the youth, for the aged, for the farmers, for the workers, for the industrialists, against militarization and war, for extension of the war, for peace, for more arms (to the East), for nationalism, for internationalism, for states' rights, for economy, for prosperity for ideas against armed might, but more armed might, etc.

MacArthur identified the administration as the "extreme reactionaries" who furnished the "prerequisites to a socialistic state." He was against one corporation, which he labeled the "corporation of federal government." Which he wouldn't

mind heading, of course.

MacArthur was for "peace," accusing the Democrats, as other Republicans have done, of being the "war party," heaping on their heads the blame for World War I, World War II and the Korean War. His program for ending the current war is to extend it, give more arms, use more men—a bigger and "better" war.

Lunatic Fringe

It is worth noting that beyond the swamp of the Republican reaction is the miasma of the proto-fascist, racist lunatic fringe, seeking to exert its influence on the convention, containing Gerald L. K. Smith, Rev. Gerald Winrod, Joseph P. Kamp, Upton Close and Mrs. L. C. Hynning. According to the Chicago Sun-Times, they have variously depicted Eisenhower "as a Roman Catholic, a Swedish Jew, a tool of the Communists, a tool of Wall Street, a man failing in health, a warmonger, a 'Me, Too' candidate inspired by the New Deal, a believer in white supremacy and an advocate of nonsegregation of troops." (Senator Taft repudiated their support.)

"Socialist," at a period when the organized socialist movement is so weak, has become the favorite epithet for anything anyone is against. Colonel Robert McCormick of the Chicago Tribune denounces "Ike's millionaire-socialist backers." "Socialist" is used to describe reaction; progress; the New Deal and Fair Deal; military training; government bu-

reaucracy; subsidies to health, medicine or housing; rural electrification; the corporate state; communism or Stalinism; fascism; civil-rights legislation; etc., etc.

Oratory

Words are generally debased when people say what they do not mean and do not mean what they say, when the impromptu speeches are long-rehearsed, and teleprompted, when the media of information—more abundant and technically better than ever—reveal less than they conceal. The new "people-creepie" approaches the delegates and according to reporter Alistair Cooke, they say, "Here it comes. Button your lip."

"History will record . . . never before . . . greatest citizen of all time . . . destruction of the ramparts of free men . . . dishonor in high places . . . tax and tax, and spend and spend . . . free men . . . Mussolini-fascism, Karl Marx-Socialism, Keynes and deficit spending . . . government give-away programs . . . steamroller . . . dictator . . . fair play . . . sacred honor . . . spiritual purpose . . . our dead render mute testimony. . ."

This is the stuff of which Republican oratory is made. It is the real "platform" on which their candidate, whoever he may be, will seek to wrest power from the Democrats. It is an effort of desperate men to appeal to the sentimental longings for a past era of domestic and foreign affairs which will never return.

Progressive Party Convention —

(Continued from page 1)
 tional significance for the Stalinist hatchmen at the convention.

On the treatment of Negroes in America, the draft platform presented to the convention accused America of treating the Negroes in a manner "which approaches what is defined as 'genocide.'" A group of delegates attacked the plank as inadequate, and demanded that the party go on record condemning the government for genocide as defined by the United Nations convention. Since this clash developed when the convention had dwindled from its announced top attendance of some 1,700 dele-

gates to about 300 persons, it was ruled by the chair that no vote could be decisive and the matter was referred to the national committee.

That the American government is guilty of genocide (as distinct from Jim-Crowism) is a current staple of Stalinist propaganda both here and throughout the world. Yet it appears that the Stalinist high command is aware of the fact that none but the most rabid Stalinists and Negro chauvinists can get themselves to take this seriously. In the hope of hanging on to what they have left of confused liberal support they cannot afford to insist on this plank, and therefore had to sidetrack the

protest of their own most fanatical supporters.

FOLLOW WORLD LINE

It is interesting to note, however, that the CP is still trying to get a broad coalition for its foreign policy, regardless of the "concessions" which have to be made on domestic affairs in the hope of getting it. Thus the 1948 platform was watered down to eliminate its call for the nationalization of basic industries. The plank on unemployment calls for \$40 per week unemployment insurance, although \$60 per week has already been proposed by Senator Moody of Michigan as part of the program to lighten the impact of unemployment in the auto industry on his own state.

This is part of the effort which the Stalinists are making here as well as in Germany and other countries to attract small businessmen and other pro-capitalist elements to their "peace" platform. In Western Germany, for instance, the Stalinists have been conducting an open campaign to attract such people (including former active Nazis) to a "national front" at the expense of the interests of the industrial workers of that country. Here too, it appears, they hope to rally all elements who oppose the rearmament program for any reason whatever to their standard.

In watering down the domestic program they hope to make it

possible for people who are generally in the right wing of American politics to join them. This is a clear recognition of the fact that they have lost all hope of attracting any significant section of the American labor movement. Even some of the most prominent Stalinist labor leaders were conspicuous by their absence from this convention. They recognize the fact that open support for the FP tends to increase the distance between them and the ranks of the unions which they still control.

The truth of the matter is that the Stalinists have once more suc-

ceeded in capturing themselves. The well-meaning people who still follow them have no connection with the mass of American liberals and even less with the labor movement. Their effort to "broaden" out by watering down their domestic platform cannot gain them anything but a scattering of mavericks from the center and right of American politics, if that.

The CP will have to find a different vehicle for its "peace" campaign if it hopes to have any effect on the American political scene. The Progressive Party has labeled itself too clearly to be able to serve that purpose.

READERS TAKE THE FLOOR —

(Continued from page 5)
 full the two articles of Hal Draper from LABOR ACTION issues of March 24-31, 1952, dealing with the so-called "Friends of Russian Freedom" [Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom—Ed.]. The editors of *Suchasna Ukraina*, in their preamble to Draper's articles, state among other things: "The editors of LA show good will to inform the American public on the real liberation processes which take place in the Stalinist empire. We can only be sorry that the circulation of such a paper as

LA is rather limited, but this is due to special conditions in America. However, we know that this paper reaches organized American labor and this is a very important fact."

The same articles of H. Draper were also reprinted in part by a Ukrainian-American daily *Svoboda*, published in New Jersey.

Vpered, published in Germany, regularly carries notes on the articles published in your paper, too.

S. HOROSHCHENKO
 New York

The N. Y. Socialist Youth League presents

Marxism and Philosophy

A Series of Four Class Sessions by

Hal Draper

This class will center around the relationship between scientific method and the Marxist approach to philosophy, discussing dialectical materialism in this context.

FRIDAY EVENINGS at 8:30 p.m.

July 11—MARXISM vs. PHILOSOPHY.

July 18—DIALECTICS AS SCIENTIFIC METHOD.

July 25—MORALITY AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

Aug. 1—(Topics to be decided by class.)

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 W 14 St., New York City