

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 16, 1953

FIVE CENTS

**How the Liberal Party Campaigned**

... page 3

**Shachtman Passport Case Gets a State Dep't Hearing**

... page 6

**Churchill on Lords and Landlords**

... page 5

## The Halley Campaign: What Was Wrong?

By PETER WHITNEY

The Democratic Party tightened its grip on New York City with the overwhelming victory of its candidate for mayor, Robert F. Wagner Jr., over the Liberal Party's Rudolph Halley and Republican Harold Riegelman. The rest of the Democratic slate was also swept into office on the tide of sentiment for the Tammany-Fair Deal alliance.

The votes of the leading contenders were: Wagner 1,021,488; Riegelman 661,410; Halley 468,392.

Tammany Hall was particularly jubilant since it and the Flynn machine in the Bronx had backed Wagner in the Democratic primary fight and would now be in a position to cash in on its support. The Democratic victory reflected the election-day trend nationally and raised optimistic hopes among them of defeating the state Dewey Republican machine in next year's gubernatorial election.

Precisely because the Liberal Party shares this hope with the Democratic Party, their reactions to the election results were somewhat mixed. Halley's failure to win second place against Riegelman was a severe disappointment to them, since it had been fairly apparent that he could not beat Wagner. Yet his vote represented the second highest Liberal vote on record, exceeded only when Halley won the City Council presidency two years ago.

(Continued on page 2)

## SWP Splits; Stalinoid Wing Takes One Third

A definitive split in the Socialist Workers Party, between the existing majority and minority groups, took place Saturday, November 7 when, at a plenary session of the national committee of the group, the leaders of the minority were "suspended" at the same time that steps were taken to spread the ouster of the minority into the ranks of the membership.

The SWP is the so-called "official Trotskyist" group in this country. The struggle that has been going on between the two factions in the organization (detailed in LABOR ACTION articles of May 18-June 8 last) started in 1951 and has been over the question of Stalinism.

A split along similar lines has now also taken place in the Ceylon group of the Fourth International and in the British Trotskyist group ("Healy group"). The French group of the Fourth International, the PCI, split in two last year. In all these cases the majority faction represents those who wish to draw back from the increasingly pro-Stalinist evolution of the present-day Trotskyist movement.

Politically, the split in the SWP is a reaction to the development of this movement and of the Fourth International toward becoming a "left wing" of the Stalinist "revolution." That line has been one of looking on the Stalinist victories as steps in the "socialist revolution" to be supported while remaining critical of the Stalinist bureaucracy and leadership it-

self. Along with this went an increasing orientation toward centering work and propaganda around the Stalinist periphery.

All of these Trotskyist groups have given their political support to the Stalinist war camp in the Korean conflict, the cold war and any third world war to break out. The theoretical basis for this whole development has been the view that Russia and the new Stalinist regimes are "workers' states." These latter two propositions have not been in dispute in the recent struggles, being common property; what has happened is that the more pro-Stalinist minorities have sought to draw the most consistent political conclusions from them and drive vigorously ahead to full political capitulation to Stalinism, whereas the others have been unwilling to go as far.

### "TRUCE" BLEW UP

A sharp internal fight around these questions in the SWP broke out inside the national committee in 1951, and in the past year this developed into a fierce polemic in internal-bulletin articles and discussion meetings. The minority group crystallized and tightened, fairly clearly putting forward the perspective for the SWP of becoming a propaganda group oriented toward the Stalinist movement, led by Cochran, Clarke, Bartell and Frankel.

In May the two factions "made up" in what purported to be a "truce," arranged at an NC plenum, but this "truce" did not last long before the fight began again hammer-and-tongs, with continued polemics by the minority in the branches and a sharp attack by James P. Cannon on Pablo, the Fourth International secre-

(Continued on page 6)

## The GOP Jitters and The Democratic Quandary

By GORDON HASKELL

The Republican Party has the jitters. Just a year after they got their first taste of national rule in two decades, they have suffered a series of stiff political jolts in the local and state elections. They are showing every sign of panic.

It is true that in many cases in which Democratic candidates knocked Republicans out of office, purely local problems and personalities can be shown to have had a powerful influence. It is true, also, that in the Eisenhower sweep the voters were far less inclined to give the Republican Party a vote of confidence than they were to show that they liked Ike. Just because the 1952 vote was not a really powerful swing toward the GOP, the slight swing away in 1953 is ominous for them.

It is clear that during the year they have been in power, they have done nothing to strengthen whatever support they had in 1952. Quite the contrary. The spotty down-turn in the economy which is now beginning to be felt in short work-weeks and rising unemployment in places here and there across the nation, and the falling-off in farm prices, have made workers and farmers restless and fearful, and their natural tendency is to swing back toward the Fair Deal which they identify with the Democrats.

In addition, the usually apathetic voters, who turned out in such large numbers to vote for the general, and incidentally for the men who were hanging on to his coattails, were not aroused to leave their television sets to vote of local candidates.

The most striking local upsets were in Columbus, Ohio and Davenport, Iowa. In

both cities, Democratic mayors were elected for the first time in twenty years. In the latter city, seven Democratic aldermen were also swept into office, while in Columbus the city council remained in Republican hands. The local press in these cities attributes the defeat of the Republicans to the North American Aviation Company strike in Columbus and to the widespread unemployment in the agricultural-implement industry in Davenport.

In New York City the plurality given the Democrat over the Republican was so great that the Democrats are beginning to sharpen their teeth for the governor's chair next year. They figure that with a Fair Deal candidate with a prominent name—say, a name such as Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr.—they could well make it. In these calculations they are no doubt counting on getting the Liberal Party vote for their candidate in '54.

In New Jersey, the Democrats got a governor and congressman, but these votes seem to have been heavily influenced by the corruption scandals which have shaken the state. In any event, the Democratic candidate for Congress promised to follow directly in the steps of his Republican predecessor (a liberal).

(Turn to last page)

## The Tide Reaches Truman

By G. K. H.

And now comes the case of Harry Dexter White, deceased.

The papers are full of it. Editorials are written about it. Everyone wonders about it. And in the rush to comment, incriminate, explain, in the welter of charges, counter-charges, proposed investigations and the like, one small aspect of the "case" is being buried deeper and deeper. That is the simple question: What really is, or was, the "case" of Harry Dexter White? What exactly were the charges against him? What were the proofs on which these charges were based?

The American people, before whom this "case" is now being tried in the headlines, do not know. They have never been told, and it is all too probable that they never will be told. And yet, the question of former President Truman's action in this matter, which the Republicans are now seeking to turn into political capital to offset the setback they experienced at the polls on November 3, is directly related to the question: Was White a Stalinist agent, and what proofs of this are there?

What has now been revealed which was not known as far back as 1948? Nothing new has been uncovered or disclosed. All that is actually known is that right after the last war two former Stalinist secret agents, Elizabeth Bentley

and Whittaker Chambers, said that Harry Dexter White had been part of a group of Stalinists who worked for the government.

Neither of them has claimed that they knew him to be a member of the Communist Party. Neither has even claimed, directly, that he was a spy. They said that he had been "associated with" other government officials whom they knew to be CP members, and some of whom had turned over government documents to the espionage ring.

What is known, further, is that in 1947 a grand jury questioned White in an espionage investigation, but did not find evidence on the basis of which to hand down an indictment against him.

From this threshold of "facts," we step directly into the dense fog of claims and surmises in which facts are conspicuous by their absence, or by the failure to reveal them if they do exist.

Attorney General Brownell says that an FBI file on White, with very damaging information, was turned over to the White House toward the end of 1945. Truman says he never saw it.

Lamar Caudle, a former Justice Department official who was kicked out of the government under a cloud from which there appeared to drip large sums of money, says he saw the file and was so

(Turn to last page)

See page 2 for announcement of new date for Shachtman's talk on "25 Years of American Trotskyism"

# The Halley Campaign in N. Y.—

(Continued from page 1)

But since the basic perspective of the Liberals is limited by their support of the Democrats nationally and state-wide, they are in the paradoxical position of having battled Wagner and the Democrats and yet hailing, to some extent, the results of the latter's victory. Naturally, the conflict between their independent campaign and their dependent orientation toward the Fair Dealers was reflected all during their campaign and contributed to their defeat.

## A CONFESSION

In a post-election letter to the party club, the Liberal leadership outlined some of the heavy odds they faced during the election: "general trend toward Democratic Party because of dissatisfaction with national and state Republican administrations; the endorsement and active support of Wagner by big-name national Democratic leaders; the people's experience with the so-called 'independent' Impellitteri; the Democratic Party primary involving Wagner in fight against the weak and incompetent Impellitteri, thus advancing Wagner's fortunes; the Daily News-poll 'blitzkreig'; the opposition of the entire press except for the Post and the Forward..."

Revealing how completely their fate is tied to that of the Democratic Party, they write: "In 1949 we suffered from the trend AGAINST the Democratic Party; in 1953 we suffered from the trend FOR the Democratic Party." Coming or going the Democrats cause the Liberals much suffering, not to mention a considerable amount of squirming, since they spend most of their time selling the Fair Deal wing of the Democratic Party to New Yorkers.

## Shachtman Talk Postponed to Next Wednesday

The public meeting at which Max Shachtman, national chairman of the ISL, is scheduled to speak on "25 Years of Trotskyism in America" has been shifted from the original date announced to a new one, next Wednesday evening, November 18.

Originally planned for Friday before last, a freak storm burst over New York that day; at the beginning of the evening, the ISL sponsors of the meeting feared that many people would thereby be kept away. As a matter of fact, it turned out that by 9:30 Labor Action Hall was pretty close to being filled in spite of the treacherous weather conditions and slush-filled streets.

Shachtman and Albert Gates spoke that evening, instead, on the hearing with the Passport Division of the State Department in Washington which both had gone to the day before. (See story of this hearing on page 6.) It was obvious that the audience was extremely interested in their account—especially since the hearing was not without its comic relief. Not decisive but contributing to the ISL's willingness to postpone the scheduled meeting was the news received the same day that a split in the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party was due in a matter of days. (See story on this on page 1.) Given the subject of the meeting, discussion of this new episode in the devolution of the Trotskyist movement was obviously indicated, and of course Comrade Shachtman will now include it on November 18.

This time a larger hall has been taken for the meeting—Adelphi Hall, on Fifth Avenue near 14 Street.

This misalliance handicapped the Liberals throughout the campaign. Halley insistently boasted that he was an independent Democrat and would remain one (even assuring the Democrats of his support in next year's elections come-what-may). Such a candidate could scarcely compete against an "independent" Democrat who had plunged into the Democratic primary and won the fight against the bosses' candidate. The fact that Wagner subsequently made peace with the bosses didn't stop him from hollering how independent he was of the bosses and that he was already the people's choice.

The ambiguous and ambivalent position of the Liberal Party with respect to the Democrats can also be seen as the underlying reason for the many ways in which the Liberals fell down in the campaign even on the organizational plane, many of which are detailed in other articles in this issue [see page 3].

## BACK SEAT

The Liberal Party and its trade-union council took a back seat all during the campaign—in sharp contrast to their active and leading roles during the 1951 election when Halley won. The line was to play down labor support—after all, the candidate was already under attack as "Dubinsky's boy" and the "stooge" of labor bosses. Comparatively fewer union meetings, rallies, and demonstrations for Halley were held. Much less work, on a shop and local level, was carried on among union members—even within the two main unions constituting the backbone of the Liberal Party, the Ladies' Garment Workers Union and the Hatters' Union.

The bulk of the printed campaign literature featured the Independent Citizens for Halley, and not until the closing weeks of the campaign did the Liberal Party itself issue a brief statement of its program for the city. Before then the only piece of Liberal Party material was its 64-page booklet on its Municipal Program, selectively distributed to Liberal activists. Liberal Party members found themselves working in and through the various Independent Citizens Committees, arranging meetings, sound truck rallies, and affairs of various sorts in its name.

And what did all this activity and energy in the name of the Independent Party mean in terms of votes for Halley on that line rather than the Liberal Party line? A mere 37,773 against 429,619 on the Liberal line.

This result has led to widespread feeling in the Liberal ranks to drop the whole idea of setting up a second party as a vote-catching device. It's the Liberal members who break their heads getting the independent petitions filled and doing

## BIGGEST VOTE

The soft-pedaling of the Liberal Party meant a soft-pedaling likewise of any kind of meaningful and bold social program. The campaign issues circled around liberalism and reform, a non-partisan fight for good investment. But Wagner had credentials from his father, the famous senator and author of the Wagner Act, not to mention all the leading and living lights of the national Democratic Party. Halley could scarcely "out-liberal" him.

If Wagner could win away support from Halley on the Liberal-Fair Deal issues, then on the remaining big issue of corruption in government, Riegelman made some big dents in Halley's support. The Republican was quick to point out that Halley was, after all, only a dissident Democrat and if elected, he'd make his peace. Riegelman compared the voting records of Wagner and Halley on the City Council—not too different—and appealed to the voters to elect him as a new broom that would really sweep clean. After the rest of the necessary Jimmy Higgins

work. There is growing resentment against this setup and a strong feeling to work through the Liberal Party only.

After all, how much had Halley done in his two years on the Council?

If, in spite of all these weaknesses of candidate and campaign, the Liberals were able to pile up their biggest vote to date in any mayoral election, it is a tribute to their real power as an opponent party to the two major parties. The party has been growing steadily since it first ran a mayoralty candidate—in 1945 when it won less than one-fourth of its vote today.

Halley's 1953 vote of 468,392 compares with a vote of 658,311 in 1951 when he won his post of City Council president. At that time, however, he was running against a hack Democrat and had more significant independent support. Obviously, the party lines were tightened in this election, and large blocs of the independent voters went to the Democrats and Republicans.

A more revealing comparison is with the 1952 vote for Liberal Party leader, George S. Counts, when he ran for U. S. senator, and got 404,769 votes in New York City on the basis of far heavier registration.

## IS IT 1929 AGAIN?

If the Liberal Party is on the upgrade, the same cannot be said for the Stalinist American Labor Party. It is fast disappearing as a factor in New York elections and this will probably be its last. Its candidate received only 54,372 votes—a new low after its steady decrease year after year. State Chairman Vito Marcantonio had sharply attacked the Daily Worker for its back-handed support to Wagner and predicted an early death for the party. He himself resigned his chairmanship after the election.

The disappointment in the ranks of the Liberal Party was based, to some extent, on a previous strong hope of victory, especially in the first stages of the election campaign when it appeared that Halley was a sure winner against a divided Democratic vote (Wagner vs. Impellitteri). Toward the end, most of the Liberals contented themselves with the hope that he'd run second, but the weaknesses of the campaign did not permit

even this modest victory. Many Liberals consoled themselves that at least they lost with their own ticket and men and for the first time; they didn't have to apologize for their candidates, particularly on a local assembly and borough basis.

Perhaps the best hope for the future was uttered by one of the defeated candidates: "This is 1929 all over again. We'll do it again." In 1929 LaGuardia first ran for mayor and lost. The Liberals can do it too.

## REPORT ACLU DISPUTE ON CIVIL LIBERTIES

According to information reported by I. F. Stone's Weekly (Oct. 31) a tense situation is brewing in the American Civil Liberties Union, with the upshot not yet known.

The civil-liberties organization, which has done a great deal of valuable work in this field, recently took a referendum on a number of new policy statements revolving around the question of rights of Stalinists. The statements (which were made public not by the ACLU office but by its Northern California branch) were so formulated as to raise many fears that they left numerous loopholes open for going along with the current witchhunt trend on guilt by association, loyalty purges and Fifth Amendment problems.

Of the ACLU's 23 affiliates, one abstained, three small ones voted to support the statements, and the remaining 19 voted to reject them.

The national board of directors, however, by virtue of a provision added to the by-laws two years ago, has the power to override the referendum if "it believes there are vitally important reasons" for doing so.

The weekly reports that a motion to override was taken up at the board meeting on October 19 and lost by only one vote. Since then it is reported that three board members who voted to sustain said they wanted to reconsider, and a new board meeting was scheduled for November 2, the results of which are not known.

## New Program of Classes on Marxism and Socialist History Announced by SYL, YPSL

The Socialist Youth League and Young People's Socialist League (N. Y. branches) have announced that a new program of classes will start next week, on Monday, November 23, in New York City.

The study program will start with the holding of two classes on an evening. One, on "The Basic Teachings of Karl Marx," will be given by Albert Gates and Max Shachtman, secretary and national chairman of the ISL respectively. The second, on "Revolution Since 1914," will be led by Hal Draper, editor of LABOR ACTION.

The Gates-Shachtman class on Marxism will go six consecutive sessions on Monday evenings from 7-9.

The schedule for this class is as follows:

- (1) Nov. 23—The Economics of Capitalism—I (Gates).
- (2) Nov. 30—The Economics of Capitalism—II (Gates).
- (3) Dec. 7—The Class Struggle and the Class Point of View (Shachtman).
- (4) Dec. 14—Marx's Conception of History (Gates).
- (5) Dec. 21—The Marxist Theory of the State (Shachtman).
- (6) Dec. 28—Marxism: Ways and Means (Shachtman).

The Draper class, scheduled for the

same evening from 9-1, is planned according to a rather unusual arrangement, which over a period of time will provide a survey of the revolutionary history of our time.

It will begin with three consecutive sessions on "The First World War"; later, a second series of three sessions will be announced, to cover "The German Revolution, 1918-1921." This in turn will be followed by other 3-session series to bring the study through the events in Europe following the First World War and (it is planned) other important situations since then.

The subject-matter of the initial 3-session series on "The First World War" will cover:

- (1) Nov. 23—The breakdown of the Second International.
- (2) Nov. 30—The development and ideas of the anti-war Left, 1914-1917.
- (3) Dec. 7—Revolution and the end of the war.

The co-sponsors are publishing a brochure giving the contents of the class sessions in greater detail, plus suggested readings and bibliography.

Both classes will hold their first sessions this coming Monday, dividing the evening between them, at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street.

Hear **MAX SHACHTMAN** on

'25 Years of Trotskyism in America'

next Wednesday eve., Nov. 18 at 8:30 — Adelphi Hall, 74 5th Ave, N.Y.C.

Near 14th Street

## MORE ON THE HALLEY CAMPAIGN—

# How the Liberal Party Ran the Campaign

By WALTER BARRON

This year's New York City election has been described as a victory for Fair Dealism, a return of Tammany to power, and a blow to the Republicans in state and nation. It was, to some extent, all of these.

For the first time since 1932, a Tammany leader actually has "his" candidate in the mayor's office. Governor Dewey has been dealt a serious blow. And it should be noted that the Democratic city vote, even in this landslide, was actually a minority vote.

**But one attitude, expressed after the election by some and felt by many, cannot be accepted. It was in no sense a defeat for the Liberal Party.**

Those who were close to the hopeful Rudolph Halley, and some active campaign workers who were selecting their city jobs prematurely, may have been sadly disappointed. But the Liberal Party vote was about 20 per cent of the total, the best vote it has ever received in any election, except the off-year special election that elected Halley as City Council president in 1951. It was some 8 per cent higher than the proportion received by George Counts, running for senator last year, a vote which many Liberal adherents felt decisively established the living role of the party.

**WRONG THEME**

To the dismay of many of the people running his campaign, Halley received only an additional one per cent of the vote (less than 40,000 votes) on the Independent line set up to garner the support of those who would not vote Liberal. Not only did almost all the Halley vote come on the Liberal Party line, but it came primarily in those areas of the city which have usually had a strong Liberal vote.

Actually, the way the campaign was geared, the appeal to the "independents" was considered more crucial than the need to keep and extend support from the typical Liberal voter. The Liberal Party itself was rarely mentioned by party spokesmen, religiously avoided by the candidates themselves. Halley and his running mates were presented, and presented themselves, as "independents," "responsible to no one but the people of New York."

**If it failed to win these independents, the theme of the Liberal-Halley campaign did little to add more votes from what should have been the center of new support, the working class of the city.**

**WAGNER'S POSE**

As in no city election for many years, the vote for the Democrats was a "poor man's vote," the Republican vote largely a "silk-stocking" vote. Fair Dealers generally supported Wagner. The CIO, getting into the campaign late, did active leg-work for his ticket. Poor districts of the city, usually traditionally Democratic but Republican-supporting in 1952 because of the Korean war, gave Wagner some of his biggest margins of any area in the city. Negro districts in Harlem gave Wagner as high as 70 per cent of the vote, remarkable in a three-cornered race. Even the Stalinists openly backed him, and quietly told their ALP cohorts to vote straight Democratic.

It is pure ritual to blame this vote on the work of any "Democratic machine." In election after election, including this

year's Democratic primary, the power of the machine vote has proved to be non-existent. It is true that in the midst of a more than usual general confusion about issues, many voters simply returned to their traditional voting ways. But there was a reason for that tradition, and it reappeared in this election.

Wagner and the Democrats appeared as the "poor man's friend," and to the extent that there was any meaningful presentation of a program in the campaign, it was Wagner's repeated demands for more schools and homes, better pay for city workers, transportation improvement with reduced fares (however weak in contents his specific proposals may have been) and his emphasis on the responsibility of the Dewey state administration for the city's woes.

**FUTILE EXPOSE**

**In contrast, Halley and his associates made only passing references to these questions, and then only as part of the general context of "corruption"—the continuing evil of all campaigns, just as "independence" is the basic virtue. The good-men-above-parties were presented as the "new LaGuardias" who would give us "clean, honest, efficient administration."**

This comment is not a bit flippant; it is based upon an authentic picture of how they campaigned. When polls showed the tide running against them, their response was to "get something" on someone connected with the Democratic ticket—City Council president candidate Lawrence Gerosa, who, they insisted, was involved in some insurance graft several years ago. Gerosa is now in office, and his "exposure" probably lost him no votes.

What makes the nature of the Halley campaign even more out-of-joint was that Halley *did* have an excellent record

in city office that could have been played up. He had been outspoken and active in his opposition to the state-imposed rent and fare increase, had personally interceded to prevent the state from closing a veterans' housing project, had personally gone to Albany to fight Dewey's antics. Of course, some embarrassment might have been produced by the fact that Wagner and he usually formed a team in the Board of Estimate on these questions. But by emphasizing the Liberal Party as the continuing political body that could push for these demands (with Halley's role clearly appreciated), while Wagner was running with men who had opposed him on the city government, even that objection could be overcome.

**DILEMMAS**

**The Liberal Party as an independent political force, not as a few independent men, was the line that might have won more votes. This the Liberal Party leadership, with its orientation toward the respectable reform vote, would not push. There was little liberal campaigning even in some of the unions that are the core of the party, in order to avoid the Liberal Party identification.**

Looking back at the election, Dubinsky of the ILGWU, Rose of the Hatters Union, and Liberal State Chairman Adolph Berle must be keenly aware of their dilemma. Both the Fair Deal and Tammany have won, and they wonder how they can defeat the latter and not hurt the former. Dewey, or his chosen candidate, may have a rough time in next year's gubernatorial election, but will Tammany leader Carmine De Sapio become a state boss as a result? A coalition with the Republicans may have won this year's election, but then how can you attack Dewey?

## The Liberals Hid Their Face

By ROBERT HACKER

The rather dull mayoralty campaign in New York City is over, the Democrats scoring a none-too-sensational victory, amid general apathy.

Robert Wagner is the mayor-elect, facing a multitude of city problems, many of which he is not very concerned about.

These include: the problem of helping the Puerto Rican migrants to adjust and develop in New York; the general lowering of city services in sanitation and education; enormous slum and general housing problems; matters of traffic congestion, etc.

Other problems are far beyond his program or powers of solution: making New York financially solvent, perhaps fiscally independent; lowering the subway fare and increasing services on the subway, in health and in education; ending Negro and Puerto Rican ghettos; planning city problems to include the entire metropolitan New York area.

Wagner certainly cannot eliminate bossism and corruption from city government for the Tammany machine with its Republican alliances put Wagner into office.

**THIN CAMPAIGN**

**The dullness of the campaign can be attributed to the lack of issues posed by the candidate as well as to general public apathy. The issues of bossism and inefficiency, real as they are, were worn thin by the Liberal Party candidate, Rudolph Halley.**

His campaign had no political focus; he capitalized on the obvious little scandals that a city campaign develops: ties in horse-race betting and assorted frauds. The issues of housing, education, city finances, psychiatric services, transportation were certainly treated by Halley, but in countless minor speeches and press releases—so many little ringlets on the tail of the piglet.

Indeed, the Democratic candidate, supported by both the De Sapio Tammany machine and a glittering array of New and Fair Dealers (Stevenson, Truman, Eleanor Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., Lehman, et al) ran a better Fair Deal-type election, speaking more on housing, rents, and such issues, although he too engaged in a wealth of minor smear politics. The Republican, Riegelman, ran a dapper conservative campaign and received a largely upper-middle and upper-class vote.

**With all the dirt flying about, the public was genuinely bored. All sorts of people came up to this writer after one of Halley's typical "oust the bosses" speech and asked, "Well, when is he going to say something?"**

The general public attitude was that all the candidates were a bunch of crooks and that whatever the campaign promises were, and there were relatively few of them, conditions would remain the same—the same crooks would live off the city; the fare, if anything, would rise to 22 cents; rents and prices would remain high, with businessmen and landlords hauling in the profits, garbage would not be collected and postmen would come late.

**"INDEPENDENT" MASK**

**The Liberal Party ran an extremely poor election campaign, in fact, for the most part, the party couldn't be seen. Being a "practical" organization, despite the surprising mass undercurrent that forced the leadership to run Halley as an independent candidate, the top brass of the Liberal Party wanted "a winner," if not at all costs than at practically all costs.**

The Halley campaign was run as an "independent" one with most of the literature, the publicity, the placards and sound-truck speakers representing the independent Democrats for Halley. In Brooklyn the Liberal Party was so inactive that the Young Liberals were forced to work with the independents.

The central office of the Liberal Party in Brooklyn had one phone to about ten or fifteen for the independents. In Manhattan the central Liberal Party office at the Hotel Claridge had one telephone operator whose job was to refer calls to the independent headquarters at the McAlpin where Liberal Party leaders worked, largely incognito.

**The Liberal Party wanted Halley to attract votes from independent Democrats, Republicans and just plain independents, and felt that prominent display of the Liberal Party and its program in this campaign would prejudice these votes against Halley. It should be noted at this point that of the 468,000 votes cast for Halley, less than 40,000 were on the independent line.**

**LACK OF PARTY WORK**

There were virtually no Liberal Party placards, only "independent" ones. In the borough of Brooklyn there were no Liberal Party sound trucks, all of the trucks

As their leaders ponder which horse-trade produces the neatest result, which generally will get more of the reform vote, the Liberal Party ranks should remember that they have every right to take the election as an augur of good possibilities for the party, if not for Rudolph Halley.

The Liberal Party had an uphill fight, once Wagner won the nomination over Impellitteri. Halley and Wagner both tried to make the same type of general appeal, and Wagner had the more prominent Fair Deal figures in his corner, the right name, the right father, most of the labor movement, and the tendencies of New York workers to return to their traditional voting when there is no meaningful opposing appeal.

**NEED A NEW LINE**

**The Liberal Party could have had, on its side, the idea that it represented a new but stable political force, with its organizational base in a few, though strong, labor unions. Its leaders thought it could rely on the gang-busting of Rudolph Halley instead. That did not work, and possibly nothing could have produced a victory in this election. But, being more interested in building up such a party than in a particular electoral victory, we can say that a better fight could have been made by a campaign set on winning over New York workers.**

Yet the showing was relatively satisfactory. Despite the very poor campaign, the typical Liberal Party vote not only held but increased, despite the fact that the leading opponent was an active member of ADA, running with CIO backing. Such returns do not bring patronage, but they do indicate a significant step in the sometimes tortuous climb toward political realignment, toward a national third party.

being operated in the name of the independents. The latter often opposed even the mention of the Liberal Party on the sound trucks by Liberal Party speakers.

The Liberal Party put out only one piece of popular literature, which remained largely in the clubhouses. Its other piece of literature was a 64-page booklet on party program put out on slick paper for the party elite.

Relatively little campus work was done for Halley: a Canudo meeting at Columbia attracted five; almost nothing was done at Brooklyn College, almost nothing at NYU; there were some meetings at Hunter and City College. This was true despite the fact that the Young Liberals are a fair-sized organization with fair hopes of equaling or surpassing the Students for Democratic Action in New York City. It has 10 campus clubs plus four county clubs.

**HALLEY'S FUTURE**

**All this contrasts unfavorably with previous big campaigns by the Liberal Party, and basically reflects the political indecision of the party leadership in the face of the Fair Deal Wagner campaign.**

The independents who should have been satisfied with the way the campaign was going showed no such gratitude. They wanted to go the whole hog and run an independent Democratic campaign around the issue that Halley was running to reform the Democratic Party. They now feel that Halley should have run in the Democratic primaries, either winning or causing Impellitteri to win. Then, as independent and Liberal Party candidate, he could have handily defeated the ultra-conservative Impie.

They now have Halley in mind for the Democratic candidate for state attorney general in the 1954 election. However, in order to keep Halley alive, they are faced with the dilemma of whether to have Halley continue to act as watchdog and expose Wagner at each point (this would certainly not help FDR Jr. in the 1954 gubernatorial campaign) or whether to have him support Wagner (why then prefer Halley over Wagner in the first place?). If he remains silent, Halley may die politically.

For story on Detroit election, see page 4.

## THE BENDING CROSS

A BIOGRAPHY OF EUGENE V. DEBS

by

Ray Ginger

**Now, while they last only \$1.00**

Order from:

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

# Detroit Election Shows UAW Line at Ebb

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, Nov. 8 — Unlike the events and trends in the rest of the country, the municipal election results here last week drew little comment or attention from anybody anywhere.

At first glance this would seem rather remarkable. After all, it was only one year ago that labor leaders here were claiming that the only city in the nation which stood up against the Republican-Eisenhower trend was Detroit. The road to national success was an expansion of the strategy used in this industrial area last year. Of course, at that time we doubted the claim, and suggested that factors other than alleged labor leaders' influence and tactics had been responsible for the victory of Democratic Party candidates here.

The labor movement, both CIO and AFL, did not endorse any candidate for mayor, thus assuring Mayor Albert Cobo, often denounced as a strikebreaker and a Republican flunkie of the big-business interests, of re-election on a platter. His opponent, James Lincoln, an associate of former Senator Blair Moody and Governor G. Mennen Williams, ran without endorsement or any open support of the labor movement. At that he received 40 per cent of the light vote of 423,000.

How the CIO viewed the rest of the

election results may be seen from this choice item in the current issue of the Michigan CIO News:

"A bid of liberals to place a majority of Detroit's Common Council fell short Tuesday by a few thousand votes as four CIO-endorsed candidates won election to the nine-member legislative body.

"The four CIO-backed winners finished at the top of the 18-candidate race with Council President Louis C. Miriani leading the field followed by Mary V. Beck in second, Eugene Van Antwerp, third, and Edward Conner in fourth. All are incumbents."

The impression given, for the sake of the uninformed and uninitiated, is that these victors got there because of CIO endorsement. (The same line was used last year to explain the triumph of the Democrats here.) However, just as last year, the results would have been the same without CIO endorsement.

It was only two years ago that the CIO refused to endorse Miriani because of his failure to act on FEPC and other social issues. Miriani was top man then, with the CIO actively campaigning against him. Van Antwerp, another new-found liberal, is the former mayor whom the CIO once spent thousands of dollars trying to defeat unsuccessfully. It was the year they endorsed him that he lost out.

Actually, the three pro-CIO candidates, Stanley Novak, Dr. Orville Linck, and Charles Diggs Jr., a Negro, lost, with only Diggs making a real race, having 137,000 votes to the ninth-place winner, Mrs. Wise, a Republican.

Surely, with a combination of labor-Democratic Party candidates winning elsewhere in the nation, a similar situation should have prevailed in this indus-

trial center, where unemployment, etc., have created as much resentment and dissatisfaction with the Eisenhower administration as any place in America. How can anyone account for the complete failure of labor, in politics here? For that is what is the fact of the matter. The CIO didn't have even a Democrat to endorse for mayor, or one they were willing to gamble on. They didn't even have a nine-man slate to endorse for Common Council, knowing in advance that this meant four years of rule by an administration which was and will be anti-labor!

Is there a city in America where labor per se has less influence in politics? Even in Atlanta, Georgia, a Negro running for board of education on a city-wide election recently won. But in Detroit, Diggs, who is a state legislator, lost with CIO backing.

Such an embarrassing situation is best, of course, forgotten, or if mentioned is dismissed as a minor event. The prestige of the labor leaders may be revived by national events, and, if everything works out, by riding on the coattails of Governor G. Mennen Williams, who has been heartened by national results in the 1953 elections enough to plan a campaign against Senator Homer Ferguson in 1954. Senator Ferguson is running scared, and he might well be, for Williams appears way ahead already.

No one understands the impotence of Detroit's labor leaders better than the regular Democrats and Governor Williams, who has shown on more than one occasion that he intends for the CIO to remain second-class citizens in the party which they re-created along with taking him from nowhere and making him governor.

## 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!

# 'Third Camp' Conference on War Planned

The call to a "Third Camp Conference," printed to the right, speaks for itself. The conference is planned with the idea of bringing together a number of socialist, pacifist and other organizations which oppose both capitalism and Stalinism, and refuse to support either war camp or their military and foreign policies.

On invitation of the Peacemakers' Executive Committee, the Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League have agreed to co-sponsor this conference.

In addition to the official representatives of the sponsoring organizations, it is hoped that the conference will bring together members of other organizations, and individuals who do not belong to any organization but who share the views set forth in the call. It is hoped that the conference will not only bring together these organizations and unaffiliated individuals for an exchange of views, but that from it may issue a basis for collaboration of the organizations in fields of common interest and activity, in which unaffiliated "third-campers" can also participate.

All readers of LABOR ACTION are invited to attend, and to extend this invitation to their friends.

## TEXT OF THE CALL ISSUED FOR CONFERENCE

The undersigned organizations are sponsoring a THIRD CAMP CONFERENCE to be held in New York, November 27-29, 1953.

**PURPOSE.** The primary purpose of this Conference is to bring together representatives of organizations, and individuals, who oppose and reject both the capitalist and the Stalinist social systems; who refuse to give support—"critical" or otherwise—to the war preparations of either side in the cold war, or to those aspects of their foreign policies which are a part of such war preparations; who believe unequivocally in the right of all peoples to independence from foreign control, whether military, political, economic or cultural; who stand on a program of democracy in its fullest sense both at home and abroad; and who are dedicated to the defense of civil liberties, including those of Communist Party members in the United States.

The organizations listed below believe that whatever their differences of approach may be, there is a wide area of collaboration open to them on questions on which they are in agreement. For example, it is obvious that the position of Peacemakers that Gandhian non-violence is integral in their philosophy and strategy is not held by a number of other groups sponsoring this Conference. The tactical problem of cooperation in specific projects, on the basis of integrity and mutual respect, can form the subject of discussion at the Conference. (Copies of the Peacemaker Declaration on a Third Camp, which furnished the starting point for discussions leading to the calling of the present Conference, are available on request.)

The primary task of the Conference is to discuss and more clearly define what the areas of collaboration are and to seek ways and means of united action, both in the field of popularizing the third camp, anti-war position and in that of practical work in the struggle for civil liberties, racial equality, religious freedom, and against military conscription and other tendencies toward a garrison state which are progressively stifling democracy in this country.

**PARTICIPATION.** All organizations and individuals who subscribe to the basis stated in the second paragraph above are invited to present their views and proposals to the Conference and to participate fully in the discussions. How-

ever, it is understood that votes on policy statements and practical collaboration will be reserved to representatives of organizations now sponsoring the Conference and others which may accept invitations to share in the sponsoring. It is also understood that any decisions on policy statements and practical collaboration will be referred to the participating organizations for final action after the Conference.

Organizational representatives and individuals listed below who have served as a committee to plan the Conference will serve on the Steering Committee of the Conference, together with representatives of other organizations which have been invited to share in sponsoring the Conference and which accept such invitations. The Steering Committee may also invite individuals in attendance at the Conference to participate in its work.

**ARRANGEMENTS.** Registration will begin at 12:00 noon, Friday, November 27. The first session will convene at 2:00 p.m. sharp. Other sessions will be held on Friday evening, Saturday morning, afternoon and evening, November 28, and Sunday morning, November 29. The Conference will be held at Labor Temple, 242 East 14th Street, New York.

It is suggested that out of town participants will for the most part make their arrangements for rooms either personally or through the organizations to which they belong. Those who cannot make arrangements in this way may write the Conference Secretary.

In addition to the sponsoring organizations listed below, the Fellowship of Reconciliation is participating in an observer capacity. Focal Point of Yale University has notified that it will participate and other student anti-war groups are expected to do so.

- Independent Socialist League
- Libertarian Socialist Committee
- Peacemakers
- Socialist Youth League
- West Coast Young Peoples Socialist League (S.P.-U.S.A.)
- Young Peoples Socialist League

For the Planning Committee:

- A. J. Muste, Chairman,
- David Dellinger, Bayard Rustin,
- Arlo Tatum.
- Secretary to the Planning Committee: Charles Walker.

(Address communications to: Third Camp Conference, Room 825, 5 Beekman St., New York 38, N. Y.)

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



**LABOR ACTION**

November 16, 1953 No. 17, No. 46

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER  
Asst. Editors: GORDON HASKELL,  
BEN HALL, MARY BELL  
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

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

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....

## The Handy Way to Subscribe!

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly

114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2.  New
  - 6 months at \$1.  Renewal
  - Payment enclosed.  Bill me.

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....

## LONDON LETTER

## Churchill Acts on Lords and Landlords

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Nov. 4—It is freely admitted among left-wing circles that Churchill is a "genius." He is now 80 years old and getting a little difficult of hearing. When he goes, however, the Tories will have no one endowed with half his brain or wile.

The latest demonstration of his cunning which has been at the service of imperialism for so long is his proposal to reform the House of Lords.

Left-wing circles have always viewed the House of Lords at the best as a collection of dotards and bores, and at the worst as a millstone around the neck of any progressive government. But their lordships—conscious of Labor's stated intolerance for their august institution—behaved extremely well during the Labor government.

In 1948 all-party discussions were held about the fate of the Lords. A scheme was devised which provided:

- (1) Abolition of purely hereditary right to a seat.
- (2) Members of Parliament and others who had contributed to the public weal to be members of the House of Lords.
- (3) Women would be eligible.
- (4) Royal princes, bishops and lords of appeal would have seats as a right.
- (5) Peers who had not previously been allowed to stand for the House of Commons because hereditary titles rendered them ineligible would now be able to do so.

## LABOR DISSENTS

What is the point of reforming the Lords? Socialists believe that they constitute a reactionary force. The Conservatives agree that they have little but ornamental value. So Churchill with his sharp mind proposed to reform them—and Labor would like that. This would make their house into a powerful and influential body, which Labor would not like.

The truth is that despite nearly 50 years of mounting frustration against this institution, Labor did not have the courage to abolish it when it had the chance. By creating its own peers, Labor recognized and strengthened the influence of the chamber.

Churchill's new proposals are to limit the size of the Lords to about 300. Some of these would be elected, some would be life peers, and others would be great artists, musicians, industrialists, etc. Special extra representation would be given to the universities, whose seats in Parliament the Tories recently agreed not to reinstitute.

So drastic a change could not be carried out without the consent of the Labor opposition. Churchill has proposed an all-party conference of both the House of Lords and the House of Commons. The small Liberal Party accepted the request last February. But the Parliamentary Labor Party rejected it by 58 votes to 51, feeling, in Attlee's words, that there is a "fundamental cleavage of opinion on what is the proper part to be played by the Lords."

## HOUSING SITUATION

For many years now, the housing situation in Britain has been in considerable chaos, in fact since the population expansion of the 19th century. The real gravity of the problem has hitherto been obscured by the slum dwellings. From a purely statistical point of view, a person who lives in a slum terrace has a dwelling.

The two great world wars stopped building and repairs almost completely, so that the severe shortage of housing was accentuated by the backlog of decay and war damage. Before substantial new building projects were initiated, two and a half million houses had to be repaired under the War Damage Act. Furthermore, considerable structural damage, done to the foundations and construction of many buildings, did not show itself except in accelerated decay. The Labor government was faced with a mighty problem.

Accentuating the real housing shortage was that due to the Rent Restrictions Act. This had two effects. Often it fixed rents at a rate which rendered it unprofitable for landlords to repair houses, so the houses decayed further. And, through a provision preventing eviction of tenants

except by cumbersome processes of law, many people with large houses or spacious apartments, declined to take in tenants for fear of being stuck with them.

All kinds of anomalies were presented by these acts. For instance, a friend of mine pays \$6.30, out of her wage of \$16.80 a week, for a basement room in London, because for some technical reason her house does not come under the Rent Restrictions Act. Another family I know has a flat consisting of five large rooms for \$3.50 a week, and it charges \$7 a week to a student who stays in one of them. Also, for the purpose of comparison with the first example, a person I know earns \$44.80 a week and pays \$3.50 rent for a whole flat.

Nevertheless, despite most serious anomalies, while houses are privately owned the Rent Restrictions Acts are the only possible way one can protect the poorer people in the community from rapacious landlords.

## BOOST FOR LANDLORDS

Today the Conservatives have published a White Paper on Housing Policy. They propose to allow a limited increase in rents. In order to qualify for this, the landlord must prove that the increase is

being used for repairs on the houses. Otherwise the tenant can draw the attention of the local authorities to the matter.

About six million tenants will be affected by the new measures, which will certainly do the Tories a great deal of political harm. In effect, they are allowing the landlords to blackmail the tenants into repairing the premises they occupy.

Those landlords who by some legal chicanery have circumvented the Rent Restrictions Acts will put up their rents in "sympathy" with the others. Those who have not repaired their houses because it was unprofitable will do so, one hopes, in the future. Those who have got buildings in a good state of repairs will get greater profits.

Despite the efforts of the Tories to make it more profitable to keep buildings in sound repair, the rapacity of landlords will always come before their social conscience, and lawyers will soon be hard at work inventing phony repairs and faked reconditioning projects to justify rent increases. In the end the only real way to guarantee good houses is to make it a state ownership and responsibility, and fix rents in relation to income and other relevant factors.

# MARXISM for TODAY

## VI—CONCLUDING A DISCUSSION OF THE TERM "WORKERS' GOVERNMENT"

By HAL DRAPER

In the light of the explanation we have given of the concept of a "transitional workers' government," and of the sense in which the term "workers' government" itself began to be used in 1922 and after—was the British Labor government a "workers' government," and what kind if any?

As we have pointed out, this is very simple if you say "The only 'correct' definition of a workers' government is 'the government of a workers' state.'" Then the only question would be whether a workers' state was set up by the Labor government. Well, it wasn't. In Britain, as our resolution explained, the Labor government took anti-capitalist measures which were "striking at the heart of capitalism," its private-property relations, in important sectors of the economy; but surely capitalism was not abolished. Nor, in a number of fundamental respects, were steps taken to change the elements of the political structure which constitute the heart of the capitalist state. Things were certainly not pushed to the point where it could be said that a qualitative change had taken place in the class character of the state.

Well, does this then mean that the British Labor government was merely just another capitalist government engaged in refurbishing capitalism? No, it wasn't, in our analysis, as we have discussed already.

The point is that these were not and are not the only real alternatives. They were the alternatives only in a very schematic-Marxist view of what was happening.

What was happening was this: First, a working-class party had set up a government, which was working-class in its composition, mass basis and support—a "workers-party-government," or in that sense, a "workers' government." We have already seen that of such workers' governments there can be many types indeed, and that this designation alone certainly does not entail the support of Marxists.

## THE 'TRANSITIONAL' APPROACH IN BRITAIN

The next question for us should be: "Is this government carrying through a program which can be pushed in the direction of socialism, on the basis of subordinating the interests of capital to the interests of the working class, carrying through such a program regardless of the interests of the capitalist class?"

This question is formulated precisely in terms of the "transitional" concept. It does not yet ask "Is this government engaged in setting up a workers' state?" It merely asks whether this government is taking steps which in our view, if CONSISTENTLY carried through, WILL lead it in that direction, carrying along thereby many elements who are not yet ready to consciously adopt a full revolutionary program.

And the fact is that this British workers-party-government did start on such a program, which was contrary to the interests of capital. That was one side of it. The other side of it was the fact that it did not do so consistently, but rather with accompanying policies which pointed in a direction other than socialism. (The two most important features of this latter aspect were the Labor government's policies on workers' control and foreign policy, and our resolution devoted a great deal of attention to this which we will not summarize here.)

This is what determined the political line; the task of the Marxist left wing, as we saw it, was therefore to intervene in this transitional situation, within the mass Labor movement and the Labor Party, in order to push this movement in the direction of a consistent and genuine socialist policy. The whole social situation was in flux, in transition. What this workers' government (or workers-party-government) was going to turn out to be, was being determined in the course of struggle, of conflict of tendencies, within it. And it was not a question of how "hopeful" or "optimistic" one might be about the outcome. Not at all. It was a question of how to utilize the

situation to mobilize the forces of a Marxist left wing to push in the only direction to be taken.

If there had existed an alternative revolutionary workers' party which could counterpose its own clearer program to the stumbling line of the Labor leadership, before the masses, then the whole situation would have been different. But the fact that this did not exist is one of the very important "given" facts of the present period. The task is to create such a force, either out of the present mass Labor movement or in a process of development out of it. But it cannot be created by fiat, not meaningfully anyway.

Such a political line could best be grasped by approaching the Labor government experience from the concept of the "transitional workers' government" in the sense explained. This concept helps to clarify the real relationship of forces in the new phenomena which the Labor government presented. On the other hand, the equation "workers' government means only the government of a workers' state," because of its own limitations, helps to obscure what was new.

## 'CONSERVATIVE'?

Now, as a matter of fact, the ISL resolution on the Labor government did not use the term "workers' government" at all! And I can say that this "omission" was deliberate. Before that resolution was even written, the question had already come up about the propriety of such a label. Specifically, Comrade Max Shachtman, in a discussion article in the *New Internationalist* (Jan.-Feb. 1951) had employed the term, in the context of the Comintern's 1922 discussion which we have gone into here. He was using it in that sense.

But it was not at all necessary for the resolution to get into that "terminological" question. Without the label, without having to go into any explanation of the confusion between two senses of the term, the resolution set forth its analysis positively and clearly. That analysis stands on its own feet, with or without any label.

Parenthetically: Comrade Jack Walker's discussion piece raised the question of the label "conservative workers' government" with respect to the Labor government. I do not know where that comes from, and do not see much point to it unless it is explained by some context. For example, this Labor government, manned as it was by Laborite rightwingers primarily, certainly was headed by the more "conservative" wing of the movement—that is, less radical, more reformist, less revolutionary. That is well-known. But the epithet "conservative" for a government which did take anti-capitalist measures which no previous social-democratic government had ever put through, might well be misleading, especially when so many left-wingers (in Britain, for instance) were mistakenly insisting that the government's policies were designed "merely" to preserve the capitalist system and that's all.

Comrade Shachtman's aforementioned article did indeed refer to the British Labor Party as a "conservative workers' party" (my emphasis) in the context of the following remark: "There are any number of instances where a conservative workers' party was transformed into a genuine socialist party." This was also in the context of criticizing those sectarians who refused to take on the task of pushing for a consistent socialist program inside the Labor Party on the a-priori ground that it could not be reformed. The emphasis was on the need of assembling the Marxist forces as a left wing of the mass movement, not as a sect on the outside.

In point of fact, Shachtman's article quoted a passage from Zinoviev-1922 in which the latter (presenting the line of favoring a vote for the Labor Party) referred to a possible Labor government as a "liberal workers' government." That was 1922. For our present purposes, I think it is the concept best expressed by the term "transitional workers' government" which illuminates the problem of the day. It is a concept which also plays an important part in our position on war.

### Read about Independent Socialism

in the special pamphlet-issues  
published by LABOR ACTION—

10 cents each

The Principles and Program of  
Independent Socialism.

Independent Socialism and the  
Third World War.

The Fair Deal: A Socialist  
Criticism.

Socialism and Democracy: The  
Independent Socialist View

Order from:

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street, New York City

# Shachtman Passport Case Gets To First Base in State Dep't Hearing

By ALBERT GATES

The long-delayed case of the application for a passport permitting travel abroad by Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, was brought a little step closer to a decisive test when a hearing before a representative of the Passport Division of the State Department was finally granted to Shachtman in Washington on Election Day, November 3.

The hearing, whose "informal" character was stressed by the State Department representative, was held in response to a request telegraphed to Washington by Shachtman for an appeal against a Department decision which "tentatively disapproved" his application for the passport. (See story in issue of Nov. 2—Ed.)

The decision seems to have been based, so far as the letter of the department to Shachtman stated, on the statement that he was supposed to be national chairman of the Independent Socialist League (a fact which the department was apprised of by Shachtman himself, in his original application for the passport as far back as February 10, 1953), that the magazine he edits, the *New Internationalist*, once described itself as "revolutionary Marxist" (a matter of long-standing public knowledge) and that the ISL had been included in the attorney general's notorious "subversive list."

The hearing was attended by Shachtman, accompanied by his attorney, Joseph L. Rauh Jr., of Washington, and by Albert Gates, secretary of the ISL, and by two representatives of the Passport Division, Ashley J. Nicholas and his assistant, Franz Mathies.

## STALLING TACTICS

It was evident from the course of the hearing and the questions put to Shachtman by Nicholas that the State Department would like to stall off a decision on the application for the passport for as long as it could, even though there has never in the past been any question about granting a passport and passport renewals to Shachtman, who has been visiting European countries periodically and publicly since 1925.

The reason for the State Department's behavior became equally evident: even though, as Attorney Rauh clearly demonstrated at the hearing, there is no ground for denying a passport to Shachtman even in the regulations promulgated by the State Department itself, the department would like to throw the problem into the lap of the attorney general's department because of out-and-out fear of the consequences that may follow any decision of its own, favorable or unfavorable.

In the course of the hearing, Nicholas' questioning of Shachtman, supplemented by questions which Attorney Rauh asked, brought out so incontestably the true position of Shachtman and the Independent Socialist League, as well as of its forerunner, the Workers Party, with regard to the Stalinist movement and the Stalinist

regimes, on the one hand, and with regard to the "official Trotskyist" movement on the other, that Nicholas found it possible to state, half way through the hearing, that there was no further need to go into those aspects of the matter.

Shachtman's oral statements, further amplified by evidence read from official organizational documents by Albert Gates, were regarded as enough, in the eyes of Nicholas, to remove these matters from consideration in deciding finally on the application.

After Shachtman and Gates had extensively testified as to the real position of the ISL with regard to the imposition of a socialist regime or a socialist society by force and violence, Nicholas—who had said that the conventional meaning of the term "revolution" was "shooting people"—asked several times that Shachtman provide the department with additional documentary material which would support his contentions about the views of the ISL and of himself.

## PASSAGE AT ARMS

Shachtman also testified, in reply to questions by Nicholas, about his relations and contacts, during preceding visits to Europe, with the Spanish POUM and the Ukrainian group that publishes *Vpered* (Forward) in Germany, as well as about his relations with Natalia Trotsky. Nicholas seemed upset to learn that the POUM was an "outlaw party," as he put it, but he did not dwell on this point when Shachtman and Attorney Rauh pointed out that every political organization in Spain, except for the Fascist Falange, was outlawed by Franco, and that the Ukrainian *Vpered* group, to say nothing of the ISL itself, was outlawed by the Kremlin.

Shachtman's replies to Nicholas' questions about the ISL position on the war—both the Second World War and the war in Korea—at one point almost became a political discussion between the two. Nicholas questioned the "consistency" of the ISL position in opposing the world war as a whole but in supporting the struggle of the French, Polish and Italian Resistance partisans during the war. After explaining the difference, Shachtman asked if it was the policy of the State Department to grant passports only to politically consistent people. That ended the discussion on the point.

The discussion on the war in Korea came to an end when, after questioning the "practicality" of the ISL stand on the war, Nicholas replied to Shachtman's question about what "practical position" he would now propose by acknowledging, "The Korean problem is a difficult one, I know."

Toward the end of the almost three-hour session, Nicholas suddenly asked Shachtman, "Are you more interested in getting a passport or trying to get a ruling by some court on the listing by the attorney general?"

In the heated exchange that followed this question, with Nicholas admitting that he was basing it upon "information from a source outside of Washington that you had no particular desire to get a passport," Shacht-

man not only condemned the "informant" as a liar, but Attorney Rauh asserted emphatically:

"Mr. Nicholas, there are two separate problems. We are going to take the attorney general into court. We want a passport. They have no relationship; that is why we are trying to get the information here on which you are acting in the record so that we can do that. We feel that already we have a case in the fact that we feel that the denial of a passport without a reason for nine months is itself a violation of due process of law, but instead of that we made an advised decision to make one last effort with the department before we go into court. But I don't think it is really any proper concern whether Mr. Shachtman ever made the statement that he was going into court. If you have any such question, it is properly directed to me. We are going into court if the attorney general does not remove it [the ISL] and we are going into court if you don't give us a passport, and we intend to cite the treatment to which an American citizen has been subjected without even a reply—in fact for eight months we couldn't even get a letter answered."

The passport official hastened to add, "If you say you are really interested in a passport, of course, we will act on your application."

## STATE DEPT' MYSTERY

Just when the Department will act remains a mystery, which no question that Attorney Rauh directed to Nicholas succeeded in clearing up. The latter's replies to Rauh's request for information showed that the Board of Passport Appeals, which the State Department is required by law to set up, has not yet been set up; that there is therefore no chairman of the board to whom to direct oneself in asking for a hearing and a hearing date; that the procedures of the Board of Appeals, which the State Department is required by law to promulgate, have not yet even been drawn up, let alone promulgated; and that if the department were to have its way Europe might well be wiped off the map of the world before the "tentative disapproval" of the passport is reversed or made final.

In view of that, Mr. Rauh served notice on Nicholas that, "if we don't get an answer within the next few weeks from you and an appearance before the Board of Passport Appeals, administrative remedies which the State Department published regulations give us," he will proceed to the federal courts to get an injunction against the department.

Meanwhile, the strange doublelock which the State Department keeps on the door of the United States remains tightly closed. It remains just as hard for some people to come to this country for a visit as it is for others to leave it to visit elsewhere. One would think that the State Department is so very busy with its propaganda drive about the freedom of people to move in and out of Stalinist Russia that it has no time or energy left to uphold that freedom in the United States.

# SWP Splits, Stalinoids Take a Third — —

(Continued from page 1)

tary who is the main inspirer of the extreme pro-Stalinist line.

Since then the minority apparently came to the conclusion that it could not live any longer under the notoriously bureaucratic Cannon regime, and that free play for the expression of its views was not possible inside the heavily bureaucratized atmosphere of this party. A demonstration of its attitude came to a head at the recent series of meetings organized by the Cannonites for the 25th anniversary of the American Trotskyist movement, when the minority supporters boycotted the meetings by staying away.

Therefore a special plenum of the SWP national committee was convened, last Saturday, to take up the serious situation. It lasted one-half hour. The Cannon majority presented a resolution calling on all who failed to attend the anniversary meetings to give their explanation and excuse; if no satisfactory explanation were given, automatic suspension was to follow. This was carried, but the minority NC representatives refused to participate and did not answer. Following this the minorityites gave a statement of their views and walked out. This meant the immediate suspension of five NC members (really six, if we include one who was unable to be present).

The split will now be extended to the organization ranks by the same process and re-registration.

## BIG BLOWS

The split means a substantial lopping off of the SWP's forces. Estimates of the strength of the minority run from about one-fifth (Cannon's) to 40 per cent. It may be safe to say that the SWP is losing about a third of its organization directly to the split-off group, with an indeterminate effect on other (doubt-

ful, demoralized or disaffected) elements.

The biggest organizational blow to the majority group is the loss of virtually all of its Detroit branch. All of Flint and Youngstown also goes with the minority. In New York the minority takes perhaps a third to 40 per cent of the members. The Bay Area branch will also be greatly weakened, and there will be losses in others, including Chicago. The above-named branches are those which have constituted the most effective branches of the SWP (plus Los Angeles which will not be much affected by the split).

What perspective for continued existence the split-off minority holds for itself can only be conjectured at present, outside of the fact that it naturally is planning to publish a periodical, probably a magazine. No doubt, in general they will seek to implement their previous conception of a Stalinist-oriented propaganda group of some sort.

## CANNON'S SPEECH

Following the half-hour split session at the NC plenum, described above, the meeting was thrown open to the membership of the SWP and also turned into a kind of morale rally with a speech by Cannon on the split. (Incidentally, at no point since the fight started in 1951 has either group raised the question of putting the dispute before the membership for a decisive vote at a convention, regular or special.)

In his speech Cannon attempted to explain, among other things, how come he and his group have, up to now, been going along with the political positions which they are now denouncing. Formally, during the preceding struggle the Cannon group protested its adherence to the same resolutions which the minority took as its point of departure; and when the Fourth International expelled the

majority of the French PCI for rejecting the policy of entry into the CP, Cannon solidarized himself with this action.

Now Cannon explained to his members that Pablo and the minorityites had been pulling the wool over his eyes; he hadn't understood . . . now his eyes were opened . . . this babe in the woods had been buffaloeed but at last all was clear. He permitted himself to go so far as to say that the trouble with the minority was that they thought the Stalinist parties were carrying out the socialist revolution, "bureaucratically, of course, but carrying it out nonetheless"—a fact which he had somehow previously missed in his reading of LABOR ACTION analyses and from the quite plain talk of the SWP minority and Pabloites themselves.

The fact is, of course, that the pro-Stalinist political evolution of the Fourth International had not bothered Cannon much until the U. S. minority had begun to step on his own toes in "his own" party. Now he made clear that, so to speak, the ax was out for Pablo and his like. Marvellous to behold, he even denounced the "leader cult" around Pablo. . . .

He indicated that the SWP was now friendly with the expelled PCI group. Comparing this split with that of 1940 in the SWP, he insisted that the present opposition was the worst yet, none had ever been so "completely revisionist," that, in fact, what characterized the Cochran-Clarke group was that they were "traitors" and "Stalinists," etc.

## WILL THEY RE-EXAMINE?

In Ceylon (which, besides Bolivia, has the only Fourth International section with any mass influence) the more pro-Stalinist minority walked out of a party conference October 18, after a three-year fight now revealed for the first time.

According to the *Militant* report on this, the minority presented two pro-

Stalinist resolutions to the conference and left when they were defeated. The immediate issue around which the fight came to a climax was that of organizational attitude toward the Stalinist party of the country. Again according to the *Militant* version (which means the majority version) the split-off group, headed by P. H. William de Sylva, wanted "programmatically unity" with the Stalinists whereas the "orthodox" types merely stood for united front (and also, we can add, support to the Stalinists in elections, attendance at the fake "peace conference" of the Stalinists in China, etc.).

Nothing is said about the strength of the split-section in Ceylon.

While the break in the SWP makes it possible now for the Cannonites to re-evaluate their political devolution toward Stalinism, the political position with which they are left at the moment is that of a hopeless quagmire. The inherent logic of their "workers' state" position was indeed more consistently set forth by the minority; and while one can deplore that the minority militants had fallen so hard for Stalinism (pushed to wall also, of course, by the small-scale bureaucratic regime for which Cannon is noted), yet the SWP members have also acquired an opportunity to re-examine the whole question of the Stalinist state, freed from the pressure of that section of the movement which acted as the vanguard of pro-Stalinist degeneration in its ranks. If this is not done, then any positive possibilities of the shake-up will have been frittered away.

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

# PRESS AGENTS OF THE PENTAGON: THE MILITARY PROPAGANDA MILL—Part 4

## The TECHNIQUES of MILITARY PROPAGANDA

Fourth installment of a series based on the new pamphlet, "Press Agents of the Pentagon," by John M. Swomley Jr., published by the National Council Against Conscription. The present installment is a condensation of the corresponding material in the pamphlet, in which sections are combined with summaries.—Ed.

The armed forces have developed techniques which are designed virtually to guarantee acceptance of military propaganda.

One technique is the combination of planted story and press conference. A story, to launch a "new line," is planted with a press or radio commentator, followed up at Pentagon press conferences, endorsed by the cabinet officers for the armed forces, backed up by the White House, etc., each step getting headlines as it goes along.<sup>1</sup>

Another technique is what a Washington *Daily News* reporter called "Operation 'Winning Friends and Influencing the Public':"

"Here are the tactics to be employed: Join the Kiwanis. Get on public committees. Take part in civic events. Be ready to make speeches at the drop of a hat. Serve on boards. Be seen at public functions. [Etc.] . . . Once a month, at every station, a progress report has to be made to the Chief of Naval Operations. One man, usually the Public Information Officer, has to make the report. He lists the speeches, public appearance and similar functions in which the various officers take part."<sup>2</sup>

Another approach is to prepare material for special groups. For example in 1950 the Defense Department started to put out a monthly news and feature story service entitled *Defense News for Women*, to get the special female slant.

The military publicists take advantage of calamity or any other occasion to sell their program. Here is a comment on the method from the *Denver Post* (Feb. 13, 1949), at the time when a large section of the Midwest was snowbound in the blizzard of 1949:

"OPERATION SNOWBOUND began—and the president named its colorful and able boss, Brig. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, to be chief of Army Engineers. And the engineers got press clippings by the ton, just in time to help them battle against being absorbed into the new all-purpose federal department proposed by Mr. Hoover's 'task forces' . . .

"Let's give the army full credit for a job well done. But let's not forget the boys of reclamation, and range management, and soil conservation, and forest service, etc., who'd been slugging it out with the blizzards for nearly a month before the army showed up. Slugging, too, without rest, without relief, and without publicity—just getting the job done.

" . . . The army had all the equipment needed, which other agencies lacked. And it was used well, all right.

But surely it isn't too impolite to point out—it seemed also to have had a pressman and a photographer riding on every 'dozer, recording every hay-drop, and noting every path cleared to the ranch barn or to the Chic Sale."

Another technique is seen if we examine the story behind the army feature films.

"This year" (1952), wrote the Chief of Motion Picture Section of the Army's Public Information Section, "the motion picture industry is producing more films on Army subjects or with military backgrounds than ever before. In all, thirty-five features and short subjects are in various stages of writing and production, from story outline to final film editing. In theme they range from entertaining comedies depicting the life of a recruit to action-filled war dramas. All together they constitute an important and far-reaching medium for sustaining broad public understanding of the Army's activities."

### HOLLYWOOD PLAYS BALL

The army estimates that "seventy-five million people attend the twenty thousand theaters in the United States each week. A 'hit' picture may reach as many as forty million persons, exclusive of foreign audiences. Assistance to the motion picture industry in the preparation of films based on military topics thus is a vital aspect of the army's public information program."<sup>3</sup>

The Defense Department's publicity staff decides on matters of policy and "is the sole authority for approval of cooperation of any component of the Department of Defense in the production of commercial motion pictures, whether for theatrical or television release." The Pictorial Division's Motion Picture Section "evaluates story ideas and synopses, makes recommendations for screenplay approvals, and suggests the appointment of army technical advisers."<sup>4</sup>

The Army's Motion Picture chief points out that "to qualify for military cooperation" a film depicting an army subject for example must be a "picture [that] will reflect favorably on the army." The army adviser appointed to work with the film company must be "forceful enough to insure that his suggestions will be followed. He is the type of officer who can gain the confidence of the producer by his constructive suggestions. He remains responsible to the Chief of Information for the military authenticity and propriety of the story."<sup>5</sup>

The finished picture is viewed before release by Department of Defense and army officials. If they approve, the film industry may announce that it "has been produced in cooperation with Department of the Army."

"Army cooperation does not cease with the final review, however. If the picture renders valuable service both to the Army and the Nation, assistance is given through military participation at previews throughout the country." Such participation may mean "the use of troops, bands and equipment at local theaters as a means of bringing recruiting drives, blood donor campaigns" and other programs "to public attention."

A *New York Times* film review began: "The United States Military Academy needs recruits, and *Beyond*

*Glory*, which opened last night at the Paramount, is a manful effort to extol the martial virtues and to defend the Academy against its detractors."<sup>6</sup>

The same paper described the "brass band in the middle of the Paramount Theatre lobby" and the 298 West Point cadets who had been brought to New York to perform in Central Park and on Broadway as a promotion stunt. One cadet explained that "Beyond *Glory*" was good publicity to give the people "on the outside." He added, "I wish this place were like the institution in the picture."<sup>7</sup>

The army not only has a real hold on any motion picture firm that wants to produce a military film but also on news reporters. The army can make it difficult for a critical reporter.

The armed forces have established a roster of accredited correspondents who can be assigned promptly to any military operation or headquarters. Newspaper publishers, editors, reporters are taken on plane journeys or sea voyages or invited to dinners. They are made to feel obligated to the military. "The press is part of the United Nations Army in Korea," said Gen. Van Fleet, according to a Sept. 19, 1952 AP dispatch from Korea. All news correspondents in Korea had to sign certificates admitting the army's right to dismiss them. In addition the army and other military branches have certificates of appreciation which are presented to faithful reporters, newsreel men, etc.

Advertising is another way to secure cooperation. In 1946 the army was the third largest advertiser in the nation.<sup>8</sup>

As Col. Caldwell pointed out in a Senate hearing: "For the paid advertisement you might say that we are receiving approximately 10 or 20 times public service or free advertisement, which we probably obtain by using the paid advertisements." He added, "The magazines are very cooperative in writing stories. . . . The newspapers and the radio, particularly, give us a great deal of public space and time."<sup>9</sup>

Army and air force policy on radio advertising states that "radio time will be purchased on a long-range basis calculated to give each station supporting the recruiting programs of the army and of the air force an opportunity to obtain a portion of the national or local advertising."<sup>10</sup>

In other words, radio stations that promote the army can expect financial aid.

(Next week: More Techniques)

1. See U. S. News and World Report, June 15, 1951 for detailed description of this technique.
2. Washington Daily News, August 28, 1946.
3. Army Information Digest, Sept. 1952.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. New York Times, August 4, 1948.
7. Ibid., July 29, 1948.
8. Washington Post, May 8, 1947.
9. Senate Appropriation Committee Hearings, Defense Department, 1952, p. 937.
10. Radio Daily, April 10, 1950.

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### "A Step Forward"

To the Editor:

In reading your preface to the Peacemaker statement, published in the Oct. 26 LABOR ACTION, I find the usual attitude of the ISL toward all other groups. Rather than recognizing that at this point in history all past dogmas are pretty well discredited—including your own—and that the best revolutionary groups can do is work toward democratic goals with considerable humility, you invariably label any positive step by other groups as an "advance" (presumably toward your own enlightened views.) When I read a bulletin issued by an SYL member in Chicago which described the Peacemakers as "a pacifist group oriented toward socialism," I couldn't help but wonder what you'd think of our labeling the ISL as a "socialist group oriented toward pacifism."

You could be a good deal more creative in finding answers and working with the rest of us if you could get it through your Marxian skulls that all of us (including at times even the ISL) are changing our views and advancing toward a better, more democratic, more revolutionary position. But we are not advancing toward your position except to the slight degree that your position in some areas is correct.

To attack the "absolute pacifist" views of the Peacemaker statement because we said that violence was undemocratic, only indicates that all the growth isn't going to take place on the side of the pacifists. Democracy fundamentally rests on certain assumptions about the nature of man, one of them being that human beings are entitled to respect and, regardless of how we may feel about them, our regard for the dignity of man forces us to treat people in a decent way. To use

violence as a social method, even in a last resort, is to destroy that essential bond among men which is the basis—not only in religion but in sociology—for democracy. To weep copious tears for the workingman, or the oppressed colonial, and then exhibit hatred and violence toward capitalists, racists and imperialists shows your inability to separate the man from his ideas and inclines me to believe your view of mankind is that of the young lady who remarked she loved all human beings but couldn't stand the neighbor next door.

David McREYNOLDS

We admit we find it a little difficult to understand just what McReynolds is angry about.

Here LABOR ACTION (alone, outside of the pacifist field) devotes most of a page to greeting the Third Camp resolution of a pacifist group; reprints it in its entirety; assigns an inadequate two sentences to objectively noting our disagreement with its absolute-pacifist views; welcomes it as "a step forward" (not, incidentally, as a step forward to "our" views)—and yet, strangely, this pacifist correspondent responds with a rather virulent epistle about our "Marxian skulls" and such.

We could understand this if McReynolds were the stereotype-caricature of the mythical "sectarian Bolshevik" who believes in heaping the choicest abuse precisely on people who share some common views. But McReynolds is not a "Bolshevik"—he believes in "treating people in a decent way," "respect for human beings," and love for all men including the neighbor next door.

As we understand it, the Peacemakers themselves consider their resolution as a step forward in the pacifist movement,

that it represents something of a departure from the types of resolutions adopted by pacifist organizations in the past, though of course many individual pacifists have held similar views for long.

Apparently we are scolded for saying that the Peacemaker resolution is "a step forward," but actually McReynolds uses the peculiar method of referring to that comment and then adding: you mean a step forward "presumably toward your own enlightened views." The presumption is his own.

Of course we are proud in our own way that we raised the Third Camp banner 13 years ago, just as from their own point of view many a consistent pacifist has the right to be proud of a record of militant struggle against war. But "our" position on the Third Camp is fortunately not our private property. It would be just too bad if it were. Our main regret is that its "proprietaryship" is not more widely shared than it is.

Yet, on the basis of "presuming" some stereotype which may exist in his own mind about people with Marxian skulls, he proceeds to read us a stern lecture about a number of laudable moral qualities, including humility.

For the rest:

(1) We do not believe that "all past dogmas [by which we read: doctrines] are pretty well discredited." Neither does McReynolds, of course, since he seems to hang on to the "dogma" of absolute-pacifism. Unless he means that "all past dogmas" except his own are discredited—a view he cannot possibly hold in light of the high moral tone of his letter.

(2) We were content to draw attention to the "radical social views" of the Peacemaker resolution, though to our mind these views do point in the direc-

tion of socialism. The ISL, however, is not a "socialist group oriented toward pacifism"—that is, we quite disagree with absolute-pacifist principles. We are for collaboration with pacifist anti-war fighters to the fullest extent possible. We do not believe that either tendency has to abandon its views in order to make collaboration possible.

(3) We do not think that (for example) the Spanish workers, when they organized their armed militia to resist Franco's attack, were violating democracy, decency, or the dignity of human beings. It was the Franco fascists who fit this description. It was the men who rose up against the fascist legions in the name of freedom who fought for the great ideals.

Aside from the usual case for pacifism on various grounds, we do not see that McReynolds has even begun to explain why it is undemocratic for an overwhelming majority to defend its rights with force against (say) a fascist putsch that seeks to enslave the people by force. In any case McReynolds would seem to have in mind some special pacifist definition of democracy; this he has an indubitable right to make and defend, but we suggest he not present it as if no one had ever heard of another. Quite the contrary is true.

As compared with the present exchange, there would be value in a serious discussion on such views about "pacifism-as-the-only-democratic-doctrine." In fact, we take this opportunity to invite our correspondent (or anyone else of his opinion) to present for our publication an article defending this asseveration, one that might do so more fully than McReynolds' few words on the subject attempted.—Ed.

# GOP Jitters, Dem Quandary —

(Continued from page 1)

while the Republican plumped for the program of the most know-nothing wing of the GOP.

In Buffalo and in Akron, Ohio, the Democrats got themselves mayors, as they did in New Haven, Conn. Elsewhere, the parties pretty much held on to what they had. Despite the fact that in an off-year such as this national politics plays less of a role, there can be no doubt that the Democrats had a trend going for them.

The first reaction of the Republicans to their setback has been all too obvious. They are trying to distract the people and hearten their partisans by dragging out the old story of Harry Dexter White as the opening salvo in an intensified "red scare" campaign. The day after the elections Joe McCarthy told the press that the trouble with the Republicans was that they had not campaigned on the "Communist issue," and they seem to have taken his criticism to heart. They will probably try to keep this and similar "issues" boiling from now till next year.

The Democrats, on the other hand, are publicly wondering how they should conduct themselves during the coming year to make sure that they keep the trend moving in their direction. Some believe that these elections show that the effects of the Eisenhower victory, and the sanctity which this gave the man in the White House, have worn out, and that now they can afford to go after him and his party hammer-and-tongs. But others point out that their policy of lying low

and saying nothing for the past year has paid off, and hence see no reason for changing their tactics.

## SNIPE AND RUN?

Of course, there is a certain advantage to the latter approach. It is clear that one of the things which has made the electorate cool to the Republicans has been the striking difference between their pre-election promises and their performance in office. Their pledges to balance the budget and at the same time lower taxes, their claims that all the country needs to surge forward to an unprecedented prosperity is for the government to stop interfering with the economic processes—all that is now on the way down the drain.

The advantage for the Democrats in not putting up a fight against the Eisenhower administration is that this makes it unnecessary for them to develop a program of their own on the basis of which to make a real fight. They can snipe a little here and criticize a little there, and let the natural trend of the economy, which is now down, take care of the Republicans for them.

There are two disadvantages for the Democrats in trying to develop a program of their own. One is that this tends to emphasize the divisions in their own ranks, and the other is that the people would naturally expect them to put into effect, if returned to power, any program they might develop while they are in the oppo-

sition. Far better to come into power without having promised the people anything positive, but just on the basis of a Republican failure.

Actually, the divisive effect of any serious program on the Democrats is the more compelling reason which tends to keep them quiet. The Fair Deal wing of the party knows that any program it might develop would have to be pushed in Congress. But the Southern Democrats dominate the congressional representation of the party. Although these gentlemen are now seeking to draw away a little from Eisenhower and his embattled GOP, for fear they might get hurt if the lost "skirmish" should show signs of turning into a general rout, they are certainly not prepared to turn the leadership of the party, in Congress, to the Fair Dealers. In fact, if the latter should start to push strongly for their type of program, the well-known Dixie-GOP coalition in Congress, and perhaps in the next elections, might be cemented more firmly than ever.

## DOWN-POINTERS

But if the Democrats do not come forth with a real program of their own, and really put up a fight against the Republicans during the next session, the voters will once more be faced with having to make a choice, not between two parties with different programs, but between two office-seeking machines with no distinctive programs whatever.

Of course, what will be really decisive is what happens in the cold war and in the American economy during the next year. It now appears that in the former, we can expect a period of stalemate. Although the great projects on which U. S. foreign policy has embarked in Europe, such as the European Defense Community, may die a lingering death, it may well be that this period will pass without any electrifying crises. In that even, domestic events are likely to be decisive politically.

And now, everything points toward an economic dip in this country. Just how far and how deep it will go, no one can tell at the moment. But it need not go very far or very deep to bring about a major political upheaval in the country.

We have already seen the cattle-ranchers march on Washington. That is a response to just a minor "adjustment" in their field. The rise of unemployment to three, five or six millions for several months during 1954 is not at all impossible, and this need not be accompanied by a major collapse of our armament-propped economy. Such a development would force the union leadership to start making all kinds of demands and even threats in the political sphere. And despite the well-known American two-party tradition, there is no political law which says that the American workers are going to be bound to the impotent support of one of the two office-seeking machines forever.

# The Witchhunt Reaches Truman — —

(Continued from page 1)

disturbed that he called the then attorney general, Tom Clark, at the hospital and told him that White should not be promoted to a job with the International Monetary Fund. Clark can't remember the call.

Jimmy Byrnes, also a former New Deal official who has fallen out with his former pals, says that he also saw the file and discussed it with Truman. He says that Truman was so disturbed that he sought to have White's confirmation by the Senate held up, and phoned Biddle, the Senate clerk, about it. Biddle cannot remember any phone call from Truman with regard to White.

Byrnes also claims that he discussed the matter with Vinson, then secretary of the treasury, who had recommended White for the job with the International Monetary Fund. Vinson is no more in a position to affirm or deny this than is White himself.

## HIS OWN PETARD

As the days go by, Attorney General Brownell, who touched off the fuse of this political bomb, appears to be retreating steadily. At first he said that the people who appointed White knew that he was a Russian spy. Now his office claims that derogatory information about White "was available" to Truman.

But still he refuses to divulge exactly what this information was. After all, if a grand jury found "insufficient evidence" to indict White (not to prove him guilty, but just to indict him), is it not quite probable that there is insufficient information even to make out a good, strong, extra-legal case against him?

Obviously, we cannot answer that question, any more than it can be answered by any of the editors, journalists and columnists who are discussing the whole business with such a marked lack of restraint. And our reason is the same as theirs: we have not seen the FBI file in question, nor the further files that may have been compiled since 1946 and which may contain additional information which was not available to Truman or anyone else in that year.

And if we had seen the file, we would have no way of knowing whether the information in it is authentic or not, genuine or forged, based on reports of witnesses whose testimony could withstand cross-examination or on those of nameless informers who need only assert, because they will never be questioned.

But the absence of all this information does not keep the Republicans from feeling that they have a real good thing in this whole business. Obviously they are not relying on anything which could be subjected to judicial process—for the "defendant" is now dead. They are relying on something much more ominous: the existence in the country of an anti-Stalinist hysteria which prevents people from keeping their heads and demanding

proofs, and makes it easy for the most flimsily substantiated charge to gain wide popular acceptance.

The baseness of the Republicans' methods and actions in this matter cannot, however, absolve Harry Truman and his administration from the responsibility they bear for the procedures which are now being used against them, and for the political atmosphere in which it is so difficult to challenge these procedures effectively.

As LABOR ACTION goes to press, Truman, Byrnes and Clark have been subpoenaed to appear before Veldé's House Un-American Committee. If any or all of them take the stand, and unless the Republicans' fear of losing office has really driven them mad, it is hardly likely that they will be subjected to the same kind of questioning and procedures to which dozens and even hundreds of citizens of lowlier estate have been subjected under rules and procedures set up by Truman's own administration in similar matters.

If he were not an ex-president of the United States, how would he make out under these procedures? Even a most rigorously restrained imagination can paint a sober and realistic picture of what his position would be.

## CASE OF MR. Q

Let us say that he was Mr. Q., a government official of the second rank, say a division head in the Treasury Department. In 1945, when the honeymoon with Russia was just beginning to lose its first hot rapture, Mr. Q. was asked to pass on the qualifications of a subordinate official, say a Mr. Harry Dexter White, for promotion.

Mr. White has been a long-time government official with a splendid record. All his associates and superiors speak of him most favorably. But in the course of his deliberations on the matter, Mr. Q. is handed a file from the FBI in which it is stated that certain parties (unknown) claim that Mr. White was closely associated with a number of other highly reputable government officials, of all of whom it is alleged that they are a Soviet spy ring. This is long before the Hiss case and the Rosenberg case and all the others.

Although Mr. Q. can easily check on the character and standing of all the people who vouch for Mr. White, he has no way of checking on the character, motives, or even the kind of evidence given credence by the anonymous parties who are alleged by other anonymous parties to claim that Mr. White and a number of other important government officers are really Russian spies.

Actually, there is as yet no really firm evidence that Mr. Q. really read the FBI report. But whether he did or not, it is pretty clear that it was available for him to read it. In any event, he recommends that Mr. White be given the promotion.

The years pass. The memory of all the people who had something to do with this particular promotion is made uncertain by the passage of time. Some of them, including the man who was centrally involved, have since passed to their reward. But suddenly a charge is made that Mr. White was really a Russian spy. In fact, by this time the authorities, who only had vague allegations about him, have since then gathered information which is much more concrete, damaging and verifiable (that is an assumption made for the purposes of this example).

The question then is: who recommended Mr. White for this and other promotions? The records are carefully searched. Among them is found a receipt by Mr. Q.'s secretary for the FBI file in question. That means Mr. Q. read the file, or could have, or should have read it, before making his recommendation.

At least one fact remains clear. The recommendation was made. Why? True, since then the cold war has altered the attitude of the whole government toward Russia, the Communist Party, etc. True, at the time, Mr. White was highly regarded by all kinds of professional and personal associates who are now very reluctant to admit that they thought he was an outstanding public servant. But why was he appointed? Is it not a suspicious circumstance that Mr. Q. recommended him? Shouldn't Mr. Q. have known at the time that where there was smoke (the FBI file) there might be some fire? Is it not just possible that there was some collusion between Mr. Q. and Mr. White?

The security officer in the Treasury Department is given Mr. Q.'s file for a close going-over. His relatives, former landlords, school teachers, his friends, enemies and acquaintances are questioned about him. It turns out that he also recommended, or men recommended by him recommended, Messrs. X, Y and Z, about whose loyalty there has also been raised a reasonable doubt.

How could it be that Mr. Q. was in some way "associated" with so many doubtful people if there is nothing "wrong" with him?

Mr. Q. insists that he is the most loyal man who ever worked for the government. He demands to see the FBI file on Mr. White, so that he can check with his memory. Sorry, that is restricted information.

He demands that he be given the records of the other men whom he recommended so that he can show why they seemed at the time the best people for the job. Sorry, that is restricted information.

He appears before a board which is going to decide whether or not he is a security risk. The charges against him are that he on occasion recommended people to office who, it now turns out, were security risks. He wants to know what the proofs are that these men were

security risks. Sorry, that is restricted information.

But he is told one thing: some of them belonged, or were sympathetically associated with, organizations since listed by the attorney general as "subversive." Mr. Q. is surprised, but he demands to know on what basis these organizations were thus listed by the attorney general. After all, there could have been a mistake. Sorry, there is no provision in President Truman's Executive Order on this matter for divulging the basis on which organizations are listed as "subversive."

After some deliberation, it is decided that there is "reasonable doubt" as to Mr. Q.'s loyalty, and he is ousted from his job. He is outraged, and wants to take the matter to court. But his attorney advises him that the courts have held that it is a privilege, not a right, for a citizen to work for the government, and that as long as the government provides reasonable procedures by which a man can prove himself innocent, it is no business of the courts whether he is hired, retained in his job, or fired.

## HE'S LUCKY

Mr. Q., it would appear, is in a bit of a pickle. He feels that whichever way he turns he is blocked by the refusal of government authorities to give him the information on the basis of which he can clear himself, or even to furnish him the information in such concrete form that he might try to refute it.

He is out of a job; his name has been smeared in the papers as a man who recommended a bunch of spies to high office; the broad implication is there that he was either a hopeless idiot and dupe or a Russian agent himself. He cannot get a good job now. He cannot refute the vague charges, insinuations, etc., in the press. And any way he turns, he cannot escape the fact that these "procedures," this whole "loyalty" or "security" program, was set up and developed and brought to full flower under the administration of one President Harry S. Truman.

It is probably fortunate for citizen Harry S. Truman that his name is not Mr. Q. It is true, the more reckless columnists in the Hearst press and its similars are already saying openly that Truman was either a dupe or an accomplice of spies and that he should be dealt with accordingly. But they are only the more reckless columnists, and it is likely that even the more reckless Republican officials will tread a little more warily in this matter.

After all, he was not just an ordinary American, he was the president. And to convict him under the procedures laid down by himself might do more than just cost a citizen his livelihood and his reputation: it might lower the office of the president in the esteem of the whole nation. He is lucky.