

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

THE 'NEW LOOK' IN OLD-LINE LABOR LEADERS

DAVE BECK: The Line Forms on the Right

... page 6

DAVE McDONALD: The Bride of U. S. Steel

... page 7

The Harvard-McCarthy Fracas: Stoolpigeonry Is the Issue

... page 5

DECEMBER 21, 1953

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

THE TREND IN WASHINGTON

New U.S. Military Perspective: Go It Alone with A-Bombs

OUR NOBLE ALLY

We venture to believe that there is no mystery about why the Panmunjom negotiations, for setting up a Korean peace conference, stalled along and finally broke down as U. S. representative Dean stalked out in a huff. No doubt the Stalinist side wanted to stall, but it is quite clear that the reason why they wanted to stall is—Syngman Rhee, the United States' contribution to the "democratization" of Asia.

The Stalinists have been waiting for January 27 to come around and for Rhee to carry out his threat to move into an attack against North Korea. That was the deadline which Rhee had set. And the Stalinists could not wish for a more beautiful setup than that.

Now, a few days after Dean's walkout, Rhee has been brought to shift ground and pledge no aggression until a peace conference has met for 90 days. But the Stalinists need not abandon their dream that Rhee will play their game. For as the N. Y. Times correspondent from Seoul noted on December 14, on any given day a pledge from Rhee is good for about only 24 hours. "Winning Korean approval for a plan is hard enough, but a Korean pledge, once given, is often unexpectedly withdrawn." It all depends on Rhee's "whims," he writes.

"Others in the South Korean government, especially Foreign Minister Pyun Yung Tai, have been even more difficult. Mr. Pyun's idea of solving the Korean problem is to drop a hydrogen bomb on Moscow. Mr. Pyun has frequently suggested that course in conversations with diplomats and reporters."

ASIAN FEDERATION

Washington has let it be known that it would like to see the free nations of Asia form a regional alliance independent of NATO, the West and the U. S. Independent? Well, the inspired press story makes it clear what they mean. It seems that the State Department has looked around for an Asian leader who can take the initiative, since the Asians are too suspicious to tolerate direct U. S. leadership in the project. Who is there? Regrettably, Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek are counted out—the free Asians won't go for them. Who then? Says C. L. Sulzberger in the Times:

"Specialists studying this problem have tentatively concluded that the best if indeed not the only Asian politician who might be able to accomplish the job is—"

Nehru of India, do you think? A Burmese leader? Indonesia? No, remember that Washington wants somebody independent.

"... is Razon Magsaysay, new president of the Philippine Republic," says Sulzberger—i.e., head of the ex-colony which is still under the economic and political shadow of the U. S.

What remains of the suggestion is its testimonial to the power of the idea of a truly Independent Federation of Asia which is not a creature of the Western war camp. But such a federation will not be led by Magsaysay, nor even by Nehru. It is a task for the growing Asian socialist movement.

By GORDON HASKELL

The United States government is committing itself to atomic warfare as the type of warfare it plans to conduct in the future. This is the meaning of the program its representatives are pushing at the present meeting of the ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations.

This is the significance of the changes proposed in the military budget which will be presented to the coming session of the Congress. This commitment will have far-reaching consequences on the domestic economy of this country, on the relations among the peoples of the world, and perhaps on the future of our whole civilization.

From the moment the world was informed of the atom bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it was clear that a force had been set loose which would have a tremendous impact on the world in many ways. As its first application was military, and as the imperialist drives of both American capitalism and Russian Stalinism endangered the peace of the world, it was inevitable that men's minds turned first to the awesome military potentialities of atomic power.

There is an inevitable lag between the invention, and even first applications, of any new weapon and its adoption as the dominant tool around which military tactics, organization and strategy are formed. It has taken the generals and admirals who run the armed forces of this country eight years of testing, of devel-

oping new weapons, and of rethinking the experiences of the last war in the light of the atomic potential to accept the idea that this is the weapon of the future.

And even now, it has been the civilian political authorities, pushed by economic and political considerations as much as by purely military ones, who have decided to place their bets most heavily on the atom bomb, while reducing their dependence on conventional armaments.

Two aspects of this administration's policies demonstrate that the decision has been made.

One is the decision to stabilize the NATO forces at about their present size (except for the hope of twelve more West German divisions).

The other is the plan to reduce the manpower of the American army and navy over the next few years, while steadily increasing that of the air force.

THE A-BOMB ORIENTATION

The first policy is based on at least three major considerations:

(1) The cost of increasing the ground forces available in Europe over the present 56 combat divisions is prohibitive. For some of the poorer countries, even to maintain them at present levels without constant American aid is a back-breaking burden. Congress is in no mood to increase appropriations for this purpose, specially if France and other countries continue to drag their feet on the creation of a West German army as part of the European Defense Community.

(2) An attack by Russia on Western Europe is not an immediate threat. Thus the capitalist nations must prepare themselves for a long-term maintenance of powerful military forces. But it is economically and politically out of the question for them to keep increasing these forces year by year, except in the sense of training large numbers of reservists. As long as things remain about as they are, the Americans are

(Turn to last page)

Police-State Bill Against Labor Is Presented to Congress

By B. H.

For fifteen years the legal position of American unions has been steadily deteriorating even while its power and influence has soared to an all-time high. Throughout this period labor rights have been slowly but steadily undermined in an accumulation of minor decisions of government agencies and state and local laws.

Every now and then, unions are hit by a powerful blast on a nationwide scale. Such, for example, was the Smith Connally Act which hemmed in the right to strike during the war, and the Taft-Hartley Law with its injunction provisions in the post-war period.

A new attack is in preparation, the Butler bill now being considered in public hearings before a subcommittee of Senator Jenner's Internal Security Committee. It is undoubtedly the most outrageously anti-union measure yet devised for Congress.

Random examples of a ceaseless erosion of the unions' position before the law crop up in ordinary week-to-week routine. Recent strikes on Louisiana sugar plantations and in aircraft plants in Columbus and Los Angeles show how readily the injunction ax falls.

Last week, the Supreme Court ruled that employers were legally entitled to discharge "disloyal" strikers — disloyal,

that is, not to their country but to their bosses. Thus, the discharge of AFL electrical workers who passed out handbills disparaging the quality of the programs of the radio stations which employed them was upheld.

A few weeks ago, the National Labor Relations Board ruled that unions would be barred from utilizing the facilities of the NLRB if any of their officials were indicted for allegedly signing false Taft-Hartley affidavits. Note here that unions are penalized not upon the conviction of their officials but merely upon the accusation. This method is now official government practice.

The Taft-Hartley Law penalizes unions whose officers are members of the Communist Party. The NLRB decision extends the penalty to those who are accused of membership. The Butler bill

proposes the extension of these practices in a most hideous form.

It would turn over the task of policing unions to the Subversive Activities Control Board, which would have the authority to order the NLRB to cease recognition of unions under conditions which are almost unprecedented.

Its main provision, a classical example of police-mind ambiguity, reads as follows:

"Whenever it is charged that any 'labor organization' . . . is substantially directed, dominated or controlled by any individual or individuals (whether officers of such labor organization or not); who are or ever have been a member or members of the Communist Party or of any Communist-action organization or Communist-front organization, or who have consistently aided, supported, or in any manner contributed to or furthered the activities of such organization," then the Subversive Activities Control Board institutes hearings and "shall cause to be served on the National Labor Relations Board . . . an immediate suspension order providing that such labor organization shall be ineligible to act as exclusive bargaining agent."

(Turn to last page)

Detroit Press Falsifies Facts About Mounting Unemployment

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, Dec. 13—While the United Auto Workers (CIO) was holding its unemployment conference in Washington, D. C. last week, the auto companies here were preparing a special Christmas present for thousands of workers—layoff notices.

The remarkable feature of the latest layoffs is that the numbers involved were deliberately distorted (in some cases the figures were cut in half) when the stories appeared in the daily press.

Dodge, Chrysler, Nash, Studebaker, Ford, Plymouth, Hudson, and hundreds of parts-supplier plants gave permanent layoff notices to employees, unlike previous cutbacks which were temporary. Office personnel was also reduced for the first time in the post-war period. Result was not only a shock, but three walkouts unreported by the press, in protest against the disregard of service and seniority in the cutbacks.

In addition, model change-overs have caused a big chunk of temporary layoffs here.

As a rule, once a new year's model production begins, there is plenty of overtime and steady work, as the corporations rush to fill the needs of the market. This season, every manufacturer who is already producing 1954 models has cut back his production to a new low.

The specially disturbing factor in the situation is the left-over 1953 models, of which over 500,000 are expected to remain on dealers' hands in January 1954. Even the professional optimists on the sales forces are beginning to talk about a "hard competitive" year. The post-war binge is over.

JUGGLED FIGURES

The authoritative *Automotive News* presents as its hope the statistic that there are 17,000,000 pre-war cars still being used and this is a vast potential market in 1954. As if an individual who has been so poor in the last five years that he held on to his jalopy is now—in a period of increasing unemployment—going to be in the market for anything but another jalopy that may be a little newer!

Even the Michigan Unemployment Commission states that it does not expect a resumption of volume hiring for the next few months. And, reflecting the lack of heavy orders from the auto industry as expected, the steel industry reports a slow January coming up.

The commission says that there are now 125,000 unemployed in Michigan, a figure that is quite questionable, for what the commission considers "unemployed" is something not quite in accord with the facts of life.

The commission report also stated that

It expected an increase of only 5,000 unemployed by January. Since the commission report came out, over 15,000 auto workers on the East Side of Detroit alone have received permanent layoff notices, with further cutbacks in the offing.

The juggling of statistics to cover up the increasingly serious situation here takes various forms, and it was the reason why the UAW national conference challenged the Department of Labor figures on unemployment, claiming they were one million too low.

Some corporations do not report a man "unemployed" as long as he remains on the payroll, even if he is out of work. In most cases this is a one-year period. "Unemployed" to the Unemployment Commission may mean one whose unemployment compensation is exhausted, or one who is drawing unemployment compensation. It fails to take into account the thousands who are not covered by unemployment-compensation rules, or the new labor force of high school graduates, or the influx from other states.

ECONOMIC YARDSTICK

In no case, in recent months, has any auto company given an honest figure to the newspapers on the amount involved in any layoff.

In another effort to minimize the unemployment, the number laid off is contrasted to total employment in Michigan at that moment. The Michigan Unemployment Commission, for example, contrasts the figure of 125,000 it calls "unemployed" with the figure of 2,534,000 still employed; and to be sure that does sound like a small proportion. But a more accurate economic yardstick is furnished by contrasting the 125,000 factory workers unemployed to the 1,000,000 factory workers in Michigan. This is a truer indication of the growing

depth of the crisis in the auto industry, on which the rest of Michigan depends, and whose cutbacks will be reflected soon in all other fields.

For those economists who feel that capital-goods expenditures—the classic method of promoting capitalist prosperity—are the hope of the forthcoming year, neither the steel nor the auto industry furnish much grounds for optimism. The auto industry now has a plant capacity for a car production of 10,000,000 in 1954, while *Fortune* magazine estimates car sales of 4,000,000. Besides the auto industry owns many plants that are completely idle because of war-work cutbacks.

UAW CAMPAIGN

Steel industry production will begin in 1954 around 80 per cent of capacity, with little optimism that it is going to increase very much. This is hardly an inducement for further plant expansion, especially since important price cuts have already taken place in steel sales, under the guise of paying freight charges.

As a result of these developments, a major campaign for increasing unemployment benefits is coming from the UAW in 1954. It will begin in Michigan when the state legislature convenes in January.

An interesting little indication of how seriously the situation is viewed by some politicians came in the announcement from Governor G. Mennen Williams' office that "Soapy" isn't going to attend the Rose Bowl game and ceremonies. He is staying home to work on state problems. There'll be no pictures over TV of Soapy having a good time in California, while a tragic holiday season hits thousands of Michigan homes. No wonder Senator Ferguson is fearful of losing the race to Soapy Williams next year.

Socialist Teachers Witchhunted out of California College

Not only Stalinists, suspected Stalinists, or people accused of being pro-Stalinist, are being witchhunted out of the nation's colleges on the wave of the purge system. In one California school, two faculty members who are socialists and members of the League for Industrial Democracy have been kicked out.

About a year ago an LID group was established in Orange County, Calif., and now two of its members have been discharged from their posts as teachers in the Orange Coast College.

One is Cornelius Steelink, an instructor in chemistry, who had been active in helping the LID establish a group in the school. Steelink was told by the president that he would not be granted tenure because he was a socialist and a pacifist.

He was then officially discharged by the Board of Trustees (with the official ground being given as his "total personality") in spite of the fact that the other professors considered him a competent teacher and that he was very popular with the students.

The third development in the case was that Steelink was then blacklisted in other California colleges.

The second case is that of Clint St. John, professor of physics. Professor St. John was called upon by the Board of Trustees to answer certain questions concerning his political affiliation and beliefs as required by a new state law.

With the counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union, he decided to test the law, and consequently refused to answer the questions on the ground that they violated teachers' tenure and the constitutional right of freedom of political opinion. He was summarily dismissed.

Funds are now being raised to appeal the case in an effort to get a decision on the constitutionality of the law.

These are two cases involving victims with rather right-wing socialistic opinions.

Imperialism and Its Quislings in Guiana

Britain continues its strong-arm policy of repression in British Guiana. Having ousted the legal native government by force and violence, it is now seeking every pretext to arrest the leaders of the deposed Peoples Progressive Party. It is, in other words, pursuing a policy which is doing as much as it can to strengthen popular sympathy especially for the Stalinist elements in the PPP whom it persecutes.

That can be the only effect of its last move, the arrest of Mrs. Janet Jagan, wife of the prime minister who was kicked out of office by British bayonets and warships, who is generally believed to be the leading pro-Stalinist in the PPP if not indeed the only hard-shell Stalinist in the whole movement.

Mrs. Jagan was arrested, along with 9 other party members, for violating the "emergency" regulation prohibiting the assembly of more than five persons without police permission. She was addressing an open, public meeting at a village 15 miles down the coast from the capital. Five other PPP parliamentary deputies have been arrested since the imperialist

troops took over the colony.

This policy in British Guiana is of a piece with current Tory tactics in Africa, where British imperialism has become almost as crude and brutal in its methods as in the "good old days" before it pretended to reform.

LIGHT ON MCA

From England also comes a piece of information to add to the mosaic of knowledge about the real state of affairs in Guiana. In his column in the *Bevanite Tribune*, Ian Mikardo notes that the leadership of the British Labor Party and Trades Union Congress have given the cold shoulder to the PPP's representatives in England (Jagan and Burnham) on the ground that labor should support the old Manpower Citizens Association in Guiana, not the PPP union.

Mikardo sheds some light on the character of this organization:

"What, then, is the truth about the Manpower Citizens Association? I have before me as I write a journal called *The Labor Advocate*, which describes itself as the 'official organ of the Manpower Citizens' Association.' It is the issue dated Sunday, October 18, 1953 and it is the first number published after the suspension of the constitution of British Guiana.

"The main article in this paper is a straightforward defense of two things—of capitalism in general and of colonial employers in particular.

"Nowhere in the paper is there any reference to the low wages and unspeakable living conditions of the workers of British Guiana. To read it you would believe that the members of the Manpower Citizens Association enjoy high wages and ideal conditions provided by the most generous and beneficent employers one could imagine.

"GOOSE-CLUB"

"Capitalism is described as 'a dynamic expanding system,' and as a 'bold and imaginative society.' The article pays a series of warm tributes to the employers. It even gives them credit for the abolition of slavery (which in fact they fiercely opposed), establishing industrial safety (which in fact they haven't cared twopence about), and for 'nearly abolishing' women and child labor (which in fact they have struggled to retain).

"But the most interesting feature of

the official organ of the Manpower Citizens' Association is not its editorial matter but its advertisements.

"In this trade-union journal there are 146 column-inches of text and 94 column-inches of employers' advertisements. The back page contains a full-page advertisement for—guess who? You've got it—Bookers (the biggest exploiting corporation in the colony—Ed.). Its pretty obvious where the money comes from to keep this union journal going.

"What would an A.E.U. member think if he received his union journal one morning and found 40 per cent of it taken up by advertisements of members of the Engineering and Allied Employers' National Federation?

"Yet it is this Manpower Citizens' Association, this obvious goose-club [company union], which British trade-unionists are being told by their leaders to support."

Labor Action FORUM New York

Note that during the holiday season, the forums will take place on WEDNESDAY EVENING, instead of the usual Thursday.

WED., DECEMBER 23

Al Findley on "The Printing Trades Unions and the Strike."

WED., DECEMBER 30

Subject to be announced.

With the new year we resume our usual Thursday evening schedule. On January 7, Ruth Reynolds will speak on "The Struggle for Independence in Puerto Rico."

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION—
\$2 a year does it!

The New York ISL invites you to its

NEW YEAR'S EVE PARTY

Dancing, Food and Drink

and a Gay, Gala Time for All

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 31 at 9 p.m.

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street

Contribution \$1.00



France: The Continuing Crisis

CP-DeGaulle Alliance? ... Teachers' Strike ... The Worker Priests

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, December 12 — Throughout the last month, the political scene has been dominated by the inconclusive debate on EDC and by the latest installment of the government's balancing act. This is not the place to go into details on a subject which every careful reader of the daily press knows. Let us underline, however, the widespread opposition to EDC, and to the "Atlantic" policy tied up with it, that the debate revealed.

The French Socialist Party itself, usually a staunch defender of pro-American policies, is split wide open on the issue. This opposition reflects a growing left wing in the SP which, in a confused way, represents genuine aspirations of the French people and may evolve into some sort of "French Bevanism."

A by-product of the EDC issue is the new turn in the Stalinist line, which amounts to organizing a "united front" with the Gaullists against EDC. This line was publicly announced at the recent CP Central Committee meeting, in which Duclos' report called for an "assembly of all Frenchmen, whoever they may be, and I repeat, whoever they may be" against EDC.

At the same meeting, Thorez also called for an "assembly of all good Frenchmen." As if this weren't enough, Thorez gave an interview to the Stalinoid weekly *L'Observateur* in which he explained that the difference between the Popular Front of 1936 and the "National Front" of 1953 lies precisely in their differing social content. So Claude Bourdet, editor of *L'Observateur*, writes with alarm: "If this party is going to take the enormous step of collaborating with the extreme right which causes, as it well knows, surprise and confusion in popular circles, it will have to make very soon equal sacrifices on its left."

Not very likely! The Central Committee shows no intentions of this kind, and nothing is ever left to chance in the French CP. Before the new turn was announced to the bewildered rank and file, a purge had been carried out against all likely opponents of the new policy. Its pretext was to eliminate from posts of responsibility those who had failed to the August strikes. A very thin pretext, give a good account of themselves during if one remembers the role of the CGT at the time.

Bluntly put, it meant offering the following deal to the government: we take it on ourselves to guarantee social peace if, in exchange, you keep out of EDC and adopt a "neutralist" course. The deal did not come off, but the policy continues, and the purge was directed against those militants who are likely to believe that the CP's first duty is to the French working class, not to Russian foreign policy.

The turn to the right that was started after the elimination of Marty and Tillon has thus been completed. Once more the legitimate interests of the French working class have been sacrificed to the needs of Russian foreign policy, causing "surprise and confusion" in the ranks. May this experience contribute to the rise of a clearer and more independent consciousness.

TEACHERS' STRIKE

On the social scene, the 24-hour teachers' strike of November 9 was a significant event. It was called by the *Fédération de l'Éducation Nationale*, an autonomous union, and followed by the teachers' unions of all tendencies: socialist, Stalinist, Catholic.

The issues of the strike were varied: to support a demand for a 10 per cent wage increase and to protest against the downgrading of teachers' jobs; to protest against a threatened cut in the budget of the public education system; to enforce the independence of the schools from government authority. This latter issue has arisen because the government has proposed a decree which would place the schools under the control of the local government authorities, thereby promoting political control over the school system.

Academic-freedom issues have unfortunately arisen already: only recently, for instance, a Stalinist was refused admission into a civil-service training school on the grounds of being a Stalinist.

Cuts in the budget would also be disastrous. Even now the classrooms are overcrowded, there are not enough schools and, above all, there are not enough teachers. Besides, since the law that established state support for religious schools went into effect, cutting the budget of public education has become a way of favoring religious schools.

The strike was conspicuously successful. Throughout France, it was followed by 90 per cent of the teachers. The universities did not participate but expressed their solidarity with the teachers' demands.

What made this success possible was not only the determination and discipline of the teachers, but also the fact that they enjoyed extensive popular support. The students' unions expressed their solidarity and protested against the budget cuts affecting public education. The parents supported the strike by keeping their children at home. Parents committees were formed to support the teachers and to demand better educational facilities.

In brief, it can be said that the strike had the support of the people as a whole, and thereby involved more than the demands that were actually raised. It became an occasion for expressing the persistent and universal popular discontent.

In the face of this movement, Laniel had his characteristic reaction: he banged his fist on the table, then went to hide under it.

First the representatives of the government, Laniel, Faure and Teitgen, refused to see the teachers' delegation. Then the government presented a tentative budget to the Assembly in which all the cuts had been maintained, as if there never had been a strike or a protest. Then the Assembly rejected the project and made the government propose another one, which will have to take into account the teachers' demands.

The teachers themselves are determined to fight until their demands are fully met.

FARM UNIONS

The agricultural strikes in October brought the crisis in the French farmers' unions to a head. As I pointed out at the time, the farmers' unions in France are divided among those which represent the small farmers and those which represent big landowners. The former are organized in several small unions federated in the socialist-led CGA. The latter are represented by the leadership of the FNSEA, ranging from conservative to reactionary political tendencies. Theoretically the FNSEA is part of the CGA; practically, there are irreconcil-

able differences, and the two organizations were actually rivals.

These latent contradictions came out into the open during the strikes. The landowners and capitalists of the FNSEA leadership were actually hostile to the strikes directed against their government, but could not afford to oppose them openly. Instead, they attempted to break them, which created a great deal of resentment among the small farmers who had serious grievances and did not want them minimized. This resentment took the form of opposition, protests, motions of censure, etc. Thus, the Puy-du-Dôme federation of the CGA (central France) recently officially condemned the indifference of the FNSEA to the needs of the small farmers, before and after the strike.

Faced with this situation, the FNSEA leadership decided to split, which they did by proclaiming that the CGA has ceased to exist and that they are henceforth the only legitimate representatives of the French farmers.

This only means that a state of affairs existing in practice for a while now has been officially recognized. There are going to be two unions in the field now, which is not necessarily bad, since it clarifies the real issues. Eventually the FNSEA is likely to lose its members to the CGA, until the agricultural capitalists are left all by themselves in their snug little employers' association.

In the meantime, however, the CGA faces a stiff struggle: the FNSEA has the initiative, is better organized and as yet stronger in numbers.

WORKER-PRIESTS RETREAT

Under pressure from the Spanish, Italian and German hierarchy, the Vatican has at last taken a clear position on the worker-priests' movement.

Three French cardinals went to Rome, had a difficult time convincing the pope not to break up the movement altogether, and came back with the following directives: from now on the worker-priests will be chosen exclusively by their bishops, instead of by their own decision; they can no longer work full-time in the factories, as they have in the past; they no longer can accept official functions in the trade unions; finally, they can no longer live by themselves but have to live in groups.

This means that the movement has been paralyzed for practical purposes.

What made it effective was precisely the full identification of the worker-priests with the working class and their complete commitment to its cause. In this stage, worker-priests rose to posi-

New Report by ACLU On Policy Referendum

LABOR ACTION recently quoted the story which appeared in *I. F. Stone's Weekly* to the effect that the branches of the American Civil Liberties Union had rejected the new statements on policy which the organization's National Committee had proposed—statements which, it was feared by many, were designed to water down the ACLU's stand on the witchhunt.

Now the ACLU's Southern California organ, *Open Forum*, announces that, by the reversal of a number of votes, the new policy declarations have been carried in the national referendum.

Writes *Open Forum*: "A premature announcement of the results of the referendum made by the National Office on October 16 declared that the three new policies had been rejected by the organization."

"Subsequently, however, the vote was reversed by the addition of five National Committee members' support for the measures and a reversal of the Chicago affiliates' vote."

"The total vote on the three policy statements is as follows: To approve—21,605; to disapprove—19,085; abstaining—1,755."

"Because of the highly controversial character of the policies and the close vote on them, the National Office has announced that the statements will be re-drafted in a clearer form before they are made public in a finally approved version."

The question of the final character of the ACLU's stand on some of these crucial issues, therefore, still seems to be hanging in the air.

tions of leadership in the unions, led strikes, were fired from their jobs, were arrested and beaten up by the police, took position against the Catholic CFTC for being too reformist, joined the CGT, won the confidence of large numbers of workers.

When asked what side they would be on if a conflict arose between the interests of the working-class and those of the Church, they answered that there would be no such conflict, that the Church would adapt itself to revolution and become itself revolutionary—witness themselves and their movement. All this is finished now.

Regardless of their feelings or intentions, the worker-priests will no longer be able to merge with the working class and to create a "revolutionary Catholicism." Although such a course is still possible for lay Catholics, the Church has made very clear that if neither wants nor can become revolutionary in any sense at all, and that it will continue to remain an obstacle to the working-class movement.

This only sharpens the dilemma of our Catholic comrades. They will find it increasingly difficult to solve within the narrowing framework of Catholic doctrine.

LONDON LETTER

Workers Restive, BLP Line Still Flabby

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Dec. 9—Not least important in last week's news was the 24-hour strike on Wednesday, December 2; by the Confederation of Engineering and Shipbuilding Unions. Much to the disappointment of the employers, of Arthur Deakin of the Transport and General Workers, and of Williamson of the General and Municipal Workers, between 85 and 90 per cent of the Confederation's 2 million and more members came out on strike.

This was the greatest strike since 1926, and as such is a major event in Britain's industrial relations.

Affiliated to the Confederation are not only the unions which are partly or wholly led by pro-Stalinists, like the ETU and the Constructional Engineering Union, but also right-wing trade unions like the Transport Workers and the Municipal Workers. Both of the latter two "general" unions have an engineering section which is affiliated to the Confederation.

For instance the TGWU has an engineering section with no less than a quarter million members. It has organized mainly in the semi-skilled trades; and with its small dues (as compared with the Amalgamated Engineering Union) it has been able to establish a very strong basis among certain types of engineers.

The fact that despite the union leadership's open or concealed sabotage of the

24-hour strike, such a massive percentage of workers from even the "general" unions came out shows how powerful is the solidarity of the working class in defense of its claim for a 15 per cent rise.

The Amalgamated Engineering Union—the largest union in the Confederation—has now come out in favor of a ban on both overtime work and piecework. The Confederation is to discuss this new move at a meeting in York next week.

However, this move is not likely to receive as much support as the token 24-hour strike. A ban on overtime, perhaps; but a ban on piecework would reduce earnings by as much as 5 pounds in some cases.

All in all, the engineers' moves are by no means assured and firm. There is hesitancy and a general probing forward, rather than a clear-cut forward march. This is due not only to the conflicting leaderships within the unions, but also to the different wage rates in the different trades covered by the term engineering.

The future of the wage claim is therefore somewhat obscure, and we may perhaps have to wait to see how the other wage claims that are being put forward (by the railway union, for example) fare, before we can get an over-all picture of the situation.

WEAK FRONT

As far as the colonies are concerned,

the situation is getting from bad to worse. Oliver Lyttelton, the colonial minister, appears to have stirred up almost every one of the colonies.

It must be regretfully admitted that the Labor Party's parliamentary front bench has put up a dismal opposition to Lyttelton's roughshod methods. Only last week we had the spectacle of James Griffiths—on behalf of the Parliamentary Labor Party—drawing a vote of censure on the government for its precipitous deposition of the kabaka of Buganda.

And this week, the Labor Party's case against the suspension of the British Guiana constitution was so weak, so patently hypocritical, that two Labor MPs abstained from voting with their party against the government.

Only the landslide victory of the pro-Egyptian National Unionists in the Sudan (described ruefully by the Conservative Daily Telegraph as another "Abadan") has been able to shake the complacency of the Colonial Office.

Within the Tory party, a group of right-wing "rebels"—who are bitterly opposed to any concessions to Egypt—has been greatly strengthened by the Sudan election results. It can only be hoped that they will disturb the Tory government to the great advantage of the Labor Party.

(Turn to last page)

YOU and SCIENCE

Eisenhower's Atom-Pool Plan and 'Operation Candor'

By CARL DARTON

On December 8 President Eisenhower delivered a speech before the United Nations on the supreme technological problem of our age, atomic energy.

For many months now, in and around government circles has raged the debate over "Operation Candor." The question has been whether the administrations should speak freely to the American people about the crisis in atomic weapons policy. With the announcement earlier in the year of the Soviet Union's possession of the H-bomb (or its precursor) it was apparent that the United States no longer had overwhelming superiority in the atomic weapons race, and a re-evaluation of basic policy was necessary.

Many problems relative to offensive and defensive atomic warfare have been pressing for decision while Eisenhower has been doing his best to avoid them. The basic problem is that increased scientific research by both the United States and Russia has increased the destructive power of atomic weapons beyond human comprehension. In a world in which war in various stages has become a way of life, suicide or mutual destruction appears almost inevitable.

It becomes increasingly difficult for capitalism to find a way of life which does not lead to the destruction of the very foundations of its civilization, together with a loss of its privileges and authority. It is almost impossible to hide the fact that only deep-reaching social changes, through which wars are eliminated, can save Western civilization.

UNCERTAIN HOPES

Though capitalist survival through the atomic age appears impossible, the present ruling class hopes to continue a bit longer in control of society. But what meager choices and uncertain decisions remain for them!

On the one hand, the present high production rate can be continued only by a war economy, or, if the interests of capital are disregarded, by increased benefits for the masses of people. On the other side, a restriction of production, a readjustment, can lead to serious economic decline. A continuation of the war economy with the demand for more and more powerful weapons may get out of hand and an atomic war start in which capitalists will have their property and themselves blown to bits.

Increased benefits for the people will mean lower profits, more wages for the workers, and above all more leisure and security (a 30-hour week and a guaranteed annual wage). With such increased leisure political consciousness on the part of the workers is sure to follow with resulting social changes which will remove the threat of war and permit full technological advances in peace, but eliminate the need for capitalists. Capitalist theoreticians appear to fear a readjustment, a depression least of all. But what social crises will follow mass unemployment in this land of plenty?

CONFESSION

What then is "Operation Candor"? Supposedly it would bring the people into the government's confidence and give them the courage and leadership to find a way to a better life through the atomic age. But what under the circumstances can it be other than an admission of the terrible

mess which the ruling group has brought upon society? Can the people be stirred to support the very class which brings potential calamity on their heads? The dilemma of capitalism is how not to tell "too much," prepare the people for the worse, but hold out some hope for the future.

It is still uncertain whether Eisenhower's UN speech is the start of "Operation Candor" or whether it has died a-borning. Only with great effort can the newspapers build it up to a constructive appeal. At this writing it is unknown what will be the diplomatic answer of the Russians.

Toward the end of making the people conscious of their power, Eisenhower's declaration that atomic weapons are now twenty-five times more powerful than those first used, or that the H-bomb is as powerful as millions of tons of TNT, is of little value. What can this mean to a people whose conception of calamity is a tornado killing "only" scores of people and leveling only a few acres? As to candor, Eisenhower's speech continually appealed to Russia for secret diplomacy, for "private conversations."

BARGAINING POINT?

The offer of discussion of means of making fissionable material available from the U. S. stockpile for peaceful purposes has been inflated into a great concession. Actually most advanced nations already have such materials and knowledge. Such scientific knowledge in a free world would normally flow unimpeded to all interested parties. Does Eisenhower mean that such scientific information will be a bargaining instrument with the less developed countries, just as "foreign aid" and arms have been?

Internationally, Eisenhower's speech offers little that is new, but rather the continuation of high diplomacy and power politics. Domestically it will do little to alter the pattern of secrecy and confusion in atomic arms policy.

The policy of secrecy in atomic energy has been the epitome of anti-democracy in America today. The facts relative to atomic energy and weapons have remained in the hands of a small military and bureaucratic minority in Washington, and this makes impossible a discussion of its consequences in a manner approaching even "normal" democratic standards.

SECRECY AND APATHY

Such secrecy has reinforced the effects of the "loyalty" and security program and has made the people jittery, suspicious, afraid, and ready bait for private and public repression. Political mechanisms normal to a nation at war have replaced democratic means. It is the atmosphere in which a McCarthy can thrive.

The American public has reacted to atomic energy by mainly ignoring the question of its consequences. Secrecy and the technical nature of atomic energy has resulted perhaps in a feeling of impotency and incompetency to understand or govern in such matters. A lack of leadership, which capitalism is incapable of providing, has produced general public apathy.

After Eisenhower's speech, and despite newspaper headlines, the apathy still remains. It is the people's way of turning against an impotent leadership. It is the socialist's duty to stir hope for a new leadership, for the people to take action toward a way out of the present atomic impasse.

Youth and Student Corner

SYL-YPSL MERGER PROJECTED FOR FEBRUARY

By BOGDAN DENITCH
National Executive Committee, YPSL

Recent developments in the thinking of the YPSL have made it probable that there will be organic unity between the YPSL and the Socialist Youth League before next spring.

The YPSL National Executive Committee, meeting over the Thanksgiving weekend in New York City, spent a major portion of its time discussing the problem of early youth unity. Primarily as a result of the change in immediate organizational perspective on the part of the YPSL NEC two major decisions were reached: an immediate national referendum to ratify the NEC decision to call a unity convention for the weekend of next February 20-22; and to submit a list of proposals to the Socialist Youth League as the basis for such unity.

The proposals in brief are as follows:

- (1) That a unity convention be called by both organizations for February, both organizations to be represented on the same basis.
- (2) That the resident committees of the two organizations work out (a) a joint slate for the national committee based essentially on parity, to be submitted to the convention; (b) a joint draft program; (c) a joint constitution.
- (3) That the new youth organization not be affiliated to any adult organization and that the question of such affiliation be left open until the summer of 1955.
- (4) That the new youth organization endorse LABOR ACTION, and in return have a page in the paper under the editorship of the youth organization, with a YPSL editor.

These proposals have in general been accepted by the Socialist Youth League and the resident committees of the two organizations are now working out the details of the agreement.

The importance of organic unity of all Third Camp socialists in the youth field is difficult to over-emphasize. Both organizations have been sharply affected by apathy and witchhunting on the campus and the pooling of their available forces will make possible a healthy regrouping of the radical students on the campuses. While at first sight the forces available to the new organization seem small, in the context of the period we are operating in and compared to the other political youth organizations, the new organization will be significant. It seems probable that the differences in tradition of the two youth organizations will have little or no effect on the broad and extensive areas of political agreement that do exist.

It is to be hoped that the various independent Third Camp socialists that have been active in other organizations and on campuses will join with the new organizations.

Close cooperation between the two revolutionary socialist youth organizations and the revolutionary pacifists, the cooperation that was cemented at the recently held Third Camp Conference as well as at the two New England Summer Schools, will of course continue. This cooperation becomes more specific now that the Peacemakers have endorsed *Anvil*, the anti-war student magazine whose distribution forms a major part of the efforts of the socialists on the campus.

WHAT'S BEEN HAPPENING TO THE SP'S YOUTH?

Since the national YPSL organization split from the Socialist Party, there has been little if anything developing in the SP in the way of organized youth work. This, of course, is true both because of the organizational disintegration of the party itself and, even more, because of the complete political deadlock on the question of war as far as the SP's youth is concerned.

With the departure of the YPSL the most intransigent (as well as vocal) organized Third Camp grouping left the party. What was left in the way of youth consisted of the California section, about a half-dozen members around New York, and perhaps another six or seven throughout the states.

One problem in the reorganization of the SP's youth section did not arise—that of leadership; for since all but one member of the youth NEC left with the YPSL, the party could start clean. However, from the outset two "legal" problems showed up—and as those acquainted with the SP must know by now, the "legal" problems are very important to them.

The first problem, perhaps of minor importance was one of the name. The SP's youth section, according to the party's constitution, is known as the "Young Socialists"; and the youth section's constitution, as revised by the convention which elected the most recent NEC, calls the organization "Young Socialists—YPSL" (both names being used interchangeably). Upon splitting, the Youth NEC dropped the first part of the name and now uses the traditional name, the YPSL.

But the California organization, which stayed with the SP (and which incidentally originally proposed the change of name to Young Socialists) is not only now using the name YPSL (in violation of the party's constitution) but is also protesting the fact that the majority section which split from the Party uses this name. (In fact, in a communication to the Third Camp Conference, the California group asserted that it would refuse to participate in any activities where both organizations were present if this continues.)

The second problem facing the SP's youth is much more serious. The question is one of the politics of the party's youth organization. Here is the difficulty:


The SP claims, of course, that there was "no split" but that only a handful of unrepresentative people left the party. Now the 1953 Convention of the Young Socialists-YPSL passed a clear, uncompromising Third Camp program of opposition to both imperialist camps. This convention was unchallenged as to its legality, democracy, propriety and representativeness; and presumably therefore (since there was only one delegate who opposed the Third Camp program) the program of the SP's youth section still remains unchanged. Of course actually this is not so. It is not so for the simple reason that with the exception of the members in California all Third Camp socialists in the YPSL left the Socialist Party and the handful that remained, to the extent that they have any politics, have the SP's pro-American-camp line.

The results of the political difficulty mentioned above are many. To cite one: When the Los Angeles youth, forming the only section that remained with the SP, offered to take over the National Office and reorganization of the youth section (a perfectly proper proposal since the LA group accepted in the main the program of the 1953 Convention) the SP NEC politely declined, keeping the "organization" in New York under the watchful eyes of the SP office personnel, which is unitedly opposed to the youth's program.

This is only the beginning. While the California group endorsed the Third Camp Conference, endorsing *Anvil*, etc., the SP directs all its younger members in the East into the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID), thus in effect liquidating what could be a troublesome youth section which seems to develop left wing after left wing with annoying regularity. All this of course does not help to make the position of the Californians, who are anti-war, any easier, since presumably the prospect of liquidation into the SLID, which wholeheartedly endorses the foreign policy line of the American camp, is abhorrent to them.

The California young Socialists are thus faced with a neat dilemma (which they would have avoided, of course if they had stayed with the YPSL) almost identical with the one that the old YPSL leadership was faced with: the problem of Third Camp socialists attempting to function through a pro-war (or, as they seem to prefer seeing it called, "objectively pro-war") party. This meets with our fullest sympathy, although the solution would seem obvious—join with the people who are politically close to you.

Of course in one sense the disintegration of the party as a national organization softens the difficulty, since most SP groups function purely locally and with little if any reference to the national organization. We can only express the hope that when the SP does disintegrate, formally as well as actually, the few young SP Socialists who hold the Third Camp position will not vanish out of the political arena but will join with us in building a broader, more effective socialist youth anti-war movement.



LABOR ACTION

December 21, 1953 Vol. 17, No. 51

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, 1879.—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

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of

LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-52.....\$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

About the Harvard-McCarthy Fracas: The 5th Amendment and the Stoolpigeons

By PHILIP COHEN

It's rather amazing that so much can be written about the Fifth Amendment problem—in so many articles, with so many words—without ever mentioning the issue which is most often at the heart of the case. It goes to prove, we suppose, that "stoolpigeon" is still a dirty word, or even its more euphemistic equivalent "informer."

For the Fifth Amendment cases, more usually than not, revolve around the issue: the right to refuse to be a stoolpigeon.

One of the clearest cases is the one which is behind the recent Harvard-McCarthy furor, the case of Professor Furry.

It was in connection with this case that McCarthy enunciated his dictum: "a witness' refusal to answer whether or not he is a Communist on the ground that his answer would tend to incriminate him, is the most positive proof obtainable that the witness is a Communist."

Of course, there is more than one reason why this is a typically McCarthyite police-state principle. The Furry case illuminates one of these. For here was a man who, having broken with Stalinism some years ago, was willing to "cooperate" in every way except one: *spill names* to the cops.

It was there that he drew the line, at becoming a stoolpigeon, at involving former associates whom he himself had no reason to believe were guilty of anything but political associations and opinions but who, he knew, would be hounded if ever he named them.

Thus, the *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* (Nov. 28) carries a thorough article on the Harvard-McCarthy fracas over Professor Furry, written by an eminent jurist, Livingston Hall, vice-dean and professor of law at the Harvard Law School and past incumbent of many distinguished posts. It is written in sympathy with the view taken by the university in the case. It is not possible that Professor Hall has failed to realize the motives for Professor Furry's course and the real issue which Furry's testimony raised.

Yet it is the one thing he does not mention. The same has been true of other articles on the Furry case and other articles on the Fifth Amendment question.

What McCarthy Wants

Professor Furry was not interested in concealing the fact of his former membership in the CP. He told the *Harvard* authorities (not the McCarthy committee) that he had been a member from 1938 to 1947, and apparently there may have been some association with Stalinism on his part even up to March 1951. These facts were made public by Harvard. Furry, therefore, was not silent before the committee in order to conceal his past, which was already public knowledge.

Yet, when asked the same questions by the McCarthy group, he stood on the Fifth Amendment. A reading of his testimony brings the conviction that he was anxious to answer as many questions as he could, short of stoolpigeonry. But every time McCarthy asked *any* question in a certain area dealing with the period before March 1951, he had to reply that he "claimed the privilege" (of the Fifth Amendment).

For the situation is that if he had answered *any* such question—no matter how innocuous—about that period, he would not have been able legally to refuse to answer the one question which alone interested McCarthy and his inquisitors: *NAME the other CPers you knew!*

In the course of the questioning, McCarthy had told Furry: "One way we have of determining whether a Communist has broken with the party completely is whether they gave the proper law enforcement agencies any information he may have." (The grammar is McCarthy's, not a misprint.)

McCarthy's man Cohn led the questioning to the key phase: "... I wonder if you don't feel you could tell us the Communist Party members who were working on radar secrets with you at MIT?"

This was not a question asking Furry if he knew of any "spies" among his associates. Cohn was asking him to name any CPers he knew in his MIT work. Furry had already stated categorically that he knew of no espionage.

McCarthy himself came to the point toward the end of the hearing, making explicit what all the questioning was about: "... if Furry is called before a committee and asked to give us the names of Communists with whom he himself discussed this secret information and he refused to give us the names of those Communists or any others known to him who worked in the [MIT] laboratory at that time, would you say Furry is a traitor to the United States or not?"

The Legal Gimmick

Note that Furry had already testified that he never discussed the laboratory work with anyone outside it. McCarthy was asking him for (1) the names of Communists working at the same place with whom he discussed his work, even though they were colleagues with whom he separately had to discuss it; (2) the names of Communists in the laboratory even if he had never had anything to do with them. Otherwise he is a "traitor."

As long as Furry pleads the Fifth Amendment he could refuse this information without being charged with contempt and punished, as long as he likewise refrained from answering any other such questions dealing with the period. Much of the hearing was a long and involved attempt by the McCarthy inquisitors to trap him, or provoke him, into violating this rule.

And they succeeded, or thought they succeeded, at one point. For Furry did indeed make the statement that he had "never" engaged in espionage—a statement

which presumably applied to before March 1951 also. And it was because Furry made this statement that McCarthy later announced that he would be brought up on charges.

Follow that legal gimmick: In order to retain the right to refuse to be a stoolpigeon, Furry (or any other witness in his position) had to refuse to answer *any* question in the same area dealing with the same period:

Were you spying for Russia?—I refuse to answer on the ground that it may incriminate me.—*Did you know any Communists?*—I refuse to answer... it may incriminate me.—*Did you ever try to indoctrinate your students in the Communist philosophy?*—I refuse to answer.

McCarthy then makes a hullabaloo about the fact that a refusal to deny spying (for instance) on the ground that it may incriminate is very like an admission of spying. He appeals to common-sense, etc. But when Furry is driven to give up the Fifth Amendment for a split-second and DOES answer with a denial of espionage, this then becomes the basis for demanding his punishment for refusing to answer the stoolpigeon-type questions.

That's the long-and-short of many a McCarthy show-trial.

Inference of Guilt?

Of course, at no point in his testimony could Furry have said (even if he had wanted to) that he was standing on the Fifth Amendment, with regard to a certain area of questioning, in order to refuse stoolpigeon information. For the Fifth Amendment, it is true, does not give this privilege to a witness for such a purpose; it is given to a witness for the purpose of avoiding self-incrimination.

The Fifth Amendment was designed, by the framers of the Bill of Rights, to scotch an evil known in those times, not to avoid the evil which has arisen in our own times. It is true of other sections of the Constitution, also, that although they were originally written with one problem in mind, the courts have interpreted them to apply to problems not even known in those days. This is a situation more or less inherent in the continued use of a constitutional instrumentality that is now over 160 years old.

All that may make a nice problem for experts in constitutional jurisprudence (with which this article is not concerned at the moment), but there is something else which is not in doubt: namely, that standing on the Fifth Amendment as a means of avoiding stoolpigeonry does not necessarily imply any guilt or incrimination "morally," as has so often been stated.

And surely it is well that this be understood. The aforementioned Livingston Hall, writing in the *Alumni Bulletin*, may be a great law authority, but his summary of the case can only seem weak and even a little stupid precisely at the crucial point when he writes:

"The Harvard Corporation has recognized that there is an 'inference of guilt which the use of the Fifth Amendment creates as a matter of common-sense,' but this is surely not 'the most positive proof obtainable' of the fact not answered. Moreover, a witness' refusal to answer may come simply because he is stubborn on these matters. Being stubborn may not be the best qualification in the world for a teacher, but it does not constitute proof of communism."

We say that this must SEEM weak or even stupid be-

Footnote on Hookism

Incidentally, Harvard President Pusey finds himself in a sad contradiction in the case of Professor Furry.

Pusey stated, for the university, the principle that "a member of the Communist Party is not fit to be on the faculty because he has not the necessary independence of thought and judgment." Thus, formally, Harvard stands on the same ground as Sidney Hook with regard to the right of Stalinists to teach: CP membership automatically disqualifies.

Professor Furry admitted, to the Harvard authorities, that he was a CP member from 1938 to 1947.

Yet, maintains Harvard, at NO time past or present has it had any fault to find with his competence, ability or activity as a teacher.

So, while asserting the rule that a CP member is unfit to teach because he cannot be an independent thinker, the Harvard statement said: "He [Furry] has at no time permitted his connection with the party to affect his teaching, nor has he attempted otherwise to influence the political thinking of his students."

And: "Dr. Furry's teaching is of high quality and has reflected no Communist slant..."

And this verdict was reached after exhaustive investigation (says the article by Livingston Hall), after "weeks of effort, hearing the persons involved, discussing the problem with other faculty members... consulting faculty members and students who might have firsthand information on Dr. Furry's attitudes and teaching methods..."

Thus Harvard refutes its formal principle. In practice, in the case of the professor under fire, it has applied the rule of individual competence and individual judgment, not the Sidney Hook rule to which it gives lip service. At the same time it has shown that it is not true that a CP member is necessarily either an objectionable "indoctrinator" or a parrot of the party line. Guilt is personal. There is many another teacher who "blundered" into the CP for a while while remaining unaffected as a teacher.

cause it is well-nigh incredible that Hall is not entirely aware of what is involved—and that it is not mere "stubbornness" or general cussedness. But he cannot assume that his readers are equally aware, since as a matter of fact it is not at all well known that there is a close connection between the use of the Fifth Amendment and the refusal to be a stoolpigeon.

Most people think that a witness can refuse to answer specifically stoolpigeon questions (if they want to) while willing to talk on any other subject. But if a witness has shown himself willing to answer any other kind of question, he cannot possibly invoke the Fifth Amendment or any other protection when asked questions about other people only.

McCarthy has been very careful not to publicize the relationship, since his whole method depends on black-jacking the witness into "cooperation" and into naming names, by the implied threat of "incrimination." Once a witness has pleaded the Fifth Amendment in order to avoid stoolpigeonry, McCarthy's men proceed to ask questions with the wildest implications, hoping to get Fifth Amendment answers to these also.

The witness is deliberately put in a dilemma: if he pleads the Amendment on questions about espionage (for example), he has "incriminated" himself in the eyes of the ignorant public. If he does not, then he has abandoned the Fifth Amendment ground and lays himself open to prosecution.

Chain Reaction of Stoolpigeonry

But if McCarthy is interested in hushing the stoolpigeon angle, there is no reason for Professor Livingston Hall, or even the Harvard authorities (not to speak of many self-professed liberals and civil-libertarians) to hush it up and avoid speaking of it.

But what about the "morality" of a man who says that he has now broken with Stalinism but who refuses to name the names of former associates who were Stalinists along with him? In the Furry hearing, for example, this is how McCarthy put it: "You are informed that you will be cited for contempt. If you want to cover up for Communists you may do that. If you want to cover up espionage agents getting information, you may do that. You have to take the consequences. We intend to see that any witness who does anything to destroy this nation will take the consequences."

There are some "liberals" who might put the same thought differently: If you are really no longer in sympathy with the CP and do not want to protect it, why don't you expose your former comrades?

The answer of a man like Professor Furry would be very simple. Exposure might well apply, for him, to any former associate whom he knew to be, or have been, engaged in espionage. But that is not what he has been asked to tell. He is being asked to ruin the lives of other men, not in any way involved with any breach of law or trust, solely because of their Stalinist political associations or opinions.

He himself, Professor Furry, was a victim of such stoolpigeonry.

His own name had been made public in October by the testimony of Professor Norman Levinson, who told the McCarthy committee that he had known Furry as a CPer during the war. That, and only that: there was no charge that Furry had been connected with spies, spying or any other suspect persons or activities; there was no knowledge about whether Furry was still a CPer: No, Levinson was simply "cooperating"; he was proving his own innocence. And if Professor Furry's career had to be ruined in the course of this effort, why, that was not only patriotic but also a good way to take care of No. 1...

Professor Furry was being pressed to do unto others what had been done unto himself.

Heretic, Yes—Stoolpigeon, No

He was being pressed into the dilemma of either turning stoolpigeon or ruining his career. This is used as a weapon against ex-Stalinists, not primarily as a weapon to expose either spies or present Stalinists in so-called "sensitive" positions.

The kind of "liberals" who have gone along with the Sidney Hook school of thought on the witchhunt have never faced up to this stoolpigeon issue. We have noted in these columns before that Professor Sidney Hook, the intellectual leader of the self-styled "liberals" who capitulate before McCarthyism, has tacitly accepted the McCarthy criterion for "identifying Communists." The overwhelming majority of the teachers in New York City (for example) who have been ousted as Stalinists are cases of refusal to testify, not cases where CP membership has been proved.

Hook and his ilk have implicitly accepted this procedure as adequate, even though formally Hook pretends that only CP members have forfeited the right to teach (whereas teachers with pro-Stalinist opinions are merely "heretics" and do have the right to teach).

Not in Hook's mind, perhaps—which is very, very busy thinking up rationalizations for capitulating before the witchhunt—but in actual fact, this type of liberal has got to face up to the question whether stoolpigeonry is or is not one of their new qualifications for the right to teach. Or whether their ideal man of academic "integrity" is also the type who is willing to save his own professorial hide by putting the finger on others...

We would like to hear Sidney Hook speak up some time on whether or not he regards, as one aspect of the "cultural vigilantism" which he denounces in words, the growing tendency to turn teachers, scholars, scientists and other mentors of the character and integrity of our youth, into stoolpigeons, informers and assorted kinds of quivering masses of jelly before a police-state inquisitor.

The 'New Look' in Old-Line Labor

BECK: The Line Forms to the Right

By BEN HALL

Old-line unionism needs a spokesman and leader. We refer to those most conservative segments of the labor movement, whose conservatism is crass, unmistakable and dyed-in-the-wool. The aspirant for this most dubious honor seems to be Dave Beck, territory-grabbing president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters (AFL).

The normal course of political life passes by this still powerful stratum; for its conservatism is not a political consciousness but a way of life.

The historic conservatism of American labor, defined as "business unionism," implied a preoccupation with day-to-day existence on elementary job conditions, an efficiency in administration to the exclusion of the broader interests of the working-class movement. Old-line unionism is not the past but a relic of the past in a totally degenerate form.

Its practitioners are interested not so much in "business unionism," as hitherto conceived, but in making a business out of unionism. Officials of these unions act like real bosses; they maneuver for control over jobs, apportion the most lucrative among their henchmen, and link their union activities with other forms of profitable business enterprise—legal and not so legal, legitimate and not so legitimate. In its worst form it crosses over into grafting and racketeering. For them, "politics" is simply the art of establishing connections and agreements with ward-healers to protect, extend and share areas of power and profit.

Squirming

Today they are on the defensive, under fire from all directions.

In the American Federation of Labor, George Meany, new president, takes the drastic step of expelling a whole union because its leadership was linked with racketeering. Up to the very second of his expulsion by an AFL convention, Joe Ryan was an officer of the New York State Federation of Labor and had been re-elected just a few short months before. Ryan's AFL friends did not desert him; they tried to induce Meany to compromise and take the ILA back; but he turned them down flatly.

They see the AFL placing unprecedented restrictions on the right of free enterprise in unions, insisting now on simple honesty. Who knows what other fantastic virtues will be demanded next? It is enough to make them uneasy.

In the CIO, of course, their brand of unionism is virtually unrepresented.

Meanwhile, the spotlight of investigation turns on the less legitimate types of enterprise. Longshore racketeering was singled out from the beginning, but more followed.

Bond of Sympathy

Ironically, Joe Papa, leader of Teamsters Local 202 in New York, was indicted for corruption and removed from his union post. He had been a respected member of a committee appointed by the mayor of New York to investigate the waterfront, and with the others he reported that nothing was amiss. (Except, naturally, that insidious Communist propaganda was creating never-defined evils.)

Later, the murder of a local president of the AFL Building Service Union in New York prompted a new investigation which opened the door on a labyrinth of shady dealings, extortion and crime around New York race tracks, involving politicians, judges and union officials. As a by-product of this investigation the acting lieutenant governor and leader of the Republican Party in the state Senate was compelled to resign with the revelation of his not-too-well-explained prison visits to Joseph Fay, convicted labor racketeer.

Simultaneously, a House committee is investigating the handling of union pension funds.

Before it was shooed off the trail by the pressure of powerful politicians, it uncovered some very interesting tidbits in Michigan, where James Hoffa of the Teamsters Union, through intricate manipulations had succeeded in channeling pension fund commissions into the hands of friends and had worked himself into control of a little trucking business. It was indeed regrettable, he told the investigating committee, that all his union's financial records had been destroyed for the crucial years in question.

In this type of old-line union, an actual count would probably reveal that only a tiny minority of high union officials are dishonest. The majority may be ignorant, petty, greedy, bureaucratic, narrowly selfish, but not actually crooked. But a bond of sympathy unites them all in a common outlook on life.

Ryan protected racketeers in the ILA. The New York State AFL officials who tried to protect Ryan were not racketeers; nevertheless Meany's measures against him ran against the grain; it violated a deep-seated code. They were offended to see "their" racketeers penalized by outsiders; it must have appeared to them as a downright interference with local autonomy, if not a vile assault on democracy.

Their brand of unionism may be slowly dying out but it possesses a vestigial power; they have votes; they are represented in union councils; they help to elect the highest officials. Still, no one caters to their primitive ideology.

Businessman Beck

Nobody? Not quite. By a not too remarkable coincidence, a man pushes for recognition on the national labor scene—Dave Beck, of the Teamsters Union, who is newly introduced to the public by A. H. Raskin in the *New York Times Magazine* and Joe Miller in *The Reporter*.

Beck is reliably reported to be personally honest and anxious to rid his union of racketeering wherever it is manifest. Presumably, he is able therefore to come before the public with clean hands.

At last, ultra-conservative unionism gains a spokesman who can argue for it and practice its methods; who can raise it out of the shadowy land to which it has been consigned by a 20-year advance of the labor movement; who can give it a new respectability and open influence in the councils of labor. Beck is ideally suited for the job.

"I run this union just like a business," he boasts of his rule in the Teamsters Union; for he is a businessman engaged in a multitude of enterprises of which labor unionism is one. His net worth is estimated to be over a million dollars, most of it accumulated in real-estate speculation—legitimate speculation, the report emphasizes carefully.

He is easily able, therefore, to economize for the union by keeping his labor salary down to \$50,000 a year; and the flashy blind beggar in which he drives to work like the fabled blind beggar is perhaps paid for out of funds received from other sources.

HOLIDAY BOOK SALE

The books on this list are either rare, or offered at reduced price for holiday clearance. Many items are in limited supply, and are offered on a first-come first-served basis. All orders must be accompanied by payment in full. Refunds will be made promptly if the item ordered is no longer in stock.

Anti-Duhring, by Engels (German)	\$2.50
The Bending Cross, by Ginger (biography of Debs)	1.00
The Case of Comrade Tulayev, by Victor Serge	1.00
The Case of Leon Trotsky (Dowey Commission)	5.00
Fontamara, by Silone (hard covers)	2.50
The Iron Heel by London	1.00
One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward, by Lenin (paper)	1.00
Permanent Revolution, by Trotsky (1st ed., paper)	5.00
Maenkov, by Frazier (paper covers)15
The Real Situation in Russia, by Trotsky (rare)	5.00
The Red Fraud, by Fred Beal (paper)50
Russia Twenty Years After, by Serge (rare)	3.00
Spain, by Trotsky (U. S. edition)	4.00
The UAW and Walter Reuther, by Howe and Widick (out of print)	3.50
White Collar, by Mills	5.50
Workers Before and After Lenin, by Gordon	1.50

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

His very existence is a kind of biological curiosity, for he walks about as a living, moving, flesh-and-blood embodiment of a radical caricature of a labor leader. This labor leader joined the Elks in the '20s when he started his rise in the labor movement, for he was eager to rub elbows with judges, bankers and businessmen; and as he rose he became a member of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

His relations with other unions are only faintly adulterated by the philosophy of labor solidarity and class-consciousness. The Teamsters Union now claims 1,300,000 members, largest in the AFL, and Beck's ambition is to raise this figure to 3,000,000. And he has little compunction about methods.

His union is in jurisdictional conflict with virtually every important AFL and CIO union. While the AFL and CIO negotiate organic unity and agree upon a no-raiding pact, Beck chooses to raid the Brewery Workers (CIO) and makes clear that he has no intention of observing the pact.

The Fair Strikebreaker

In the Port of New York, Beck heads an AFL drive to oust the racketeering ILA from the waterfront. Longshoremen who remain loyal to the ILA fear that the AFL drive is simply a cover to oust them from their jobs and end the independent existence of any longshore union. Their racketeering union officials play skillfully upon these fears. Beck chooses just this moment to set up a new public-loaders local of the Teamsters to take over work that has been traditionally under control of longshoremen.

His methods were perfected in the thirties when he headed the AFL drive to combat the CIO. At that time, he presented himself to employers as a reasonable man, unlike the radical CIO; and warned that if they didn't sign the backdoor sweetheart-agreements he offered, they would fall victim to demanding CIO unions. His "fairness" is so respected that West Coast employers often ask him to arbitrate their own inner-contractual disputes that have nothing to do with labor relations.

In 1948, he helped to break a strike of the International Association of Machinists at the Boeing Aircraft plant in Seattle, first by running trucks through picket lines and then by signing strikebreakers into his Teamsters Union. For this, he was condemned by the Washington State AFL convention that year.

Next year, he was denounced by the East Bay Central Labor Council (AFL) for breaking a strike of AFL retail clerks in Los Angeles with the same methods.

But his conscience is clear. What the ordinary labor citizen would define as vile treason to labor, he explains as "instances of the clearer heads of labor making concrete contributions to the cause of free enterprise."

Moreover, he points out with incontrovertible logic, "For every enemy I make in the labor movement, I make a hundred new friends in the Chamber of Commerce."

One executive for a trucking concern, three years ago, told writer Joe Miller: "If we have to deal with unions at all, I'll take Beck any time. Last year he cost me \$65,000 in wage increases. Any other labor leader would have cost me \$100,000."

"Dave fancies himself as the director of a huge labor-supply corporation," one reporter wrote. "He is selling a product—human labor—just as Westinghouse sells refrigerators. He tries to get the best price he can for his product but that's as far as his union ideology goes." And he is not averse to undercutting the market in labor power if he can grab off new contracts from other unions.

Conservative Whip

Under the leadership of Beck, the Teamsters Union, with its \$29,000,000 treasury and its 1,300 organizers, is ideally fitted to act as a conservative whip against the rest of the labor movement. It is strategically placed to put pressure on smaller industries and shops which depend upon trucking as their lifeline.

Beckism can count on the support of every element of backwardness in the labor movement and is bolstered by the conservative moods in the nation as a whole. But his future lies only with the strength and persistence of these moods, to which he admirably attunes his opposition to "government in business," to "socialized medicine" and to "mixed economy."

But the forces in the labor movement against which he pits himself are far more powerful than he can ever hope to become.

The CIO recognizes him as a confirmed enemy, denounced him at its last convention, and warned that unless his union-grabbing talents are curbed, the AFL-CIO no-raiding agreement will be rendered null and void. Within the AFL he faces strong opposition; even his natural allies among strong conservative crafts are alienated by his raiding. Beck's recent election to the top Executive Council of the AFL is evidence of his great strength but this victory was achieved over the opposition of leading figures on the council, including Meany, Charles J. MacGowan, president of the Boilermakers; George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks; David Dubinsky; and probably others.

If unity between the AFL and CIO is achieved, he would be swamped by the combination of a CIO which is unanimously against him with his AFL opponents. Meanwhile, valuable time and energy must be devoted to warding off his ventures against other unions: The CIO has pledged full-scale support of any of its affiliates which he threatens.

Leaders: Dave Beck & McDonald

McDONALD: The Bride of U.S. Steel

By PETE JARMS

It looks as if Dave McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers (CIO), is making his own bid for recognition as the right-wing leader of the labor movement in the United States.

Whether or not this is a campaign to out-Beck Dave Beck of the Teamsters, or whether it merely developed under McDonald's own steam, it is also a fact that he has a powerful ally—his good friend and comrade Ben Fairless, president of the United States Steel Corporation.

Dave and Ben, as they are affectionately known to each other, are putting on a regular diamond-studded gold-embroidered love-feast, in accordance with the design.

Here is part of the story. Let it add up as it goes along.

The Grand Tour

First of all, Dave and Ben are on a joint tour. They came to Chicago last week, hand-in-hand visited mills of U. S. Steel in Gary, South Chicago, Waukegan and Joliet. (Dave found time to break away to attend a banquet also.)

The Chicago daily papers, which usually treat labor news quite inadequately, greeted them with a certain effusion.

It was the third leg on their joint grand tour. Previously they had visited Cleveland and Pittsburgh installations in the same manner.

Here's how the tour goes: Dave and Ben come into town and register at a suitable hotel. A bus, with representatives of the company and the union, picks them up and brings them to a U. S. Steel plant. They make a fast trip through the plant (without the press, at this point), say hello to some workers to show how devilishly democratic they are. Then they have lunch with the union and management in attendance, breaking bread together.

The joint tour by these two mighty presidents of labor and capital began while the CIO convention was still going on. Dave McDonald, head of the second most important union at the convention, absented himself from the sessions in order to begin the jaunt. The newspapers found this to be positive evidence of a forthcoming fight between McDonald and Walter Reuther. That didn't develop, though the reporters played up the theme to the end of the convention.

In Pittsburgh, the steel magnates joined with McDonald's steel union staffers to celebrate "Dave's Day" on November 27. The event was so unique that it can be done justice only by quoting directly from a similarly unique article: the account of these festivities as they were written up on the front page of the *Wall Street Journal*, which has not often carried such effusive accounts about a labor leader.

Dave Earned It

But before we let the *Wall Street Journal* give the details at some length, let's fill in some background.

These are tough times for labor today, and not least of all for the steel workers. The inflationary rise in the cost of living has not turned down from its top yet, but the steel workers' take-home pay has been reduced. This has taken place through short work-weeks, elimination of overtime, and downgrading through the various steps of layoff procedure during plants' production cutbacks.

The Steelworkers Union has been faced with a series of wildcat actions throughout the country. Workers who had no confidence in the local leaderships would decide to bargain the "old way," as local militants tried to strengthen weak contracts by organizing job actions to move the company.

Dave McDonald's way of handling the unrest in the mills is to crack down on the local leaders. The company makes the initial move by discharging union leaders, and then the International office OKs the measure. Presidents elected by the rank and file have been victims of this outrageous conduct. Through these means, the number of wildcats has been cut down, but this may well be only a temporary lull.

It is only natural, therefore, that President Ben Fairless of U. S. Steel should love and respect his friend Dave. He recognizes in Dave the kind of labor leader who *deserves* to sit across the table from him. Aren't they both honorable people who live up to their contracts?

At any rate, Dave is. As for Ben, well—he can't be expected to know everything that goes on behind his back in such a giant institution as the one he heads.

The Sentimental Tycoons

It is also natural that this love and respect should be reflected in the *Wall Street Journal* and among the sen-

timental industrial tycoons of Pittsburgh, who can't do too much for a good guy.

Hence the front-page story that was emblazoned over the *Journal* on "Dave's Day."

The headline read: "Pittsburgh, Bannered, Lighted and Bedecked, Staging 'Dave's Day'—Dinners, Televised Speeches, Floor Shows to Honor Steelworkers' McDonald."

The lead paragraphs began: "More than 3000 men and women from labor and industry, religion and education, politics and the professions will turn out here tomorrow night to honor David J. McDonald as Pittsburgh's 'Man of Steel.' It will be quite an affair."

Here are some of the details of the big wassail: "Streets, railroad stations, hotel lobbies and the airport will be decorated for the occasion, an elaborate testimonial for the 51-year-old leader of the CIO United Steelworkers."

"If plans of the committee in charge are fulfilled, all downtown Pittsburgh buildings will be lighted from top to bottom and honored guests will be taken to the top of a hill overlooking the city to see the sight. [It happened, and they were—P. J.]

"The mayor-elect of New York City and the chairman of the board of U. S. Steel Corp. will speak at the main testimonial banquet in the William Penn Hotel." There was also a "satellite dinner" for second-class VIPs in the Roosevelt Hotel several blocks away which got the speeches piped in to it.

The union's district director Hart called the blowout the "most important labor-management undertaking ever planned." This puts it a rung above the wartime labor-management boards and committees, which were nowhere near as important to Dave and Ben.

"Steel workers from as far away as California will rub shoulders with hundreds of management people, including some of the shiniest brass in the steel industry. Labor attachés representing the United Kingdom, Canada, France and West Germany will be on hand.

"Visitors arriving by plane will see McDonald banners and bunting strung up in the modernistic building of the new Greater Pittsburgh airport. For those coming by train, there will be pictures of Mr. McDonald in the railroad stations and for hometowners there will be street decorations in the 'Golden Triangle' business district."

Footing the Bill

Hotel lobbies also displayed pictures of the Compleat Labor Leader. "Those who go to the William Penn Hotel for the main festivities will pay \$20 a plate. Some steel companies have taken tables for 10 at \$200 a table." A floor show was thrown in with the dessert, and the whole shebang was televised.

A slight difficulty occurred over the souvenir program, which carried about \$12,000 in advertising. "Six weeks ago, Mr. Hart's committee solicited steel companies for space in the program at \$100 a page, but apparently something went wrong with the signals." There weren't enough pages to go round to take care of all the steel companies and magnates who wanted to advertise their undying devotion to Dave. "Mr. McDonald himself is said to have called a halt to the solicitation, holding that the steel companies should not be asked to foot the bill for the souvenir program."

Walter Reuther was not invited to the testimonial, the *Wall Street Journal* notes laconically.

Finally: "A biography of Mr. McDonald titled *Man of Steel*, written by a Pittsburgh newspaperman, Edwin Beachler, and a Pittsburgh public-relations man, George Kelly, is now being prepared. It runs to about 50,000 words, has 16 pages of illustrations, and will sell for \$3.50.

"Although the biography is a project separate from the testimonial, Mr. Hart's committee had hoped to have it available for sale at tomorrow night's dinner. But latest word is that it won't be ready in time. It's reported to present Mr. McDonald as an example of the 'new look in labor leaders.'"

It is scarcely necessary to point out the extent to which the steel industry is involved hip-deep in the projected buildup of David McDonald. The U. S. Steel Corporation has taken the job of selling him to the steel workers and the rest of the labor movement as well as the "public."

The Bartered Bride

At any rate, the steel magnates apparently succeeded in selling Dave to himself and themselves to Dave. That was dramatically and publicly demonstrated at a banquet held in Chicago on December 11. The occasion was a testimonial dinner given the Steelworkers' subsidiary director Joe Germano by the Jewish Labor Committee. Dave McDonald was the featured speaker.

After everyone had already been seated and had begun eating, McDonald staged his entrance, amid a ringing ovation by the people in attendance. (This is becoming the traditional method of showing "respect" in the labor movement today.)

His speech was a classic of its kind. The somewhat bewildered audience did not know when hit them.

McDonald told them he hadn't come late in order to make a grand entrance; he had been busy with union affairs, so very very busy. He had been with Ben all day, and the last person he saw before he came was Ben, and Ben was mad at Joe because he hadn't been invited too, in fact Ben was so mad at Joe he was thinking of sending him back to the shop. . . .

McDonald then went on to talk about the idea which Phil Murray and Dave McDonald had conceived of a joint tour with Ben. He, Dave, had had his misgivings about the tour idea but he'd been all wrong, it was the greatest event of 1953 in the labor movement, its value could not be imagined. . . .

On and on he rambled in the same vein. "The U. S. Steel Company and the United Steelworkers are married to each other; U. S. Steel needs the Steelworkers' Union. . . ." (Unprintable interpretations of this news passed through the audience.)

Furthermore, Dave went on, what had impressed him all through the tour with Ben was that he was continually running into men who'd been original members of the old Steelworkers Organizing Committee and who now were company superintendents, and ex-members of bargaining committees and executive boards who were now foremen and general foremen.

He then rambled into praise of democratic capitalism and an attack on all the tenets of "Marxism," though some listeners thought his picture of Karl Marx looked something like Reuther. "Where else in the world could two people like Ben and Dave rise from such humble beginnings to become leaders of such great organizations like the U. S. Steel Corporation and the United Steelworkers?"

So on and on he went—Phil and I—Ben and I. . . . There were some present who gave it the palm for being the most egotistical, ignorant and pro-company speech ever given to a labor gathering.

Bright Prospect for Dave

The next day the Illinois State CIO convention met. Throughout the corridors there was talk of Dave McDonald's speech, about its egotism, about the "marriage" he had hymned. Even Steelworkers Union men at the convention expressed themselves.

Particularly appalled were the strikers from Continental Can, who had been told by the company to go to the devil after only 20 hours of negotiations; McDonald had not even mentioned their strike. How could he have done that? Ben might get mad. After all, hadn't he met in a secret meeting in California with the head of Continental Can, ex-Gen. Lucius Clay (ex-instructor to West Germany in the American democratic way of life)?

This secret meeting, incidentally, had been exposed in a speech by UAW regional director Pat Greathouse. The heads of all the major industrial corporations were present, together with members of the Eisenhower cabinet. A Los Angeles paper had carried an article on the meeting; the article appeared in one edition and then was killed. What had the assembled moneybags talked about? Why had the get-together been so conspiratorial? What were Eisenhower's men doing there?

Not only did McDonald show no interest in the big can strike but he also hadn't remembered to say a half word about the problem of the layoffs and recession.

McDonald today finds himself on top of the Steelworkers—that is, on their backs—but his outlook is in complete opposition to the realities of day-to-day life in the mills. His mind and his way of life touches that of the steel workers at hardly any point.

Today he is riding high, but there are many observers who believe that it cannot last, that the union will have to throw him out. If so, there can be no doubt that he will not starve; Ben can always make him a superintendent, if not indeed a vice-president.

Now you can see

The Emperor's Clothes

This unusual play has been revived, off Broadway, by the theater group of the Greenwich Mews Playhouse. It deals in memorable fashion with the dilemma of a man in a police-state under the pressure of conformism and state terror. Should he squeal or stand up to his inquisitors? Should he be a rat or a "hero"? Should he sell himself and his child to the police for the job he wants? (The setting is laid in Hungary, for convenience.)

N. Y. ISL Theater Party for
"The Emperor's Clothes"

Tuesday eve., January 26

Write for tickets to:
New York ISL, 114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Contribution: \$1.50

Military Perspective —

(Continued from page 1)

not willing to send any more troops to Europe than they have there now.

(3) Atomic military power, now highly developed for tactical use against armies in the field, as well as for the wholesale destruction of cities, makes it possible for the NATO powers to keep their military manpower at present strength. Former Russian military superiority was based on the ability to mobilize masses of men using conventional weapons. Now it becomes questionable, however, whether this type of army will be able to hold the field against atomic weapons. Even if it were possible for the NATO powers to build up armies of a similar type which could stand up to the Russians, this would not necessarily be advisable in view of Stalinist development of atomic weapons.

SUBSTITUTE FOR ALLIES

This is a remarkable change from the plans of NATO's early years. At that time, the picture of the Russian steamroller forcing its way to the English Channel in a few weeks was held before the eyes of the world. A sense of desperation gripped military men and their spokesmen in the press.

The European governments were whipped on to more frenzied efforts by

American urging, threats, and outpourings of cash. The year 1954 was held up as the "critical year" for the military buildup, and dozens of columnists wept bitter tears over the "apathy," the "blindness," and even the "cowardice" of European governments which refused to recognize their peril and throw their all into preparation for the year of doom.

Under the first impact of the war in Korea, this country too was organized for a vast military effort. Budgets of forty, fifty, and sixty billion dollars a year for military expenditures were forecast and developed. But now the plans are for a gradual reduction, dropping to the figure (still astronomical, to be sure) of \$30 billions for 1957.

It is true that since 1950 much has happened to show that Russian Stalinism is not the all-powerful, united, monolithic military power that it was thought to be. The indecision and purges since Stalin's death, the unrest in the satellites, the revolt in East Germany—all these have demonstrated that the Russian Stalinists have much else to think of than a quick conquest of the world by military means.

Yet the fact remains that Stalinist military power is about what it was then (and has even increased), that its political appeal is still a mighty force among the peoples of the world, and that the

character and intentions of its ruling class have not undergone any change whatsoever.

The big difference is a recognition of the impossibility of keeping the capitalist world on a war footing indefinitely—and the acceptance of the atom bomb as a substitute for such a military policy.

ATOM CONTROL IS OUT

All reports indicate that the budget which will be placed before Congress for the next fiscal year will call for a considerable reduction in the manpower of the army and navy, and an increase in the manpower and planes made available to the air force. One of the factors involved is the Eisenhower administration's desire for economy. But the government's plans are based on what the military now refer to as "a bigger bang for a buck," namely the "bang" of the A- and H-bombs.

The implications of this idea for mankind, in the long run, are becoming clearer by the month.

With the government now acting on these assumptions, it is plain that any talk about stopping the atomic armaments race is sheer hypocrisy. Even if the American government is really serious about Eisenhower's atomic power pool, this would be put together from the surplus of A-bomb material. If the government were seriously considering international control of atomic power, they would not be basing their whole military policy on its increase.

The political consequences of this policy are also becoming clearer as it is put into effect.

Ever since the last year, America's economic strength has made this country the dominant military power in the capitalist world. But the other powers were at least dealing with a country whose military forces were of the same kind as theirs, and which needed their armies, and hence at least a considerable degree of their political agreement, for any action which it might undertake.

GOING IT ALONE

But as the shift to atomic power develops, the disparity in relative strength will grow with it. Although smaller nations may hope one day to develop their own atomic power, and the means by which to deliver it, that is still decades in the future for most of them. In the meantime, they are even more at the mercy of the decisions of the American government than they were before.

The United States has already decided to withhold an armored division which it had promised NATO for next year. The logic of this is not lost on the Europeans. Why send an armored division, when a bomber wing with atomic armament can do just as much? The bomber wing is cheaper, and can be kept in this country, completely under the control of this government without any NATO interference.

With regard to Korea, high military and government officials have let it leak out that if the truce finally breaks down, the United States will not resume the fighting on the old basis. This is an open threat that atomic weapons will be brought to bear.

As it is hardly conceivable that the European allies in that war would readily agree to such a step, it means that America would be ready to go it alone, to depend on its atomic power instead of on any degree of consent by the allies, with the idea that they will have to accept a victory achieved by such means, whether they like it or not.

LOGIC OF MADNESS

The end-logic of this new policy is quite predictable.

With a vast stock of atomic weapons at its disposal, with a powerful air force which can deliver these bombs over any city in the world, this government need concern itself less and less with the political side of the cold war. Allies remain desirable, but they are not as essential as they were, and in some cases may be an inconvenient liability, specially when their governments or peoples cannot be induced to see things from Washington's point of view.

If the masses in France, or in Italy, or in India, are shot through with neutralist or even pro-Stalinist attitudes, that is just too bad. That means their armed forces cannot be relied upon very much in any case. You can't tell what they will do under the pressure of a war with Stalinist countries. But the good old A-bomb is reliable enough. All you have to do is drop it in the right place, and bang!—you know what will happen.

Of course, this is the logic of madness, but it is real enough. It has not yet come

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!

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

BLP Line Is Flabby —

(Continued from page 3)

LACK DRIVE

Mysteries are quite commonplace today. Now that we are used to flying saucers and Abominable Snowmen, we may be used to anything. One of the great political mysteries which is baffling the political experts is this: What has the Labor Party leadership in mind as a serious alternative to Tory policy?

Serious political observers have commented again and again on the LACK of policy displayed by the Labor Party leadership and above all by the Trades Union Congress.

The General Council of the TUC denounced the British Guiana PPP without even mentioning the suspension of the Guiana constitution! The purely negative attitude of Transport House to Jagan and Burnham, the PPP leaders who have visited England, is just another instance of this "stonewalling" attitude of the party tops.

Only the Bevanite *Tribune* ever says anything at all; and not all of what it says is either good enough or worth saying. In fact *Tribune* sets the pace for the local constituency parties without affecting very much either Transport House or the policy of the party in the precincts of the House of Commons.

The solution to these "mysteries" lies perhaps in the hesitancy of the Labor Party leadership to formulate a bold policy based on a continually changing international and national scene. There is a great fear of the "unknown," the "future." There is a general realization that the "historic revolution" in the "backward countries" (both these phrases being much used by our party leaders) is undermining the old basis of their thinking. However, there is a fear of "adjustment" to this new situation.

The bolder spirits, the Bevanites, are conscious of the problem, the problem of reformism in an age of revolution. They even tentatively point the road to the solution of the dilemma. But they too are vaguely aware of the important implications of any serious and long-term adjustment of the conceptions, ideology and ideas of the Labor Party to the new scene.

The implications are simple: an organized struggle within the Labor Party on the basis of these new ideas.

And it is not as if they are not in a position to conduct such a fight. Bevan has but to address a few of the decisive miners' lodges which are the key to the control of the decisive National Union of Mineworkers, and the whole balance of power in the trade unions would shift to the left.

Further, as J. P. Mallalieu was complaining in *Tribune*, constituency parties which are Bevanite are still selecting anti-Bevanite MPs. It is not surprising, by the way, that Mallalieu's article was viewed with some hostility by the Parliamentary Labor Party; for he was showing constituency parties the way to put into Parliament those MPs whose views agree with theirs.

In general, we can say, therefore, that Bevan and the Bevanites could quite successfully take over the Labor Party machinery, but that the implications of such action would lead to a split in the bureaucracy. It is the most general explanation for the lack of initiative and drive shown by *Tribune* since the Margate conference of the party.

It underlines the necessity for forces within, but not completely identified with, the Bevan current to press forward for that most urgently required rearmament of ideas which is so sadly lacking in our movement.

Police-State Bill —

(Continued from page 1)

It is almost unbelievable but true: the union need only be CHARGED with the crime, not convicted, and its NLRB rights vanish. The charge may be brought by rival unions or employers. This is an interesting fact, for the U. S. Chamber of Commerce still accuses the CIO of furthering "Marxist economics" and the class struggle; and the American Machinist, published for big business, accuses it of following "the Communist Party line with the persistence of a shadow."

A union, if found guilty by the board, may appeal; but the ban remains in force until the Supreme Court finally acts. The years between can be filled in by the employers' unrestrained union-busting so that the Supreme Court has the possibility of satisfying an appellant who is vindicated but quite dead.

The "crime" spreads over a new area and is closely woven to catch every fish. Not only Communist Party members but former Communists are to be tracked

down. And not only "members" but those who supported "in any manner" the activities or causes of groups which the board decides are or were "Communist." The ingenuity of hard-working subversive-hunters receives an unlimited arena for creativity and fabrication.

The Butler bill, says the CIO *OH Worker*, is the product of hysteria, and this hysteria "is being coldly, carefully, deliberately cultivated by a group of men in powerful positions. They are creating this hysteria as a smokescreen behind which they hope to remold America in a pattern completely different from that we have known in the past. They want to bring about an end to what they think is this damn foolishness of common people organizing and expressing themselves and promoting the common welfare . . . through labor unions, for example. . . . The Big Lie boys are not out to destroy communism. They are out to destroy democracy. To destroy democracy, they must destroy free trade unions."

to wholly dominate the thinking of the American government, let alone of the American people. That would take time, just as it will take time for the new military policy to establish its complete sway over the older policies and the weapons on which they were based.

But just as the cold war is now stretching out into the indefinite future (and with it will come new crises and new defeats for American policy in the political sphere), so one can count on this "logic" growing on the ruling class of America and the government which reflects its thinking.

At the present time there is little the American people can do about the A-bomb. But they can do a lot about the power of the people who control it. It is far too dangerous to leave political power in the hands of men whose thinking is developing along these lines.

The ultimate catastrophe is not reserved for peoples of other countries. Unless a political movement is created which can wrest this power from their hands, it is bound to descend on us as well.