

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

THE REVOLT IN THE BLP

... page 3

Economics for the Cold War

... page 6

Taxes to Tickle the Rich

... page 2

MARCH 8, 1954

FIVE CENTS

McCARTHY'S STRUGGLE FOR POWER: What Was Behind the Raid on Stevens?

Subversive List Blasted in House By Congressman

In a speech on the floor of Congress on February 17—a speech remarkable for these days—a Democratic representative got up to deliver a slashing attack on the whole concept and system of the attorney general's infamous "Subversive List."

This item of news, so exceptional if not indeed sensational, did not make the headlines.

The nonconformist congressman was Herbert P. Eberharter of Pennsylvania.

Without pussyfooting, discussing most specifically the way Attorney General Brownell had publicly announced the "listing" of the National Lawyers Guild, Eberharter swung into a denunciation of the "Subversive List" itself.

"CAN WE TRUST THEM?"

"To my mind," he said, "for attorney general to label and slander any organization that has done nothing illegal, because the attorney general does not like the way that organization operates or because it opposes some position taken by him, amounts to a gross arrogation of power. I think it time that we put a stop to this attempt to govern the country by smear and labeling."

He questioned the whole constitutional basis for the existence of the "Subversive List":

"I have not been able to find any statute that gives the attorney general the authority to list organizations as subversive," he stated, and added that there was nothing in the Constitution to permit it.

To be sure, in concentrating his fire on the present administration, he ignored the fact that the subversive list had been established not by the Republicans but by his own party's administration; but he did ask challengingly: "Can we trust this partisan, politically minded attorney general, or for that matter any other attorney general, with the power to label any organization as subversive?"

Congressman Eberharter's short speech is published below in full, from the Congressional Record, for reference by fighters for civil liberties.

"GOVERNMENT BY LABEL" Speech by Rep. Herbert P. Eberharter Congress, February 17

Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks we have witnessed a chorus of accusations on the part of some leading Republicans labeling the Democratic Party as the

(Continued on page 2)

One Answer: The Drive Toward a Split In GOP Points to Political Realignment

By HAL DRAPER

The Stevens-McCarthy affair is most significant as the clearest manifestation to date of a political development which is still nine-tenths submerged beneath the waters of politics in the United States.

It is the latest step toward a portentous *political realignment* which could be of far greater long-run importance than the personal fate of Joe McCarthy's bid for power.

Everyone knows that behind McCarthy lurk all the reactionary anti-democratic forces which are summed up in the name McCarthyism. But for the most immediate future there is something else, more concrete, that rides behind McCarthyism.

What we are witnessing right now may be part of the birth pangs of a new party out of the Republican Party of today—a new party which, by the very fact of its coming into existence, can bring about

A Discussion Article

the most important change in the American political scene that this country has witnessed since the transformation of the Democratic Party into the party of the New Deal. More accurately what we are seeing are the strivings of this party to be born.

Unlike the New Deal development, which was a shifting of the center of

(Continued on page 4)

By H. W. BENSON.

Whatever the final outcome of the Stevens-McCarthy affair, one fact is established: the extreme right wing of the Republican Party, spearheaded by McCarthy, has won an outstanding victory and emerges aggressive and self-confident. The Eisenhower administration, disappointing the hopes of those who look to it for a kind of "conservative liberalism," shuffled off in an undignified and embarrassing retreat.

At last, key figures in the Republican administration have had the charge of "Communist-coddling" heaped upon their heads. Just a few days ago, the defenders of Earl Warren, now chief justice of the United States, were compelled to answer the charge of "Marxism" leveled against him; but it

(Turn to last page)

Press Uses Terrorist Attempt To Falsify Puerto Rico Issue

By H. D.

The bullets that were indiscriminately fired by three Puerto Rican Nationalist Party supporters onto the floor of Congress, wounding five congressmen, will not aid the cause of Puerto Rico's independence—they have set back the cause—but the condemnation of the terrorists which is filling the press must not be allowed to be a cover for lies and falsifications, which are also filling the press, about the real plight and unfree condition of the Puerto Rican people.

The Nationalist Party is a group of political primitives who are the victims of their own programless desperation no less than of the conditions of imperialist oppression, and (as we said at the time of the attempt on Truman's life at Blair House) they "can scarcely be considered [even] in the same category with the Russian [anti-tsarist] terrorists who mistakenly looked to bomb-throwing as a road to freedom," who at least had a social and political program which their self-defeating tactics were designed to further. The Nationalists' principle is to have no program "on principle," except the desire to get independence somehow or other.

It is a movement in a blind alley of frustration, striking out blindly. And while it can be understood how such a mood arises, if only among a section of the pro-independence fighters, their senseless acts can have only reactionary effects.

But we don't believe that LABOR AC-

TION readers need to be agitated about the political sins of individual terrorism. It is more important at this moment, amid the sanguinary headlines, to defend the REAL cause of Puerto Rican freedom from the hail of lies about Puerto Rico that have followed in the wake of the hail of bullets.

Every single newspaper (in New York City anyway), from the liberal N. Y. Post to Hearst's Journal-American, has carefully explained to its readers that Lolita Lebron and her associates are simply fanatic "gunmen," "desperadoes," "gangsters," or "mad dogs" because, after all, their island homeland is perfectly free. So what was all the shooting about?

THE BIG LIE

To take the liberal Post instead of the reactionary Hearst press, here is a sample:

"Both Truman and President Eisenhower have pledged that Puerto Rico will be given independence if the people vote for it, but in various elections they have rejected both independence and statehood in favor of continuation of Commonwealth status.

"The people of the island now elect their own governor and their constitution gives them power to pass their own laws and govern themselves."

This is a Big Lie, which some liberals swallow along with the rest.

Moreover, the facts about this claim are completely public, verifiable and really beyond dispute.

It is true that Truman once gave a pledge "that Puerto Rico will be given independence if the people vote for it." He dishonored that pledge when put to the test.

In his message to Congress on October 16, 1945, Truman declared:

"It is now time, in my opinion, to ascertain from the people of Puerto Rico their wishes as to the ultimate status which they prefer. . . ." He proposed in effect that a plebiscite be held in which the islanders could declare themselves.

In 1946 the Puerto Rican legislature adopted a resolution asking that such a plebiscite be held. This was vetoed by the then U. S. governor, Rexford Guy Tugwell.

The island legislature re-passed the resolution over the governor's veto. It was then vetoed—and therefore killed—by President Truman himself.

The Puerto Rican people have never been allowed to state in any ballot—let alone "various elections"—what they, the people, want. Truman's open betrayal of his pledge saw to that.

On the other hand, Eisenhower has never even pledged a vote by the people. In his statement of last December, put out for international consumption at the time in order to get the UN to relieve the U. S. of the necessity of making reports on Puerto Rico, Eisenhower promised to grant independence if the Munoz-controlled legislature asks for it. He did not even raise the question of a democratic

(Continued on page 6)

GOP Administration Proposes 'Soak-the-Poor' Tax Program

By L. G. SMITH

Congress is moving toward some kind of action on the nation's tax structure. And although taxation may strike most people as a pretty dry kind of subject, even the least interested are likely to perk up their ears if it is discussed sometime near March 15. Although it is a sure thing that we will be taxed, the manner of our taxation is not a matter of indifference to us, any more than the fact that death is inevitable makes us uninterested in just how it may come.

The Eisenhower administration is preparing a tax program which is simply an expression of the basic outlook of the men now in power. It is frankly and openly designed to favor a relatively small section, not of the population as a whole, but of its richest members.

Taxes on dividends are to be cut to "save" the tiny group of significant stockholders \$240,000,000 per year. Other tax "reforms" are calculated to stimulate business investment and expansion by exciting the greed of the investors, while the rest of us pay their share of the bills for the armament economy.

The idea is that the present recession is caused basically because businessmen don't have enough "incentive" to invest their money in further production. When that is given them by tax relief, more jobs, goods, and the rest are supposed to follow meekly after.

DEMOCRATS' PLAN

The leading Democrats in Congress have a different idea. They are proposing to increase the basic tax exemption from \$600 per year to \$800 this year and \$1000 the next. (Actually it is clear that the latter two figures are for propaganda purposes, and that they will gladly settle for a figure of \$700.) It is estimated that each \$100 increase in personal exemptions would cost the government \$2,300,000,000 in revenue, while the administration's whole program is calculated to cost it only about \$1,200,000,000. The Democrats are also proposing a drastic reduction in luxury taxes and other excise taxes, while the administration wants to be very "selective" in cuts in this field.

Auto Unemployment Raises Problem for UAW Strategy

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, March 1—Like a creeping paralysis, the unemployment problem intensifies and dominates the economic and political outlook in this automotive center.

A full-page feature, with plenty of photos of long unemployment lines, in the Detroit Free Press was startlingly similar to the kind of journalism one saw in the 1930s: The sad story of personal tragedies, especially among the older workers; the fear and uncertainty of all unemployed; the bewilderment over events that seem too large at the moment to understand; and the cold statistics—124,000 now unemployed in Detroit, a figure higher than anyone expected, and 17,000 workers whose benefits have been exhausted under Michigan unemployment laws.

On Sunday, there was a mass rally of the unemployed in front of Dodge UAW local hall. The bitter denunciations of the Republican-controlled state legislature by Democratic Party speakers drew enthusiastic response.

At Lansing, the state capital, there was the unbelievable spectacle of a Republican committee trying to confine Walter P. Reuther, UAW and CIO president, to a 10-minute presentation of labor's views on the unemployment crisis in Michigan. They wouldn't allow him to speak in a large committee room, but rather shunted him off to a tiny cubbyhole that held 8 people, and allowed him so little space that he had to talk sitting down.

This insulting procedure was so flagrant that even Detroit's Republican newspapers commented critically about it. Needless to say, Reuther isn't leader of the UAW because he doesn't know how to talk or stretch 10 minutes into a speech. Before he finished the Republicans had an earful, in an hourful!

The Democrats are operating on a theory which is older than the New Deal for softening the recession. The \$100 or \$200 boost in the tax exemption will bring greatest relief to the poorest taxpayers, who can be expected to take the extra money and spend it right away. Although it will amount in most cases to no more than \$44 per year, or less than \$1 per week, when that is multiplied by a few million families it can buy a lot of pork chops. The theory is that this will increase purchasing power most quickly and thus to be the most rapid stimulant to the economy. Further, there can be no question that it would be the most politically popular kind of tax reduction, and a Democrat is as anxious to win political popularity as the next man.

The next man, in this case, happens to be a Republican. And although the administration, and the bulk of the capitalists who back it, are strong for their kind of tax program, the congressmen and senators whose personal political future will be up for grabs this November are not likely to permit their well-known principles to stand in the way of vote-getting. Thus it is anyone's guess whether the administration will be able to hold the line in Congress on its tax program, if the Democrats can get their measure on the floor.

NO REJUVENATION

Even in the higher Republican councils there seems to be some uncertainty about the economic future. Eisenhower has said that if things get worse in March, the administration will really go to work to improve them. But Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, the spokesman for true-blue Republicanism in this field, says that March may be too early, and that the government should wait till May before being "panicked" into doing anything as rash as giving the workers and other little taxpayers a break. The unemployed and under-employed? Well, that is just tough, but they must learn to bear their burdens cheerfully, or at least stoically, in the interest of a "healthier" economy in the future.

The Democratic program is, of course,

the far more humanitarian of the two. As it is also bigger, and thus will provide for the retention of more consuming power in the economy and a bigger government deficit, there can be no doubt that it would also have a stronger influence on the economy than what the Republicans propose. The one thing the economy does not lack, at the moment, is sufficient investment capital for expansion purposes. The money is there, but with existing factories on short weeks, there is little incentive to build new ones.

Can the Democratic program actually "solve" the problem? That is, would \$2,300,000,000 in additional purchasing power for consumers each year, or double that amount, be the difference between stagnation and resumed growth?

In this period of transition for the war economy, it is difficult, if not impossible, to give an answer to that question. Such a shot in the rump might give the wavering beast just enough soup to get it around another lap in the track. But it can no more permanently rejuvenate the capitalist system than can the "lightning" injected into an ailing nag for one race restore her to the vigor of youth. Them days, as the saying goes, is gone forever.

Subversive List — —

(Continued from page 1)

party of treason. All of us in this body who have worked together for years know the absurd nature of such charge, and know that the charge is made only for partisan political purposes.

But these recent events have caused me to examine more closely the entire question of the power of governmental authorities to label any organization as subversive.

I have recently received in the mail from an association of lawyers known as the National Lawyers Guild a pamphlet entitled "An Appeal to Reason." It appears from this pamphlet that at a meeting of the American Bar Association our Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, announced that he had determined to list this organization as subversive. At the same time he stated that he was going to serve notice upon the guild of his intention to list the organization so that it could then have a hearing before him.

I must admit that I learned my law in the old-fashioned way and have not yet caught up with these new innovations. The way I learned law, decisions were supposed to be made after notice and hearing and not before. As a matter of fact, it is difficult for an old-fashioned lawyer like myself to understand why one should have a hearing at all if the decision has already been made.

NEWFANGLED CONCEPT

The attorney general in his speech stating that the Lawyers Guild was subversive found fault with the fact that the organization filed in court amicus curiae briefs contending that certain actions of the Department of Justice against Communists and alleged Communists were unconstitutional. According to the attorney general, this made the organization subversive.

Up to now I had thought that the word subversive had something to do with opposition to our Constitution and a desire to overthrow our Constitution by force and violence. Now I find out that according to the attorney general the word subversive means to make a legal argument in court which differs from the position of the Department of Justice. This is another newfangled concept which, as an old-fashioned lawyer, I find hard to understand.

Up to now I had thought that it was the right of every citizen to argue either in or out of court that he disagreed with the Department of Justice. Under Brownell's standard many of our distinguished Republican colleagues in the Senate side who are supporting the Bricker amendment are running a risk of being labelled subversive because they differ with Attorney General Brownell as to the interpretation of our constitutional provision with regard to treaties.

I have not been able to find any statute that gives the attorney general the authority to list organizations as subversive.

IRAN HAS ONE, TOO

"Shaban Jafari, a fierce, black-bearded giant called Beemokh (The Brainless One), has become one of the most prominent and perplexing figures of the bizarre scene of Iranian politics.

"Shah Mohammed Riza Pahlevi and the government appreciate Shaban's support. But they are a little embarrassed by it and are not sure what, if anything, they ought to do about it.

"Shaban was most helpful and most embarrassing during the Senate elections early this month. He drove from one polling place to another, administering terrible beatings to opposition electioneers or, if he suspected them of being Communists, shaving their heads. The admiring police, who got in a few kicks and punches themselves, promptly arrested his astonished, shorn or unconscious victims. He is expected to play a similar role in the forthcoming Majlis (lower house) elections here.

"Brig. Gen. Abbas Farzanegan, government spokesman, said, 'We have many problems. We will decide what to do about Shaban when we come to it.' Ardeshir Zahedi, son of Premier Fazollah Zahedi, added, 'I know Shaban is a little rough, but we like him because he is against the Communists.'

—From a N. Y. Time dispatch

Any similarity to a prominent and perplexing figure on the bizarre scene of American politics is purely coincidental, as is any similarity to the attitudes of "responsible" American politicians toward him.

As I understand it, the attorney general claims that this power comes to him from Executive Order No. 10450, our new Republican security order, and that the Constitution grants the executive branch of the government this authority in order to protect our country from subversion. But I have seen nothing in the Constitution that says this in so many words. Like the novel notion that a decision now comes before hearing, this is probably another one of these newfangled ideas that an old-fashioned lawyer like myself has not as yet been able to get on to.

ARROGATION OF POWER

I think we are all aware that attorneys general are usually political figures active in carrying out the political program of the current administration. It would be an understatement to state that the present attorney general is no exception to this rule. We have seen how he has misused his power as chief judicial law enforcer to make a partisan, political attack on our distinguished former president.

I think it is necessary for the House seriously to ponder this question. Can we trust this partisan, politically minded attorney general, or for that matter any other attorney general, with the power to label any organization as subversive?

In the case of the Lawyers Guild he does not even accuse that organization of having done or even planned to do anything that was illegal. Certainly, if the organization had done anything illegal, I would assume that he would prosecute them.

To my mind, for the attorney general to label and slander any organization that has done nothing illegal, because the attorney general does not like the way that organization operates or because it opposes some position taken by him amounts to a gross arrogation of power. I think it time that we put a stop to this attempt to govern the country by smear and labeling.

The definitive biography!
A masterly political portrait
of the totalitarian dictator

Leon Trotsky's
'STALIN'

This book is out of print, but
we have copies available for
\$6.00

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

LONDON LETTER

'Center' Joins with Bevanites on German Arms Issue

Labor MPs Revolt Against Attlee Line

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Feb. 25—What is taking place is the most serious split in the Labor Party's parliamentary group since April 1951 (when Bevan resigned from the Labor cabinet).

The complete failure of the Big Four conference has led to a situation in the Labor Party where at least one half of the Parliamentary Labor Party (the Labor MPs' organization) and the overwhelming section of the party rank and file are at loggerheads with the official Attlee-Morrison leadership.

The split in the Parliamentary Labor Party is significant for one very important reason: For the first time, the center of the Parliamentary Labor Party has lined up with the 50-or-so "Bevanite" MPs.

Harold Wilson, one of the ablest of the Bevanites, moved a resolution there calling for further efforts to unite Germany before approving of rearmament. This was on Tuesday night. The resolution was lost by only 111 to 109.

Further to add to the humiliation of the Morrison wing, the 2-vote defeat was contributed to by a few Labor peers who had to be rustled up to assure the narrow defeat of Harold Wilson's resolution.

Following this vote, the motion put forward by Attlee's shadow-cabinet (in support of German rearmament) was carried by 113 to 104.

According to the lobby correspondents of the various newspapers, even the predominantly right-wing Front Bench committee of the Parliamentary Labor Party was split on the issue. Of its 14 members, three opposed the Attlee-Morrison line on the Executive, and one abstained when the vote was put to the Front Bench committee before being presented to the Parliamentary Labor Party itself.

The three votes cast against the Attlee-Morrison line were Chuter Ede, former minister of education; James Callaghan; and Aneurin Bevan. Emanuel Shinwell, former minister of defense, abstained. Dalton—from his sick bed—also gave his support to the "rebels."

The right wing won its majority. But at what a price! It may well be that the serious discontent within the party at all its levels will finally boil over—now that the Morrison line of loyal opposition (or is it support?) of the Tory government has been approved by a narrow majority. The emergence of a center leadership seems to be in the offing, rather than an openly Bevanite leadership. Yesterday's Daily Herald, the Labor Party's main organ, with its oblique attack

on the official line, adds to the evidence for this supposition.

McCARTHY ON TV

Television is certainly not as widely seen in Britain as in the United States. Its influence in shaping and molding the minds of people cannot, however, be underestimated. Unlike the commercialized radio and TV of the States, Britain's BBC and television service commands a certain respect in all sections of the population.

Quite naturally, therefore, Monday night's TV program on "McCarthyism in the United States" must be considered quite a political event.

Aidan Crawley, a former Labor MP, introduced a program which described, with the aid of tele-recordings and tele-film shots, the attitude and state of mind of what he considered to have been a representative cross-section of the American people. His impressions gathered together in this program were the product of a careful and objective on-the-spot tour of the United States last year on behalf of the BBC.

The film of the McCarthy hearing of some apparently innocent minor State Department official did more to bring home the atmosphere which appears to be enveloping the States than all the articles and speeches that have been made in this country over the last few years on the subject. The newspapers—from right to left—were frankly shocked by the close-ups of these hearings. It looked too much like "1984"—on this side of the Iron Curtain.

Whether this TV program was deliberately arranged by the authorities at the top of the BBC is difficult to say, but the implications were all too obvious to the viewers.

KENYA REVELATIONS

This brings us to another political bombshell—the publication as a White Paper of the parliamentary delegation's report on the situation in Kenya. The delegation consisted of three Conservative and three Labor MPs.

Not only is it freely admitted that the white settlers (who comprise the main bulk of the police) consider themselves above the law, but also that police bru-

tility and corruption is rife, particularly in the lower ranks. Further, the report states flatly that the situation is worse than when the emergency began.

The report calls for African representation in the Legislative Council, and the appointment by the governor of men of all the main races to his cabinet, the Executive Council. The agrarian problem is freely recognized; and all in all, it constitutes the most devastating critique not only of the white settlers but also of the policy of Oliver Lyttleton, the colonial minister.

The white settlers will not and cannot, for one moment, contemplate even the appointment of Africans to the Executive Council, for they see this (quite rightly from their point of view) as the thin edge of the wedge. For once Africans are allowed into the government apparatus, what will prevent them from learning the methods by which they can wrest control from the arrogant white-settler community?

IN GOD'S NAME

The American evangelist Billy Graham has certainly put his foot in it. His much-publicized evangelical mission to this country received the cold shoulder when Swaffer of the Labor Daily Herald discovered that the organization behind him had printed calendars comparing socialism (and its effect) with the effects of Hitler's bombing.

The attempt to explain away the "inadvertent" slip-up (apparently "secularism" has since been substituted for "socialism" in the text) has convinced no one in the Labor Party.

The indignation aroused by Billy Graham's mission to evangelize London has to be seen to be believed. Swaffer, following up his open attack on Graham, in the Wednesday Daily Herald, suggested that Graham should evangelize America before this country.

The Labor Party here is very sensitive about its "socialism." Attacks on socialism from the right, particularly from the American right, are particularly resented. Even more infuriating is the identification of socialism and Stalinism—when it is clear that capitalism and Stalinism have more in common than either have with socialism.

Read the

NEW INTERNATIONAL

America's leading Marxist review

ATTENTION

San Francisco

Bay Area

Bay Area

Independent Socialist League

&

Berkeley

Young Socialist League

announce a public forum on

"Is McCarthyism

American Fascism?"

(A Symposium)

Friday, March 19

8:00 p.m.

2412 HASTE ST., BERKELEY (Third Floor)

Coffee and refreshments will be served

ISL FUND DRIVE

First Real Spurt in Drive: Keep It Up!

By ALBERT GATES Fund Drive Director

Although we are still running behind schedule in the Fund Drive, the campaign received a big lift this week by the contribution of the Chicago branch of the ISL which came through with \$1235. With this payment, Chicago took first place in the drive with a percentage of 68.6. This commendable effort enabled us to pay off a big loan from that area as well as some accumulated debts of the past year.

Moreover, Chicago's effort put the drive closer to the schedule it requires to complete the goal set. It will take some doing to overtake the Windy City, which is pretty confident that it will surpass its local quota.

We're pulling for Chicago and don't mind saying so. There is no reason why it can't go way above its quota and thus take up the slack of a lower national quota because of the absence of the old SYL. The Chicago pace is a real challenge to New York, Los Angeles and the Bay Area.

Although there was a slight pickup in New York, its efforts are still kind of

feeble when compared to its quota and its possibilities. Right now, New York is seventh in the standings, but its percentage of achievement is only 13 per cent. But then, Los Angeles is represented by a big zero in the box score, and the Bay Area appears way down the list.

Newark keeps climbing steadily. With \$117.50 of its quota in, the branch has reached almost 30 per cent of its goal. Our friends there are certain they can pass the \$400 mark, judging from past performances we are certain they will, too. They keep talking about winning the drive.

At this stage in the campaign, Pittsburgh and Cleveland have a good start. If they keep it up, they too should finish ahead of schedule. Philadelphia is off to a better start than before. But we are disappointed in the failures of the National Office, Los Angeles, Detroit, Buffalo and Seattle, which haven't made any kind of showing yet.

With a national percentage of 17.6 we still have a long haul ahead. There is still \$8400 to raise. Get it? . . . Get it!

BOX SCORE

Table with columns: Quota, Paid, % and rows for various cities including Chicago, St. Louis, Newark, etc.

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

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

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's 1954 Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

Orwell's personal account of the Spanish Civil War

HOMAGE TO CATALONIA

by

George Orwell

\$3.50 Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street, New York City

MARXISM for TODAY

Marx and Engels' "Letters to Americans"

By PHILIP COBEN

A new collection of letters by Marx and Engels has been published (International Pub., N. Y., 312 pages, \$3.50) under the title of *Letters to Americans*, and of course it is of great interest to all students of Marxism. The correspondence carried on by the founders of scientific socialism is so much more valuable than the usual run of letters by great men because so many of Marx' and Engels' letters were deliberately and carefully written to expound their ideas. This was true simply because of the situation they were so often in: writing to each other from afar in order to work out their joint views, or writing to comrades who were asking for their opinions and analyses.

As we've done before in this column, we want mainly to bring the book to our readers' notice, not to give it an adequate review in this space. One thing should be made clear first. The main collection (in English) of the Marx-Engels correspondence is to be found in the much larger and excellent book *Selected Correspondence*; and about 15 per cent of the contents of the new work is to be found there. Naturally this 15 per cent includes by far the bulk of the most interesting passages (from the angle of general political interest). In this column we will only indicate what is to be found in the remaining 85 per cent, which can be considered as a supplement to the *Selected Correspondence*. (Other portions of the very extensive correspondence can be found particularly in the collections *Letters to Kugelmann and Marx and Engels on the Civil War in the U. S.*)

Another thing: *Letters to Americans* is not a collection of letters ABOUT America. It is as miscellaneous in its range as the *Selected Correspondence* itself. The bulk of the contents consists of letters to Friedrich A. Sorge, and in these letters Engels (particularly) used to "brief" him periodically on what was happening in Europe and in the movement in England and on the Continent, in addition to occasional comments on the American scene.

ON AMERICA

It is especially the most important passages about American politics that are duplications of the *Selected Correspondence*; though this new collection does add many more examples of Engels' oft-reiterated view of the relationship between the political and social backwardness of the American working class and his expectation that this working class, once it started to move, would go ahead more explosively and dynamically than the European movements.

Also, concerning the U. S., there is an extended passage on Henry George and his "single tax" plan, tracing (as Engels also did elsewhere) the way in which George was merely repeating old errors of European predecessors. But Engels made a distinction between George's theoretical weakness and the political significance of the movement which adventitiously arose around him. The Henry George mayoralty campaign in New York was an early example of independent labor politics; and it is interesting to learn that this "American example of an independent labor party" was an im-

portant talking-point for the British Marxists of the time (like Aveling) in advocating British imitation. "The American example is having an effect," wrote Engels, and again: "The American example has opened their [the British workers'] eyes, and if next autumn there were to be a repetition, in any large American town, of the New York election campaigns of 1886, the effect here would be instantaneous." Thus early political action in the U. S. was perhaps of more significance in stimulating the forerunners of the British Labor Party than in giving birth to a similar development in this country.

For the sectarian Socialist Labor Party of the U. S., Engels had no use at all, much as he sought to stimulate socialist propaganda organization. DeLeonist fossilization of Marxism is a very old story.

It was to Sorge that Marx and Engels wrote many of their scathing comments on the socialist opportunities of England and Germany (Fabians and right-wing German social-democrats). It was about the latter that Marx wrote:

"These fellows—zeros theoretically, incompetent practically—want to take the teeth out of socialism (which they have trimmed up according to university recipes) and out of the Social-Democratic Party in particular, to enlighten the workers or, as they put it, feed them 'the elements of education' through their confused half-knowledge, and, above all, to make the party respectable in the eyes of the philistine. They are poor counter-revolutionary windbags."

SIDEGLANCES

We should also like to call attention to a very interesting letter (page 57) in which Engels discusses the situation in which a socialist party is necessarily compelled to take power "ahead of its normal time," i. e., before national conditions are completely ripe for it. Naturally it will be read with the Russian Revolution in mind, *mutatis mutandum*.

While there are many other letters to be noted for their political and theoretical interest, we cannot omit mention of another feature of this new collection, more prominent here than in the *Selected Correspondence*. These are the side-glances permitted into some of the less political and more personal remarks tossed off by Marx and Engels on a variety of subjects that momentarily interested them:

Engels on the military problem of invading Britain . . . Marx on the technique of a good polemic . . . Engels on the American language and German sentence structure . . . Marx's advice to "the democratic gentlemen that they would do better first to acquaint themselves with the bourgeois literature before they presume to yap out their contradictions of it" . . . Engels' comment that "the semi-Hegelian language of my old book . . . has lost the greater part of its meaning even in German"—for that unfortunate variety of "Marxist" who thinks that the Hegelian language of so much of their earlier philosophical and political writings (and even in part of *Capital*) is something that has to be religiously preserved. . . . Engels on a certain "emancipated woman" type. . . . Or would you like to know how Engels proposed to give up smoking?

Because of its miscellaneity, among other reasons, the book often makes lively reading, in the course of which much of Marx' and Engels' habitual method of analysis can be absorbed.

One Answer —

(Continued from page 1)

gravity of capitalist politics around a new reformist ("left"-capitalist) axis, this one would mean a great shift to the right—even to the right of the present oppressive trends. . . . IF there arises no counterpoise to it. But that is a big IF, for such a development typically points not simply to a one-way shift to the right but also to a fundamental polarization on the other side.

Let us start by putting the finger on what is plainly the biggest over-all feature of the Stevens-McCarthy episode.

This is the simple and very widely noted fact that here we have had the major move by McCarthy which has been directed against his opposing wing inside the Republican Party itself.

The fact has been widely observed indeed, but just as widely it has been given a narrow (in a sense, commonplace) interpretation. At least for discussion, this article wishes to propose a different view.

What has been deduced from this fact is that McCarthy is engaged in a struggle for power—for himself. As far as it goes, that is no doubt true. But in the first place, in politics, an individual protagonist's struggle for personal power is often not unconnected with the struggle for power of a wider movement. And in the second place, if it is just a question of McCarthy's bid, then the danger would be over and the storm weathered if McCarthy is chopped down (as he still can be even by that stick-figure named Eisenhower) or if he topples over by overreaching himself. Then we shall have been saved. . . . But it isn't so.

THE "PIONEERS"

This edge of the McCarthyite sword which is turned against the official leaders of the Republican Party itself—this aspect of McCarthyism has got to be taken together with certain other phenomena: the complex of all the trends within the right wing of the GOP which have been pointing to a NEW PARTY directed not only against "Trumanism" but almost equally against the Eisenhower wing of the Republicans.

The "pioneers" of this movement emerged completely into the open—no doubt prematurely—during the election campaigns of 1952, when a group of Republicans met in conference around Colonel ("Chicago Tribune") McCormick, Ham Fish, General McArthur and others. Refusing to go along, not even with curses, with the nomination of Eisenhower, they already talked in terms of a new party, the "American Party," with MacArthur as standard-bearer, the same MacArthur who was the keynoter at the official GOP convention.

Many made the mistake of looking on this development as simply a manifestation of pure disgruntlement by a "lunatic fringe." But, as a portent, the move bulks even larger today. Not because the specific people who were there are themselves the big dangers, necessarily, but because it is known that their then perspective has grown into a bigger and bigger tendency within the whole party.

There is reason to believe that, viewed not only as a national movement but also as a development inside the Republican Party, "McCarthyism" has been developing into the boldest and most aggressive expression of the kind of split-perspective which this tendency holds.

WHERE IT POINTS

It goes without saying that, through the instrument of McCarthyism, these elements hope firstly to gain control of the party. But the tactics of McCarthy vis-à-vis the administration indicate that, failing this, they are oriented toward a split. For that matter, domination of the GOP by such a wing could just as effectively mean split anyway, since it would be difficult if not impossible for the Eisenhower-Dewey type to live politically under their control.

It was in the Stevens affair that McCarthy has to date most blatantly assaulted the administration publicly. Here, for the first time, there could not even be any pretense that the attack was directed at some "dirty mess" left by the "Truman-Acheson" regime. It was in this affair that McCarthy publicly called "completely false" a statement which Eisenhower had just personally endorsed 100 per cent (Stevens'). As was noted about his press interview, not once (as one reporter emphasized) did he refer to "President Eisenhower" or "the President," but only "Eisenhower." This is not a small wind-indicator; in Washington, for such a public display, it appals aches scandalous language, something like the failure of a

senator on the floor to call his opponent "the honorable gentleman from Iowa."

This tendency of McCarthyism has been cumulative. There was, also, to be sure, his previous run-in with Stassen; his more veiled attack on the White House in connection with trade with China, and his appeal for letters and telegrams to the White House; his opposition to the Bohlen nomination; his previous clash with the army over Fort Monmouth; his use of his TV speech on the Harry Dexter White case, made presumably to answer Truman, for an attack on Eisenhower's foreign policy. . . .

His raid on Stevens is the end term in a progression. It is a progression which, we submit, points not merely to a desire to strengthen his own support and standing as against Eisenhower's—that is, not merely to an aim of winning over the Republican Party—but, in its public brutality, to an orientation of winning-or-else.

TO A SPLIT?

In their heyday in the deep '30s those New-Dealers who consciously held the perspective of winning over the Democratic Party to a program of fundamental social reform also looked upon themselves as a distinct faction struggling for party power; but they never dared to behave like this. Their hopes were concentrated on bringing the party along with them, along with the wave of the future which they felt they represented.

The Republican wing which stands behind McCarthyism (if not behind the individual McCarthy), or, more accurately, which denounces Eisenhower as "as bad as Truman," does not limit itself to tactics designed to bring the party as a more or less united whole along with them. More and more, wider sections of these anti-Eisenhower elements already in fact think of themselves as representing a different kind of party from Eisenhower's. They are daily gaining in self-consciousness under the "educational" influences at work in the murky reactionary atmosphere of the capital and the country.

Such are the forces driving toward a situation which could mean a split in the GOP. This drive is even more powerful and deep-going than the motives which led to the Dixiecrat split from the Democratic Party. But as has been mentioned, such an upheaval could not remain something affecting the Republican Party only.

An analogy: In the days when the labor-liberal New-Dealers were talking about a "new political realignment" through a victory of their "left wing" in the Democratic Party, their own expectation was that this would necessarily drive the conservative Democratic into coalition with their Republican similars. And it would have, if it had been more than a dream.

Under symmetrically opposite conditions, with the push coming from the right, such a GOP split as we have discussed would have a similar effect—all on a terrain far further to the right. A wing of the Republican Party would be driven by such an internal upheaval into coalition with its Democratic similars.

REALIGNMENT

The labor-liberals used to talk about a "new political realignment" coming through initiative from the left. As a result of the deepening reaction in the country, which their ineffectual policy has not been able to stem, the perspective now looms of a "new political realignment" which gets its drive from the self-confidence and aggressiveness of the far Right.

But though such a realignment would, in such case, come about in a way which is far less favorable, a Republican split could have the same effect of polarization, by leaving the labor-liberals with no political home that they could live in—that is, leave them with no alternative except to organize independently, in a third party.

It goes without saying that what we have now are only the forces which are driving in this direction. The "other Republican Party" which, we have said, is "striving to be born" is by no means homogeneous, nor is it simply coextensive with "McCarthyism." There are plenty of counter-influences which can short-circuit it. But it is an element in the dynamics of the present political situation which, we believe, is stronger than has been recognized. And in any case it is the element which points up the significance of McCarthy's war, not only against the army, but against the Eisenhower wing of his own party, so spectacularly evidenced in the Stevens fracas.



LABOR ACTION

March 8, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 10

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

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

NOW—IN ENGLISH
THE FAMED "VOLUME 4"
OF "CAPITAL"

**Karl Marx's
HISTORY OF
ECONOMIC
THEORIES**

PART ONE

Langland Press—337 pages—\$5.00

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

young socialist CHALLENGE

March 8, 1954

Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

Confab Defends Academic Freedom

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

On Saturday, February 26, an intercollegiate conference on Freedom was held at Sarah Lawrence College in Bronxville, New York. Several hundred delegates from fifty schools met to discuss Freedom and Its Relation to Politics, Religion, Education and the Arts. Young Socialist League members from New York and New Haven were present as delegates and observers and participated in all of the sessions of the conference.

The general mood of the Sarah Lawrence meeting was one which inspired hope in the Young Socialist League delegation. The students present were not necessarily political since they had been sent by student governments and not by independent campus organizations. Yet there was a general ferment, a belief that American freedom is in great danger, and a willingness at least to take a vocal stand against the oppression.

Whether or not this vocal stand can be translated into organized activity was the central question which the conference raised. The Young Socialist League delegation constantly insisted upon this point: that a ferment and a willingness to speak in defense of academic freedom and civil liberties was not enough—that this conviction must be made into action, and, more specifically, into political action.

ACTION NEEDED

The conference itself was not organized so that any kind of Continuation Committee for action projects could emerge. Thus the main question of whether or not these students were willing to act on their announced convictions was not answered. Young Socialist League floor leader, Bill Shirley, a delegate from Yale University, summed up the sentiment of the YSL delegation when he said, "I was heartened by the vigor of the discussion, but I don't know if these students were aware of the fact that discussion is not enough. It is our main job in the immediate future to work on the campus and to find out if this sentiment can be organized into effective action."

This question was obvious in the workings of the entire conference. The only political group openly represented at Sarah Lawrence was the Young Socialist League. Copies of the convention issue of *Challenge* were distributed to the delegates and those who showed interest in the YSL program were also given copies of *Anvil*. There was no reaction of open hostility toward the YSL.

On the various panels, this lack of conscious political direction was again obvious. Young Socialist League members who were present only as observers were nevertheless able to play a prominent role in the discussion. The student reaction on the panels was one of generalized hostility to the witchhunt, but the YSL was the only voice present which was able to specify the areas in which an actual program had to be worked out.

For example, in the Politics forum, the students were caught in a cross-fire between a Stalinoid approach and one of liberal capitulation to reaction. Yet both sides, Stalinoid and liberal, represented themselves in the guise of principled defense of civil liberties. In this situation, counter-argumentation had to come from the floor because the panel members were split on the basis of their own particular approach. Here the YSL was able to play a particularly active role.

On the whole, the conference was a sign of hope. Perhaps a thaw on the campus is taking place. Yet the Young Socialist League delegation was painfully aware that the sentiment was still far too generalized. The conference makes it clear that the League must redouble its efforts to work openly on the campus for the organization of this student conviction into action.

Young Socialists Call for Unity Against the Campus Witchhunt

By BOGDAN DENITCH

On Saturday, March 6, at the Ethical Culture Society's auditorium, a student meeting on Academic Freedom is taking place. This meeting, under the sponsorship of the Intercollegiate Committee for Academic Freedom, is called to discuss the problems involved and help plan for Academic Freedom week, which is to take place some time in April and involves nation-wide activities in defense of academic freedom.

If this Academic Freedom week really does mobilize active work on the part of the National Student Association and the bulk of the campus liberals, it will be the first time that a really major development has taken place in the student field since the beginning of the witchhunt. It is therefore natural that the YSL, as a consistently democratic youth organization, supports fully the efforts of the conference, and hopes that it may mark, if only in a small way, the turning of the tide on the campuses.

However, the problem is not as simple as it seems. No one except the wild men of the extreme right, represented politically by the Students for America, is against "academic freedom" but consistent and principled defenders of academic freedom are rare indeed.

Sidney Hook is "for" academic freedom; yet his "academic freedom" speci-

fically excludes the right of a Stalinist to teach. Gideonse of Brooklyn College is "for" academic freedom—and he bans student organizations and newspapers that take sharp issue with his college administration. The Stalinists are "for" academic freedom . . . except for their own enemies, wherever they have the power to suppress them under favorable conditions.

But there are also less well-known examples. How about the civil-libertarian president of City College, whose appointment was hailed by the liberals, who, while condemning the tactics of McCarthy investigation committee, in the same breath practically gives a free (and unsolicited) endorsement of the Jenner Committee? How about the ACLU which is split over the question of civil-liberties work on behalf of Stalinist totalitarians? How about the ADA? But there is little point in listing the "defenders" of academic freedom who defend the academic freedom of everybody except. . . .

Socialists are not happy about the failure of the liberals to consistently defend academic freedom and civil liberties. They are not happy about the fact that the student liberal movement has not fought for its own program in this field. They hail every effort of, and stand willing to offer all aid at their disposal to, the stu-

dent liberals in a fight for academic freedom. We say to the Students for Democratic Action: we don't ask you to fight for our program of opposition to capitalism and war; fight for yours—but fight, and you will find us working side by side with you.

The YSL feels that it is not enough to protest against isolated attacks on academic freedom, that it is essential to show the connection between the drive toward war and the drive toward conformity. It is no accident that the liberal and "socialist" defenders of the cold war also defend the corollary of the cold war at home: the drive toward silencing all opposition to the war preparation of our government.

This is why it is not enough to dismiss the attacks on dissenting thought as "McCarthyism"—because the attack pre-dates the senator from Wisconsin, because the pattern was laid previously under the Truman administration.

FOR A BROAD FRONT

To be sure, many Fair Dealers and liberals are outraged by McCarthyism—now that the witchhunt is extended against them. But they stood silent while victims were "only" Stalinists and their followers—just as the Stalinists stood, not silent but cheering, when the Smith Act was used "only" against the Trotskyists in Minneapolis.

It seems today that the witchhunt on the campus is beginning to slow down. The "silent generation" is beginning to murmur in protest. But sentiments are not enough. Meetings and conferences are only a step (and we might add a hesitant step since radical organizations of the youth are as yet carefully excluded from participation). What is needed is organization of all democratic elements on the campus for joint defense of academic freedom and civil liberties. It is essential that this be the work of the democratic groups on the campus because you cannot consistently defend democratic principles along with defenders of totalitarianism.

We call on the SDA and the other democratic student groups of the campus to begin organizing a broad democratic student front against further infringements of academic freedom. Such a grouping would not need to hide whatever differences existed so long as it agreed to work on one thing—defense of democracy for everybody:

(1) Defending the right of students to organize political groups of their own choosing, hear speakers of their own choosing, issue literature of their own choosing—irrespective of the political nature of such groups.

(2) Defending the right of Stalinists to teach, and insisting that the only criterion for hiring or firing a teacher is his ability to teach.

(3) Opposition to the militarization of the campus—that is, opposition to the ROTC.

You will find that at least in this fight we, revolutionary socialists, will work side by side with you.

Help Anvil!

The national office of the YSL reports that the units are slow on meeting their quotas for *Anvil*. Now while we have no doubt that the money will be in, since the drive is only for \$250, the point is that every day of delay postpones the appearance of the anti-war student magazine of the campuses—and consequently affects the sales.

We ask all members, friends and sympathizers to please help on the *Anvil* fund drive. The only anti-war student publication needs the money, and time is a major element in the drive. Send all contributions, noting the purpose, to the YSL National Office at 114 West 14 Street.

Forum on Youth & Politics Hears Young Socialist View

By EDWARD HILL

Community Church in New York City was the scene of a youth conference last weekend. Representatives of the Young Socialist League, Students for Democratic Action, Young Republicans, Young Democrats, Labor Youth League, Young People's Socialist League (Socialist Party youth group) and Students for America addressed an audience of some one hundred young people.

The YSL delegate to the conference was Michael Harrington, League NEC member. In his speech, he stated the broad League perspective of opposition to Stalinist and American imperialism, but he concentrated on the immediate problem of civil liberties, of conformity on the campus, and its relation to the war economy. In discussion groups afterward, a League delegation of fifteen members found that the YSL approach had probably attracted the most students in the audience.

The conference was significant in many ways. For one thing, it marked the open appearance of a representative and members of Students For America, an extreme right-wing group (bordering on the fascist) which grew out of the Students for MacArthur movement and has the general as its honorary president. The SFA speaker was received with laughter during his presentation, in which he presented a Manchester "liberal" line, punctuated by references to every other group present as "socialistic."

The Labor Youth League (Stalinist) was also present in force. They hammered on one point and one point only: a popular front of all anti-McCarthy groups. In this situation, the YSL group was the only one present with a long history of experience with LYL and similar organizations. The YSLers insisted that a unified front against McCarthyism was welcome, but demanded that such a movement require as a minimum agreement a statement on a principled defense of civil liberties.

When it became clear that the YSL included civil liberties even for fascists in the United States and for oppositionists in Stalinist territory, the Labor Youth League people fought against such insistence on "petty differences."

But perhaps the chief result of the conference was the overwhelming rejection of major-party youth groups by the students present. The Young Republican speaker had referred to all groups present, except his and the Young Democrats, as "splinters." But the youth of Community Church decisively rejected this point of view.

THE POLITICAL MOOD

There was a wide, vocal dissatisfaction with the Tweedledum and Tweedledee nature of the two parties. Students constantly expressed themselves as believing that there was little or no difference between the Republicans and the Democrats. Yet, except for YSL speakers, there was little realization of the need for independent national political action.

The situation was otherwise when it came to the campus. Here almost the entire group of students present agreed that one should join an independent political group rather than a major party satellite. The chief basis of differentiation between the nation and the campus seemed to be in the concrete awareness of the students that the major-party groups did nothing on campus except at election time. This was part of their own experience and they were quite willing to generalize it into a rejection of major-party groups and a predilection for independent political youth organization.

The Young Socialist League was able to make particularly friendly contact with the Students for Democratic Action and with the Community Church youth. Here there was real feeling of the possibility of joint action, of the necessity of rallying the American youth into organized activity for civil liberties and against the war-inspired witchhunt.

AMERICA'S COLD-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY

The Randall Report Prescribes Some Medicine

By SAM TAYLOR

What is the foreign economic policy of the United States to be in the next few years? Will the Eisenhower administration, for all the talk of a "dynamic" new policy, bring forth anything significantly different from the Truman policies?

The appearance of a report from any of the innumerable Eisenhower commissions is heralded by a fanfare of Bold New press releases as if a radically new program is to be announced. The report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy headed by Clarence Randall, chairman of the board of directors of the Inland Steel Corporation, is no exception to the gap between the press releases and reality.

For several years, ever since the end of the Second World War, there has been a steady succession of reports by commissions on foreign economic policy. Each one clarified, reiterated and validated the findings of the previous commission in most essential respects. Taken as the whole, the Randall report cannot be considered conservative as against the Gray and Rockefeller reports of the Truman administration. About the most important change is the defining of foreign economic policy in more openly nationalistic terms.

Professor Seymour Harris of Harvard, one of the most pro-Fair Deal economists commenting on the report, makes the observation:

"We have had a succession of reports on foreign economic policies of the U. S. The medicine has invariably been the same: lower tariffs, more imports and increased private lending by American investors. . . . On most issues the Randall report makes sense. Faced with an extremely difficult problem and composed of members with irreconcilable views, the commission produced a report about as good as could be expected."

The reasons for this are not difficult to see. Irrespective of the nuances of policy and the real or alleged blunders on the part of Secretary of State Dulles, the fundamental foreign policy of the Eisenhower and Truman administration is the same. Therefore while the various reports are not exactly a rewording of the previous ones, it is enough to know that they follow in similar well-defined footsteps; for only a radically different foreign policy will change the monotonous similarity.

The basic ideas of a foreign economic policy exhibit the same built-in military bias as they did under the Truman administration. It is the military that determines the political and economic policies.

It Is a Military Program

John Foster Dulles restated this rather clearly in a speech of January 12:

"There are still some strategic spots where local governments cannot maintain adequate armed forces without some financial help from us. In these cases we take the judgment of our military advisers as to how to proceed in the common interests. . . . But, broadly speaking, budgetary aid is being limited to situations which clearly contribute to military strength which also helps us."

Dulles does the service of speaking out clearly and to the point. Dean Acheson spoke of democracy and morality while formulating the same policy, and it must be admitted this led to a certain amount of confusion about their basic aims.

The Randall report signals a further cut in economic aid to Europe, and calls for its replacement to a large extent by government and private loans. Foreign aid has been one of the tenets of the liberal policy in the post-war years, but one that has become increasingly difficult for them to justify. The billions that the U. S. has poured into Europe has not really solved any of the problems of European capitalism despite the momentary appearance of a tenuous stability. As many liberals and the CIO have pointed out, the masses of the people have not benefited by this aid which primarily went into the hands of the capitalists and the rich. Certainly no democratic foreign policy can be built around this sort of program.

And the Europeans themselves are anxious to rid themselves of this American excuse for and means of arm-twisting. No more will they have to hear venerable U. S. senators get up in the halls of Congress and threaten to withdraw U. S. aid if France or England does not accede to American dictates.

The New York Times economic correspondent in Europe, Michael Hoffman, writes:

"There is no surprise here at the recommendation to end grants in aid to foreign governments except insofar as the United States' own security considerations make them necessary. 'Economic' aid has long been more of a prop to feeble governments than support to really national economies and Europeans in an overwhelming majority would like to have it finished, if possible in some rather spectacular manner that would imprint the date of economic independence on their memories." (Italics added.)

Shadow of a Program

The Randall report recommends a reduction in tariffs, an end to high farm-price supports which tend toward dumping, an end of the restrictive "Buy American" Act, an increase in East-West trade, increased foreign investment, a gradual convertibility of currencies, and a continuation of the modest point Four program. But all of these things were said before, and still there is the demand for the "fundamental" new foreign economic policies.

And even if they were carried out more fully than they have in

the past, how far would it go toward facing the problems ahead?

The Point Four program, now called technical assistance, is scarcely more than a shadow of its former pretensions. It is not to be a "big money" or a capital investment program, but just what it is called: technical assistance. The short life of the Point Four program should serve as a reminder of the important part that America's wealth can play in the development of many areas of the world and of the fact that American capitalism is not going to play a progressive role. But above all it demonstrated that this development will have to be accompanied by a social revolution in these countries.

Exactly how would less restrictive trade practices, lower tariffs and convertible currency meet the problem of the sagging capitalist economies in Europe? These could only begin to approach the wished-for way of functioning if the capitalist system itself were in a healthy state; they are the result and not the cause of stability. It is for this reason that Western trade practices have become more restrictive; these practices have been attempts to build some kind of stability within the narrower national economies because a free international economy has become less stable as capitalism itself has weakened.

The United States has a decisive role to play in world affairs, and a foreign economic policy can be only as effective and democratic as the foreign policy of which it is a part. A foreign policy that is built around military needs and an alliance with a coalition of conservative and reactionary regimes will look more or less like the present foreign policy, and will be about as effective. It will proceed from crisis to crisis in desperate search of a means of seizing the ever elusive "initiative" against a more dynamic enemy.

There will be "foreign aid" for Franco's Spain, for France in Indo-China, for Formosa, for Turkey, and for Pakistan—and for any country going along with the political dictates of the United States. The foreign economic policy will be used alternately to grease the path to military alliance and to blackjack recalcitrants (as it did in the Iranian oil dispute). Economic aid will be turned on and off like a faucet depending on the turns in U. S. foreign policy, as in the Israel-Jordan dispute. This policy will provide for the construction of air bases in Spain, and the extraction of oil from the Middle East. It will do all sorts of things—except effectively meet the threat of Stalinism and assist in the raising of living standards throughout the world.

Puerto Rico Issue — —

(Continued from page 1)

vote by the people.

He expects that Munoz, the leader of the ruling Popular Party of the island, will never compel him to dishonor this pledge.

More than once, in the course of the last few decades, the Puerto Rican people have given big majorities to parties which swept into office on their pledge that they would fight for independence. Munoz Marin himself originally took power as an advocate of independence, not as a Washington collaborator. Part of the incomprehending frustration that feeds the terrorist moods of the Nationalists arises from such repeated betrayal by U. S.-corrupted politicians.

Secondly, it is not true that "their constitution gives them power to pass their own laws and govern themselves." Or rather, this is half a lie.

Even under the terms of the Puerto Rican constitution itself, which the U. S. submitted to island vote, the legislative assembly is debarred from the following spheres: any matters relating to the military, foreign policy or foreign trade affairs. The Puerto Rican people are prohibited from taking steps toward economic independence from the U. S. economy that it is tied to; and they cannot exercise the functions of a sovereign state in a wartorn world, where they have become a prime atomic-bomb target as a result of being used as an armed base by the U. S.

Furthermore, since Puerto Rico comes under the laws of Congress, any laws passed by Congress take precedence over any Puerto Rican laws in case of conflict; the U. S., or at least its Congress, can veto any island laws that get by the local quislings.

Puerto Rico has no voting representative in this Congress which controls it. It has only a non-voting delegate who has to get the consent of Congress even to talk. (Congress freely gave him this consent last week to denounce not only the Nationalists but advocates of independence. . . .)

The American draft law applies to Puerto Rico even though the Puerto Rican people had nothing to say in its passage. (That is also one reason why there have been 100,000 violators in Puerto Rico of the 1948 conscription law, and why 28.5 per cent of the eligible re-

fused to register—of whom only a dozen were ever brought to trial.)

There is another angle to the record of betrayal of promises to Puerto Rico, an angle which is directly related to the occasion which the terrorists used to shoot up Congress. As Lolita Lebron told the press, she chose the time because of the opening of the Inter-American Conference at Caracas, to gain attention.

At the Inter-American Conference of 1948 in Bogata, a resolution was passed to set up a commission to investigate the Puerto Rico question. The following year this commission met at Havana and adopted a resolution raising Puerto Rico's right to self-determination. From that day to this, nothing so far has come out of all that. This same commission is supposed to report to the present Caracas conference under a point of the agenda. The previous record of these conferences, which strain away from the U. S. big stick but at the same time tend to capitulate to it, has not been an encouraging one.

Finally there are the press falsifications of the meaning of the vote to adopt the Puerto Rican constitution. Did not an overwhelming proportion of the island vote go to approve it? Yes, a majority of those voting.

In the first place, this was a "Ja-Nein" vote: the people were given no other choice. But the fact is, besides, that a majority of the Puerto Rican people did not vote for the Constitution. They abstained. The Nationalist Party was pushing such a boycott of the vote. (That does not mean that a majority were supporters of this party, but it does indicate that the official story is misleading demagoguery.)

Yet in 1940, when Munoz's Popular Party presented itself at the general election for the first time, as independence advocates, and aroused high hopes among the people, there was at least a 90 per cent turnout of the vote, as compared with the majority abstention or boycott of the constitution referendum.

These are the facts. They can speak more powerfully than the misguided guns of the three in the House gallery. The furor over the latter's act can serve to obscure them, but they must be made known by those who believe in fighting for Puerto Rico's freedom by the means of organizing political mass struggle rather than terrorism.

YOU and SCIENCE

Discussion on the Hawthorne Experiments in Factory Relations and Parapsychology

This You and Science column is turned over to discussion by readers on some questions raised in previous columns by Comrade Carl Darton—Ed.

About Hawthorne

To the Editor:

Recently Eric Fromm cited favorably the classical studies at the Western Electric Hawthorne plant, together with facts drawn from C. Wright Mill's *White Collar*, to show the psychological need for a new social system. Fromm stated plainly that, in his opinion, only democratic socialism could furnish the basis for psychologically sound relations of men to their work. (Lecture on "The Psychological Meaning of Work in Contemporary Society," Feb. 4, 1954.)

The Feb. 22 issue of *LA* carries an article [Science column] by Carl Darton in which these studies are inadequately described, and possible insights ignored. The article shows little appreciation for the social-psychological problems involved: "Thus from such experiments the 'Human Relations' administrators found that output and profits increased when working teams were organized and the workers given the illusion that their well-being—always measured by output records, of course—was being taken care of." A conviction that socialists cannot afford to give this field the once-overlightly leads me to continue the discussion.

Here is a brief report on the five-year relay assembly test room experiment (1927-1932):

(1) Two workers who were known to be friendly were asked to choose the remaining four of the group.

(2) The nature of the test (study of working conditions) was carefully explained.

(3) "They were repeatedly asked, as they were in the first interview, not to strain but to work 'as they felt.'" (George C. Homans, in *Readings in Social Psychology*, 1947, Henry Holt & Co.)

(4) The girls had a "test room observer," but no supervisor in the ordinary sense. In response to questioning, the girls let it be known: "First, the girls liked to work in the test room; 'it was fun.' Second . . . the absence of the old supervisory control made it possible for them to work freely without anxiety." (Ibid.) For example: "Talk became common and often loud and general," whereas in the regular department it was, in principle, not permitted.

(5) "The reasons for the contemplated experimental changes were explained to them. Their views were consulted and in some instances they were allowed to veto what had been proposed."

(6) The workers formed a group that met outside the plant for social activity.

(7) Production rose continuously from the onset of the experiments. It did not seem related to controlled variations of the experimental conditions. Planned elimination of rest periods did not change weekly production substantially; nor did the institution of the 32-hour week.

(8) Eventually the group developed a leader under whose influence the goal of increased production was adopted. This took place after two of the original workers had left. It is claimed, however, that the development of this group aim was an outgrowth of the participation in an experiment, etc.

Another Hawthorne study contrasts sharply with this one: the "Bank Wiring Observation Room" study. The workers involved did not have their conditions of work changed, except that they were placed in a test room and an observer assigned to them. The group disregarded the openly assigned observer, after a period of time. Production did not change, nor did the group's systematic limitation of it. "Standardization" of output figures continued.

The conclusions of the standard writers on the relay test room experiment are as follows: Increased production was due to: (1) feelings of "recognition" due to participation in an important experiment, and interest shown in the individual employees; (2) greater participation in decision-making and information-sharing; (3) an improved informal social organization within the group. (See R. M. Bellows, "Psycho. of Pers. in Bus. and Industry," 1949.)

Some conclusions on the second experi-

ment are as follows: "The Bank Wiring Observation Room seemed to show that action taken in accordance with the technical organization [management's operating plan and executive machinery—D. R. C.] tended to break up, through continual change, the routines and human associations which gave work its value. The behavior of the employees could be described as an effort to protect themselves against such changes, to give management the least possible opportunity of interfering with them."

"Roethlisberger and Dickson made the following observations: 'The worker occupies a unique place in the social organization. He is always in the position of having to accommodate himself to changes he does not originate. Although he participates least in the technical organization, he bears the brunt of most of its activities.'" (Homans, *ibid.*)

Two of Eric Fromm's conditions for meaningful work in modern society are an extension of the above conclusions from the Hawthorne studies: (1) Active participation in all aspects of the work process, with a wide range of technical, economic, and scientific knowledge; knowing the place of the work in the totality of the work process. (2) Working relatedly, and responding to others in the work situation.

A close study of the materials of industrial and social psychology leads in the direction of socialism; but it is more because the entire labor movement has something to learn from these fields that we should give them close attention. These are some questions posed by even the now-old Hawthorne studies:

(1) How important are the "non-economic" and non-physical aspects of working conditions to the individual worker?

(2) Should the unions leave it solely to management to manipulate (or neglect) aspects of working conditions usually described as psychological or sociological?

(3) Darton ridicules supposedly management-oriented studies such as "Maladjustment of Industrial Workers." Have the unions shown sufficient understanding or concern for mental health of workers, both in and out of the plants?

(4) What have we to learn on a theoretical or general level from these fields?

The answers are not simple. Even the scope of the questions cannot be appreciated without a closer and more sympathetic familiarity.

D. R. C.

On Scientific Method

To the Editor:

Darton's article, "Some Fallacies of 'Parapsychology,'" in the Feb. 1 issue of *LABOR ACTION* [in the Science column] has come to my attention and I would like to make several comments on both the nature and content of the article, which I consider to be un-Marxist and inimical to the scientific-materialist method of the Marxist movement in general.

In the final paragraph he states: "... we believe that parapsychology can find credence only in an age which is half-scientific. In times of frustration like ours it is nice to believe in the impossible, not the 'impossible' which can be brought into being by work and effort but that of the mystical and irrational. . . ."

This supposition, it appears, to me, is the key to the reasoning in the entire article—and if so, it seems to me a false line of thought. While it asserts quite rationally that a pseudo-science can gain general credence in an age—like ours, more apparently hideous than real—it does not in the least discredit the particular science (or even "pseudo-science") under consideration, any more than it could be considered that the theory of evolution was "discredited" as soon as

it was pointed out that it owed its origin to a century that was profoundly materialistic and scientific in its outlook. Obviously, such an explanation only explains why a theory, an idea, appears or becomes popular at a certain cultural stage.

In his article Darton makes the further error of phrasing his attack on Mr. Huxley's article in *Life* (which is unfortunately not available to me at the moment) as though such attack were definitive for the field as a whole. The somewhat ambiguous sentence to the effect that he "realize(s) that parapsychology is more than an accounting of personal experiences, but such experiments as Rhine carries out are an attempt to prove 'scientifically' that they are evidence of the existence of 'psi,'" does not in the least identify Mr. Huxley's article with relation to the entire literature of parapsychology, both classical and modern, and leaves the impression that Mr. Huxley's article is either typical or representative of such literature. On the basis of the examples abstracted from Huxley's article I would say that this is simple misrepresentation; the acceptance of the work of an amateur in distinction to that of the professional, and the attempt to discredit the latter through an attack on the former.

It is my opinion finally that a more distinct purpose would have been served had Darton decided either to attack Huxley's article as it stands and let things go at that; attack the general field of parapsychology on whatever scientific grounds he may consider plausible; or, even more justifiably, attempt an analysis of that factor suggested in the quoted paragraph which provides within our society grounds for an acceptance of parapsychology, interpretation of its results, quite exceeding and at variance with its own pretensions.

E. CONTRERAS

Mexico, D. F.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Djilas's Views On Organization

To the Editor:

There is all the difference in the world between the organization of support for an idea and the support of an organization built around an idea. Keeping this difference in mind, we can see that there is really no ground for saying of Djilas that "there is a contradiction in his breast." (Hal Draper in *LA*, February 8.) Two ideas contained in the passages which Comrade Draper has quoted from Djilas are sound and important, and if these are taken into account the charge of contradiction disappears. (There may be some comrades which still wish to say that Djilas is wrong, but it will have to be on different grounds.)

Djilas is saying in the first place that he does not wish to commit all over again the mistakes of the bureaucrats: He does not wish to build an elaborate piece of political machinery which will remain as a parasitic and oppressive burden after the ideas have outlived their usefulness. He sees that bureaucracy hinders the development of new ideas and prevents their adoption to meet the changing needs of society. He does not wish his ideas (through an organization built around them) to become the same sort of shackles on society as have the original Communist ideas established in Yugoslavia after the war. He knows that it is impossible for him (or any other well-meaning person) to prevent bureaucracy simply by resolutions or will-power, or by being less sinister than his predecessors. It is necessary that the ideas be developed in some other way than by building an organization around them.

Readers of *LA* should be especially responsive to this point, since they show a general awareness of the fact that, in order to avoid in the future bureaucratic consequences similar to those of the Russian Revolution, it is not sufficient merely to be more honorable men than Lenin and Stalin and to have more democratic intentions. It is only actions, not intentions, which have objective consequences. Therefore it is necessary to deal with similar situations in a different manner.

This is what Djilas recognizes, and he is seeking to take more democratic steps than Communists in the past toward the realization of his ideas. The alternative he suggests is that the vigorous popular expression of ideas will itself force democratization on the party level.

This leads us directly into the second point which Djilas has in mind. The support for new ideas cannot be organized from the top, but must be expressed from the people. Thus there is no contradiction when Djilas says that "he needn't form an opposition group, but nevertheless part of the objective process of 'inevitability' is the organization of support around the given idea by the 'people.'" (Draper, *op. cit.* His emphasis.) Djilas is (or was) one of the top dogs in Yugoslavia, and therefore an opposition group organized by him would have something false and artificial about it, no matter how sound his ideas. The realization of an idea becomes inevitable, on the other hand, when support is organized by the people, because the idea is then within the consciousness of the people and the support for it is solid. It cannot (as is the case with an opposition group organized from above) be subverted by manipulation at the top level.

Djilas seems to have conceived his role to be that of awakening ideas within the consciousness of the people by means of publication, rather than as that of pushing ideas into the mouths of the people by means of organization. This cannot be labeled a contradiction except by denying these two ideas Djilas had in mind and by overlooking a fundamental distinction: that between stimulating support for an idea and organizing politically around an idea. Far from being paradoxical or muddle-headed, Djilas' position lies at the heart of the ideological break with bureaucratic communism.

Newt GARVER

Oxford, England

Comrade Garver's first point is that "It is necessary that the ideas be promoted in some other way than by building an organization around them." (See also the "distinction" in his last paragraph.) Does he really mean that one should

not try to build an organization to further one's political program? I am not sure. In any case, this isn't the place (nor is Djilas the question) for me to argue in favor of the need for organization as a social duty, a moral duty and a democratic duty.

If Comrade Garver is simply recommending that one should not build a bureaucratic type of organization—or one "which will remain as a parasitic and oppressive burden after the ideas have outlived their usefulness"—then of course one can only agree in general; but it is very general.

Perhaps (as his second point implies) Comrade Garver is merely advocating that "support for new ideas cannot be organized from the top" but only "by the people." We can all agree that a healthy organization cannot be formed only from the top, i.e., bureaucratically. But that truism is not involved here. It is a question of a man like Djilas lending his influence and help ("from the top") to stimulate and encourage the democratic organization of his co-thinkers from below. I am not discussing here whether that was possible for Djilas tactically—but only the general conception of organization suggested by Garver.

Lastly, Djilas indisputably does not hold Garver's point of view. What I had pointed out was this: that in an article Djilas fell into a semi-anarchistic rationalization through his anxiety to defend himself from the charge that he wished a faction (note: whether that faction was formed from above or below). The real danger he was seeking to avoid was not any of those that Garver is concerned about, but a much more immediate one: the ax. And he is not the man to think a question through consistently. It was Djilas himself who spoke of that contradiction in one's breast; I picked it up from him. The anarchist view on organization can be a consistent one, but Djilas considers himself a Marxist; the idea he fell into was not consistent for him.

To hail the emergence of the Djilas opposition tendency, as we do, does not require us to get enthusiastic about all of Djilas's first attempts to think out his own ideas.

Hal DRAPER

McCarthy Struggle for Power —

(Continued from page 1)

was an unknown crank who cried him out. Now it is Joe McCarthy, a not-uninfluential figure in the Republican Party, who accuses the U. S. army, under its Republican administrators, of deliberately sheltering known Communists, plunging the party into a first-rate crisis.

It all began when McCarthy insulted Brigadier General Ralph W. Zwicker in the course of investigating dentist Major Irving Peress.

Many months after Peress was inducted into the army as a dentist, in October 1952, he refused to sign a loyalty questionnaire and an army investigation was begun. While under investigation, he was promoted, as a matter of routine, from captain to major. On January 18, this year, the adjutant general directed that he be given an honorable discharge within 90 days.

WANTS TO BE BOSS

Before his discharge was effected, Peress was called before the McCarthy committee, where he refused to answer questions on the ground of the Fifth Amendment. McCarthy demanded that he be court-martialed. But three days later, Peress applied for and received his honorable discharge.

Note: all this took place under the Eisenhower regime. It was regular and according to procedure. Obviously, something had slipped somewhere; some defect in regulations thwarted a burning at the stake.

But Peress was out. Secretary of the Army Robert Stevens, in a polite letter to McCarthy, admitted that such procedural weaknesses had existed but he hastened to add that they had already been corrected and it wouldn't happen again. Case closed. Naturally, it was still possible to open all cavities filled by the suspected subversive in a search for hidden microfilm. But that could be done anytime.

Closed? Not for Joe McCarthy. The army hadn't clicked its heels upon his order. Besides, he had an account to square with Stevens, who had ridiculed his spy hunt at Fort Monmouth.

If the senator's expressed objective, the hunting down of Communists, was his real goal, he should have been satisfied with Stevens' reply. But his ambitions soar far beyond the simple correction of regrettable procedures.

"McCarthy's purpose is plain enough. . . . He is candidate for supreme boss—for the dictatorship—of the Republican Party," writes Walter Lipmann. And to speed this objective along, he has to terrorize not just "Communists," not just liberal Democrats, but also those within his own party who stand up to him.

He summoned General Zwicker, Peress' superior, for interrogation. Zwicker refused to answer a series of questions on the grounds that he was forbidden by army regulations to reply. Zwicker had been a hero of the Battle of the Bulge, decorated thirteen times. But McCarthy was not to be misled; he suspected that beneath this beribboned breast beat the heart of a Communist-coddler.

THE SURRENDER

"You are a disgrace to the uniform," sneered the senator, "you're shielding Communist conspirators. You are going to be put on public display next Tuesday. You're not fit to be an officer. You're ignorant." As James Reston put it, he assumed the right "to treat generals like juvenile delinquents." Zwicker took offense.

Secretary of the Army Stevens bridled, and without consulting Eisenhower, announced that he would permit no further browbeating of army officers; that he himself, and no others, would testify before the committee. A date was set for a showdown; Stevens would appear before McCarthy in full view of the television cameras.

What was at stake, according to various reports, was the "morale of the army," "national defense," "trying to avoid the melancholy experiences of the Foreign Service" demoralized by McCarthy, the "rights of the Executive" and other far-reaching matters. McCarthy had to be curbed. But he was not.

On the eve of the awaited confrontation, Republican members of the McCarthy committee organized the capitulation to him. Stevens was maneuvered

into surrendering at the very moment when he thought he had achieved a great victory, only to discover what really had happened in newspaper headlines.

No one bothered to tell the president what was going on; he must not be diverted from an intense preoccupation with platitudes by mere critical emergencies. Later, when he learned what had happened, Eisenhower authorized a vigorous criticism of "browbeating" directed against no one and nothing in particular. As always, he stands foursquare for virtue if only someone could explain simply where this elusive quality was to be found at any given moment.

TO THE END

In a comedy of errors, McCarthy won again. The press was almost unanimously against him; liberals, "responsible" conservatives—all joined in deploring the humiliation of Stevens. If only the administration were more alert, more aggressive; if only Eisenhower could be torn away from golf practice; if only the trout were not so obligingly drawn to his floating dry fly, if only . . . things would be different. But McCarthy's streak of victories is not due to someone's minor oversight.

Behind him, is a powerful wing of the party. He knows how to manipulate and utilize the witchhunt mood, the fear of "subversion," the atmosphere of anti-democracy which he and others have helped to create. Others began the "loyalty" purges, the hunt for dissenters. He demands that it be carried out to the end.

He insists in effect, that all sympathizers of "communism," interpreted in its widest sense, be deprived of all rights and be placed outside the law—specifically, in concentration camps, in the case of "army reds." Those who object are no better; they are "Communist-coddlers" and must be rooted out themselves. Those who stand in his way are guilty of "treason."

Those who grant that "loyalty" purges are right can only whine ineffectually at McCarthy's methods. But they get nowhere. Every important political faction capitulates to him in its own way for its own special reasons, but all these reasons can be summed up under one main heading: capitulation to the mood of anti-democracy. Even poor Zwicker, reeling from insults, murmurs his endorsement of McCarthy's aims.

The leaders of the administration, its strategists and statesmen, know that McCarthy and the right wing of the party are a threat to them. But they are determined to utilize the witchhunt against the Democratic Party. In the name of party "unity" they give him free rein. Attorney General Brownell defined the ground to be defended by his party, when he accused Truman of shielding traitors.

DEMS' ROLE

The Eisenhower wing of the party understands perhaps that the spread of crude McCarthyism, the rise of its influence, and above all its rise to power within their party would be fatal to it and a disaster for the interests of the country, as they interpret these interests. But they hope to use McCarthy for their narrow political purposes. That is why, as Arthur Krock puts it, "they can only hope to tame him by a proof that reform is in his own interest."

But they cannot remove him. And even if they were to try, they would discover

that behind McCarthy the individual stands a powerful section of the party.

The Democrats maintained a diplomatic silence throughout. It was their administration which began the witchhunt and helped to create the very mood which is directed now against them. It was they who started the "loyalty" purges, passed the Smith Act, invented the "subversive lists." And so they are not to be tricked now into a forthright stand for democratic rights or even into a firm stand in defense of Stevens.

NOT CLOSED

"Secretary Stevens actively was soliciting help from the Democratic members of Senator McCarthy's subcommittee," wrote W. H. Lawrence in the New York Times. They were willing; but when Stevens was maneuvered to his knees, they lapsed into silence.

These Democratic heroes recently returned to the committee (from which they had withdrawn in protest) presumably because their main grievance against its chairman had been propitiated. McCarthy enjoys the moral support of Democrats who sit on his committee. But then, hasn't he also just succeeded in winning the votes of the "Fair Dealers" in the Senate for his committee appropriations?

The incident is not quite closed. Everyone else may be willing to compromise a little. But not, apparently, McCarthy. To reports that he had admitted mistreatment of Zwicker he replied, "That's a lie." Only a few days after the notorious memorandum in which Stevens signed away his principles under the illusion that army officers were to be treated politely, McCarthy announced that Zwicker was either wrong or a perjurer.

'Separation of Powers' Is No Real Issue in the Peress Case

By GORDON HASKELL

In the case of Senator McCarthy vs. the Army of the United States, a broad spectrum of opinion has found agreement in focusing on one point. This spectrum reaches from the organs of respectable and "responsible" Republican opinion to the farthest reaches of liberal New-Dealism.

The point on which they agree is that what was involved here, among other things or even mainly, was a conflict between the executive and legislative branches of the government in which the former failed to protect its proper prerogatives and functions. In giving in to McCarthy the army, headed by the president, permitted a grievous blow to be struck at the separation of powers established by the Constitution, and thus permitted the basic structure of American government to be undermined. So goes their argument.

It is quite true that in winning this "fight" McCarthy has further strengthened the most reactionary wing of the Republican Party, has increased the power of the myth of his invincibility, and has spread fear and demoralization into the ranks of the army as well as an increase of these trends in the country as a whole.

These real and significant consequences of the McCarthy victory are discussed in other articles in this issue. Yet the strongest stand of the liberal and conservative opponents of McCarthy was taken on the issue of his alleged invasion of the powers of the executive.

CONCEDED

Insofar as this was an issue, it was the one on which McCarthy stood formally on the strongest ground, and his critics on shifting sands. For many of them it can be affirmed that the reason they chose this as the issue was that they had conceded the real ones in advance.

The facts, insofar as they have a bearing on this point, are simply these. McCarthy found out that the army had given an honorable discharge to a medical officer, Peress, who had refused to give it certain "loyalty" data about himself, and who had stood on the Fifth Amendment when questioned by McCarthy about Stalinist affiliations. McCarthy then demanded that General Zwicker, Peress' commanding officer, tell him who had ordered the honorable dis-

charge and why. Zwicker refused to give this information on the ground that there is an Executive Order in existence forbidding government officers to divulge any information about security or loyalty files or procedures. In addition, the general gave a number of evasive answers about his personal knowledge of the "charges" made by McCarthy against Peress.

McCarthy used abusive language in questioning Zwicker. The secretary of the army then said that neither Zwicker nor other officers would be subjected to McCarthy's abuse in the future, and later capitulated on this point as well as on the point of withholding information about the Peress discharge from McCarthy.

NO SAFEGUARD

In all this, it is difficult to see in what way the prerogatives or powers of the executive have been unconstitutionally invaded by McCarthy. We are against permitting the Wisconsin bully to abuse any witnesses, and this goes for generals too. We know that McCarthy's interest in the Peress matter has nothing to do with a real concern for security, or with any legitimate attempt to uncover improper executive procedures. But this was no more and no less true when he was calling before his committee the authors of books, on the transparent grounds that he was seeking from them information on how their books got into government libraries abroad.

The Senate put McCarthy in the chair of his committee with a pretty good idea of what he would do with the chairmanship. After a year's experience with his "investigations," all the Democrats as well as Republicans in it voted overwhelmingly to give him the appropriation he asked, with only one senator voting against. An investigation of the administration's "loyalty" procedures in general and their application in any particular case is certainly within the rights and duties of the legislature. That, we repeat, is as far as concerns the formal or technical right; but it is just this that we are discussing in this note—the fact that so many liberals have chosen to level their attack on this ground.

The fact that these rights are being exercised in a reactionary manner, in a way which tears down the fabric of civil liberties instead of supporting it, is the

responsibility of the political parties which run the government and which have it in their power to bounce the inquisitor who abuses his rights. The separation of powers is no safeguard against reaction. This was demonstrated once again in the Peress case.

ADMISSIONS

In the midst of the outcry in all but the most reactionary sections of the press on the great issue of "invasion of the executive function," we find curious "admissions" that in the substance of the matter, the army was vulnerable. Thus Arthur Krock in the New York Times for February 24 wrote that "the facts demanded by McCarthy, though in his own brutal way, are legitimate matters of public information."

Once that is admitted, there can be no further question about the invasion of the prerogatives of the executive. And even if the administration gives McCarthy all the information he wants, and fires every officer who participated in the decision to discharge Peress honorably, it still has nothing to do with the question. It will only demonstrate that there is no fundamental difference of interest or of principle between the legislature which put McCarthy where he is and the administration which yields, happily or reluctantly, as the case may be, to his demands.

That is an argument, and a powerful one, for replacing the whole government with a better one. That is why we are for the formation of a labor party which can do the job. But let us not obscure the real problem by making up a phony issue about the separation of powers.

A Basic Pamphlet —

**SOCIALISM:
THE HOPE OF
HUMANITY**

by
Max Shachtman

Read it!

10 cents

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City