

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

CIO Union on 'Security' Firings . . . page 2

The New United Oil Workers Union . . . page 3

McDonald Rabbit-Punches Reuther . . . page 2

SPIDER SCHNEIDER IN PARIS

. . . page 4

MARCH 15, 1954

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

Come In with Clean Hands, Adlai

Adlai Stevenson actually came right out and attacked McCarthyism, in his Miami speech before the Southern conference of the Democratic Party; and it is a real measure of the times that by this fact alone Fair Deal liberals have drawn a long breath and declared that the party's honor has been saved.

What it measures, of course, is the degree to which the Democrats, and not only the Eisenhower Republicans, have fled before McCarthy's assaults. That was measured in one way, numerically, when all but one Democrat in the Senate, down to Lehman, voted to give McCarthy funds for his smear chest. It was measured when the Democratic members of the McCarthy Bund subcommittee returned to their seats in his star chamber. It was measured when that poor woodenhead, Stevens, tried to get support from the Democratic subcommittee members and failed, as soon as it was clear that Eisenhower was not standing by him.

But anyway, the titular leader of the party has dared to attack McCarthyism, and a simulacrum of a political opposition is preserved, even though it is the most cowardly opposition that has ever been seen in our political history.

It is hard enough to get enthusiastic about this fact by itself, and much harder when we remember three other considerations.

(1) While Stevenson is hailed for his courage and forthrightness in speaking out against McCarthyism—what an age and what a political situation it takes to make that believable even to us who are living through it!—it is also clear that even in this much he is not speaking for the Democratic Party.

"The most powerful Democrats in Congress have no intention of following the lead of Adlai E. Stevenson in directly attacking . . . McCarthy and Eisenhower. . . . His address has not gone down well with most of those Democrats who basically control the party in Congress and make its record. . . . Democratic Congressional opinion that entirely supported Mr. Stevenson's position seemed on rather general inquiry to be in the minority." So reported the N. Y. Times' William S. White on March 9.

The view of the real powers in the Democratic Party was "that the Democrats could not directly attack 'McCarthyism' without being accused of being 'soft on communism' and that therefore they ought to concentrate almost exclusively on other issues, and particularly the economic situation."

DOUBLE FOR THE DEMS

One thing this means is that Stevenson's attack on Eisenhower, for not checking McCarthy, could more reasonably be directed to his own party. Everything he said about Eisenhower in this regard goes double for the Democrats—precisely because McCarthy isn't their own party's baby, and they therefore are even freer than Eisenhower to attack him.

If "a group of political plungers has

(Turn to last page)

LESSON IN U.S. IMPERIALISM:

Economic Pressure: Dulles' Big Stick at Caracas

By GORDON HASKELL

The Tenth Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, presents a striking picture of U. S. imperialism at work. It illustrates its very special character, that which makes it possible for its spokesmen to deny that it is any kind of imperialism at all, and for vast numbers of North Americans to accept this denial as good coin.

But the foreign ministers of the Latin American countries at Caracas, and tens of millions of the peoples of the countries they represent, have learned in the hard school of exploitation and oppression that "Yankee imperialism" is not just a catchword but a hard reality.

Before the conference got under way, it was clear that there was a sharp division between what the Latin American countries hoped would come out of it and the objectives pursued by the U. S. The former were hoping for economic aid and concessions which would ease their position as raw-material-producing countries. The U. S. was determined to lay the groundwork for the justification of intervention in Latin America against the growth of Stalinist movements there, and even of other social movements which

could be grouped under the label of "international Communism."

As we go to press, with the conference still in progress, the U. S. has duly waved the carrot of economic concessions before the assemblage, in the form of some vague references to loans which may be made available, under proper circumstances, by the Export-Import Bank. Then came the big push toward its political goal for the conference in the form of a resolution against interna-

tional Communism."

The resolution describes "international Communism" as "interventionist," "aggressive" and a "special and immediate threat to the internal security of the American states, and to the right of each state to develop its cultural, political and economic life freely and naturally without intervention in its internal or external affairs by other states."

It goes on to "condemn the activities of the international Communist movement."

(Turn to last page)

New Anti-Semitic Push Quietly Under Way in Stalinist States

By AL FINDLEY

A cold pogrom against the Jews of the Stalinist satellite countries is spreading and threatens to reach new heights in the Iron Curtain domain.

The Jewish Telegraphic Agency, quoting Radio Free Europe, reports that 23 Jews were arrested by the Stalinist secret police in Pilsen, Czechoslovakia, on the charge of "secret contact" with foreign Jewish organizations.

The JTA also reports that only a little while ago Premier Zapotocky placed the blame for the breakdown of the Czech production plans on "Zionism" and the remnants of the "Slansky group." Slansky, former secretary general of the Czech CP, who also happened to be Jewish by birth, was tried and executed as a "Zionist imperialist agent." The trial of Slansky and his co-defendants was full of open and veiled anti-Semitic statements made by the official prosecution.

The arrest of the 23 Jews took place in February. Since the majority of Jews who remain in Czechoslovakia maintain correspondence with, and/or receive bundles from, other countries they are all vulnerable to accusation. They also fear that this may be the beginning of a

new anti-Semitic campaign.

Readers of LABOR ACTION are acquainted with the anti-Semitic phase of the last years of Stalin. Jews were eliminated from the foreign office, restricted in the army and engineering professions; alone of all nationalities denied the use of their language; all Jewish organizations, even those of 1000 per cent Stalinist character, dissolved; a widespread public campaign conducted to place the blame for "cosmopolitanism" on the "landless," "rootless" "traders," almost all of whom were Jews and who were caricatured in the Stalinist press with long noses and Shylock features. The climax was reached in the fantastic charges against the Jewish doctors of the Kremlin who were supposed to have plotted the medical murder of leading Stalinists on the order of the Joint Distribution Committee, a Jewish relief agency.

NEW DRIVE

After Stalin's death, his apparent heir threw the charges out as fraudulent, as an attempt to stir up "national hatreds." It seemed as if the anti-Zionist, and especially the anti-Jewish, policy of the Stalinists in Russia and in the satellite countries had changed. However, the information now coming through the Iron Curtain, of which

(Continued on page 6)

His Heart Belongs to Wall Street

When a banker goes to Washington to become a government official, do his loyalties remain with the banking fraternity or does he become a "servant of the people"?

There may be few who don't know the answer, it's good to have a banker-bureaucrat tell it publicly.

Samuel C. Waugh, Dulles' assistant secretary of state for economic affairs, speaking before the trust division of the American Bankers Association on Feb. 8, was no less frank than cabinet member McKay who last year blurted out that "We are in the saddle as an administration representing business and industry."

"You do not shake off the friendship, loyalties and associations—some of 40 years' standing—merely by hanging your hat in a new office in Washington. I feel that my responsibility in Washington is to represent the point of view and the purpose which has always permeated our thinking as Trustmen [trust-bankers]—the purpose of preserving the traditions, the worthwhile values and our habits of living which we have come to call the American way of life."

CIO Electrical Union Will Treat 'Security' Firings As Trade-Union Grievance

Last week an important American trade union, the CIO Electrical Workers, took the first step toward limiting the union-busting potential of the loyalty and security program. At a meeting of the IUE-CIO Civil Rights Committee on Sunday, March 7, in New York, Committee Chairman (and national IUE officer) Al Hartnett announced that the IUE Executive Board had voted to treat security firings "just like any other discharge" and to put the power of the union behind a fired worker in arbitration proceedings.

Concern over the problem in IUE arose over a serious incident at a Sperry Gyroscope plant in New York. Seven union members were brought up for firing by the company on the basis of a letter from government security officials. The discharge question was not under the government. It was a private firing using federal information as its basis. According to one of the delegates at the IUE meeting, the men involved were not doing classified work. One was a past vice-president of the union local at Sperry.

Hartnett mentioned that at least one of the seven men in the Sperry incident was a socialist whom he described as anti-Stalinist as far back as 1936. It was not clear whether any of the men were Stalinists, but it was made plain that most of them were not.

UNION JOB

The important thing was the decisive manner in which Hartnett put the International Executive Board position. According to him, there will no longer be any need for outside defense committees in security firings in private industry. The union will demand that the issue be taken up through regular arbitration procedure and will back the worker's case as a trade-union issue. Hartnett said that such firings "cannot be permitted to become questions separate and distinct from normal grievance procedure."

The union-busting potential of the loyalty and security program had been clearly demonstrated over two years ago. James Schuetz, a UAW-CIO militant in Buffalo and an open member of the Socialist Party, was refused clearance on work which he had to handle. The charges were vague, couched in terms of

his reputation. When brought before a hearing, the charges against Schuetz turned out to be almost identical with company allegations against him during a strike that had just ended.

In the Schuetz case, his local of the UAW and the UAW executive lined up behind him in support of his case, but it was not made a union issue. The actual conduct of his defense was carried on by the Workers Defense League in cooperation with other socialist and liberal groups.

Now that the anonymous accusation of the various security programs is in the hands of the Republicans, and especially in a period of recession, the union-busting features are likely to come to the fore. IUE-CIO realized, at least, that the question of security discharges was one that had to become a union issue with all the power of the organized workers behind it.

POINT OF DEPARTURE

In general, the Civil Rights Committee meeting of the IUE took clear and militant stands on discrimination in employment (especially a defense of Puerto Rican workers) and against McCarthyism, although they tied in this aspect of their program with support of Truman. One amusing sidelight was a letter to McCarthy signed by ninety of the delegates declaring that they had read Benton's charges, believed them, and would testify to that effect.

A significant statement was made near the close of the meeting when Hartnett brought up the IUE membership drive which is aimed at unorganized workers and at shops controlled by the rival Stalinist-run union, the UE. He said that the drive was succeeding because of "the evidence we give of our understanding of people's problems and the problems of democracy in the United States." Evidently IUE has decided that a militant program is the best basis for union organization rather than some of the red-baiting tactics they have used in the past.

The International's position on security discharges is certainly evidence of an increased militancy. It should serve as a point of departure for the entire labor movement which may well encounter problems like those at Sperry in the immediate future.

After That Honeymoon Trip with Ben Fairless: Dave McDonald and the GAW

By PETE JARMS

Rumors, gossip and stories have been circulating for weeks through the CIO about the latest adventures of the Steel Workers' president Dave McDonald. One item might be titled: McDonald and the GAW Mystery.

For some strange reason a press release was issued out of the Steel Workers' union in Pittsburgh attacking a speech made by Victor Reuther, Walter Reuther's brother, at an unemployment meeting in Des Moines, Iowa.

Vic Reuther in the course of his speech about forthcoming events mentioned that "The CIO will seek the wage guarantee [guaranteed annual wage] in negotiations with the steel industry this year, and will make the same demands on the auto industry in 1955."

This seemed to be quite an innocent statement. It has been a well-known fact that when steel negotiations took place in '54, the Steel Workers were all-out for an annual wage. McDonald has even told audiences at numerous meetings that the original idea was Phil Murray's and Dave McDonald's.

SWITCHEROO

The February '54 issue of the Steel Workers' monthly publication *Steel Labor* features an article to this effect. It proclaims that the Steel Workers' union fully intends to "LEAD THE WAY" in giving workers in heavy industry the same type of economic protection that their management enjoys.

"Just as the Steelworkers pioneered the pension and social insurance programs that set the pattern for industry throughout the country," *Steel Labor* said, "so we propose to lead the way in the fight against unemployment and depression with the guaranteed annual wage"

Union negotiations with the industry gets under way in May and June. "From the very beginning," the union paper says, "the union has emphasized that the GAW [guaranteed annual wage] is a matter for negotiations and cooperative study with industry, a proposal to be hammered into shape at the collective bargaining table."

But on February 24, following Vic Reuther's speech, McDonald sent a letter—

copies to the steel union's district directors—that quoted McDonald as saying: "I cannot help but say that this is rather presumptuous on your part. In the first place, as you well know, the CIO does not negotiate with the steel industry. Rather, the United Steelworkers of America negotiates with individual companies in the steel industry."

Nobody but the international wage-policy committee of the Steel Workers union makes such determinations, McDonald said, adding that, "this committee has not met to formulate any proposals for the year 1954. Until it does meet, not even I have the authority to speak in its behalf."

HINTS FROM HEARST

What is behind this press release? Was McDonald, in his tour with Ben Fairless, president of U. S. Steel, told that the guaranteed annual wage is impossible, and is he therefore preparing for a retreat in negotiations? Or is McDonald opening up his fight against the administration of Walter Reuther in the CIO in a fight to the finish?

Both are possibilities. It is a well-known fact that McDonald, in his zeal to defend "free enterprise," is suspicious of the ideas of Reuther and has been flirting with John L. Lewis and Dave Beck. Reuther keeps insisting on his defense of the American Way of Life but this does not satisfy McDonald. In opposition to Reuther's statements on unemployment, McDonald has consistently taken the position that this issue is greatly overplayed.

This week Victor Riesel, writing in his nationally circulated Hearst "labor" column, wrote that the CIO may not survive the year. He said that the union (CIO) will be hit "a splintering blow by its second most powerful leader." He went on to state that one of the first moves will be to withhold per-capita payment to the national CIO. McDonald, said Riesel, loathes what he refers to as "Reuther's socialist palace guard or the young Turks," depending on his mood.

In a recent labor management meeting at Notre Dame in South Bend, Indiana, the Steel Workers' representatives—led by Ben Fisher, from McDonald's "socialist" palace guard—would get up to oppose any statement made by a UAW speaker. It was so obvious that it caused quite a commotion in the hall among both labor and management people.

ANTI-UAW FEELING

The background of the fight is well known to those active in the union. The anti-UAW tradition of the Steel Workers was started by Phil Murray. The Steel Workers were taught that having the company pay for in-plant grievance time by union representatives was "company-unionism," that "wage increases without price increases" was a ridiculous slogan and had no place in economic fights, that the escalator clause was a "phony-balance arrangement," etc., etc.

McDonald, who never worked in a steel mill or any factory in his life, is interested in modeling the "new look" in labor. He has nothing in common with the day-to-day realities of life in the mills. This was clearly evident in his tour with Ben Fairless. His mind and his way of life touches that of the steel workers at hardly any point.

Unfortunately, given the terrifically bureaucratic setup of the Steel Workers and the great anti-UAW sentiment created there, unless the rank and file rises up in arms his maneuvers will succeed. If they do, then along with Dave Beck's refusal to go along with any move toward labor unity, the labor movement will be hit a hard blow.

ONE VIEWPOINT: SEES SLIDE INTO ECONOMIC CRISIS

Nose-Dive by Steel Upsets the Forecasts

By JACK WILSON

Unless a totally unexpected miracle appears—and in economics there aren't any around—the present business recession gives every sign of deepening into a crisis far worse than expected by anyone studying or analyzing the current trend of the American economy.

For the basic foundation of industrial production—the steel industry—just took another nose dive, one that provided such a shock to economists that many of them are now saying that March is not the decisive month in estimating the spring outlook.

It was only two weeks ago that business publications and financial pages of daily newspapers were carrying articles to the effect that the March pick-up in steel would reflect itself in other industries to make for a spring pick-up in over-all activity.

The New York Times said a week ago that March was traditionally the highest production month for the steel industry, and thus everyone would be watching it closely.

NO UPTURN

This week, *Iron Age* magazine reports that production was only 70.2 per cent—a staggering figure—and it also pointed out that no upturn was expected within the next 30 days! Now if any economist had said six months ago, or even three months

ago, that steel would be producing at only the rate of 70.2 per cent in March, he would have been hustled off to an insane asylum (or perhaps made a senator to serve as a flunkie for McCarthy).

The *Times* article also expressed the hope of steel makers that perhaps auto orders might bring an upswing, but none are in sight, except those to maintain current levels of auto production.

Auto production is running at a rate of between 6 to 8 per cent less than last year, and with heavy inventories, the highest in history, the auto corporations are not likely to go into any spring pick-up of a kind calculated to stimulate any sector of the economy.

MICHIGAN HIT BAD

In terms of employment, the real facts—very difficult to obtain—are even more disturbing than the continued decline in industrial activity. It is possible only to get glances at the true picture.

This week it was announced that Detroit area unemployment rose to 140,000 persons, 15,000 higher than the peak estimated by professional economists in the Michigan Unemployment Commission. Three more Michigan cities were put in the "distressed labor" category.

What the picture is in steel towns, with the decreasing steel production, would be alarming.

When an outstanding independent auto producer like Studebaker just closes shop completely for an "indefinite" period, any talk about a big spring pick-up in auto is just whistling in the dark. It goes without saying that Hudson, after bravely attempting to produce cars again, closed down for another week. Chrysler rehired 2,000 at Plymouth but laid off 1,100 at DeSoto.

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

Labor Action FORUM
New York

Thursday, March 18, 8:45 p.m.

Ben Hall

on

McCarthyism and the
Fight in the GOP

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

A far better index would be comparisons of manufacturing employment, with proper weight given to seasonal factors. This is precisely what the press and magazines fail to do, for it discloses a far deeper crisis in the economy than the country's rulers care to admit.

It may seem provincial but in an industrial area like Detroit there is far more excitement over job and layoff reports than over all of McCarthy's recent shenanigans put together.

MOCKERY FROM THE BENCH

High State Court OKs 'Subversive List'

Largest Jim-Crow Employer Is Gov't, Say Negro Leaders

The New York Appellate court has set back the fight against the tenants' loyalty oath with a decision which has reversed the lower court's findings—giving two grounds which are of wider significance than the immediate issue. One of the grounds is of especial interest since it is based on a falsehood. It will be important to see what happens when the case gets to the Supreme Court.

The legal validity of the attorney general's "subversive list," as well as the attorney general's procedures in connection with it, is directly involved.

The issue started with the Gwinn amendment to the U. S. Housing Law, requiring tenants in federal housing projects to certify non-membership in organizations on the attorney general's arbitrary list. In December 1952 the New York City Housing Authority adopted a resolution implementing this locally.

The present case against the tenants' loyalty oath was launched by four members of the Stalinist fraternal organization, the International Workers Order. The state Supreme Court held that the housing authority's action constituted a denial of the "due process" guaranteed by the 5th and 14th Amendments. This decision was appealed by the city, and the Appellate Division was acting on this appeal.

COLDWAR LAW

In the first place the Appellate ruling was based on the cold war:

"In the present-day context of world crisis after crisis, it is our opinion that the danger the Congress is seeking to avoid (i.e., infiltration of government housing by subversive elements) justifies the requirement that tenants herein choose between government housing and membership in an organization that they know to have been found subversive by the attorney general," the court said.

This is a more open statement than usual that juridical restriction of democratic rights is to be justified by the needs of the war drive. The idea is not new in the courts, in recent times, but its expression is particularly unabashed.

While LABOR ACTION stands for uncompromising political warfare against the Stalinists, we do not believe in using the Stalinist danger for undermining the civil liberties of any political tendency, including those we so vigorously disagree with.

But the Appellate decision has a bigger import than merely depriving Stalinists of civil liberties. The court refers for justification to the war crisis, i.e., the clash of Western capitalism with the Russian totalitarian empire, but the attorney general's "subversive list" does not include only Stalinist organizations. It also smears radical socialist organizations like the Independent Socialist League, which is militantly anti-Stalinist and anti-Kremlin.

On this point, the court decision is colored by the fact that the specific case was brought by Stalinist sympathizers, but the decision itself is a bigger blow at civil liberties for socialist anti-Stalinists.

NEW CLAIM

But the most disgraceful aspect of the court's action is another ground presented based on the "subversive list."

The lower court had based its action in part on the fact that the attorney general's list is gotten up without provision for a fair hearing for labeled organizations and without any recourse allowed for such an organization to contest the administrative action of the government. In making up its notorious list, the attorney general's office is accuser, prosecutor and judge rolled into one, with no democratic safeguards.

The Appellate reversal based itself on what it described as a change in the situation since the lower court ruling was made. Since then, it said, the Department of Justice has promulgated rules granting listed organizations the right to a hearing.

"The determination of this court," the Appellate Division said, "must be based on the law as it stands at the time of our decision. Under the provisions presently applicable, listed organizations (and those proposed to be listed) demanding a hearing are entitled to have one before the attorney general, at which time they may be represented by counsel, introduce evidence and examine witnesses."

Presumably this consideration quashed the lower court's argument.

But this ground is a falsehood.

It is true that the attorney general's office has "promulgated rules," but it is also a fact that it yet is to actually grant a hearing. The ISL asked for a hearing from the Department of Justice as long ago as 1948! When the new rules, providing for a hearing for the first time, were put out by the Eisenhower administration in 1953, the ISL immediately demanded a hearing again. To this day, the attorney general has stalled. To this day, no hearing has been secured.

THE JOKER

The "promulgation of rules" is a far cry from the actual right to a hearing, when every step is completely within the arbitrary say-so of a bureaucratic department.

But even more important—since some day sooner or later the Department of Justice is likely to go through the motions of a hearing—this right to a hearing, upon which the court based its scandalous finding, is the right to a hearing by the accuser, before the accuser and with every procedure determined by the accusing body, not a hearing before some body which is even formally impartial (like a court).

The agency which is doing the "hearing" is an agency which has already made up its mind, as evidenced by the fact that it has already gotten up its "list."

Lastly, it is a mockery of the truth when

the court says that, in this hearing, the listed organization has the right to "examine witnesses." As everyone knows, the determination by the attorney general's office is based, by its own admission, at least in part, on anonymous, secret and undivulged charges and "evidence" by witnesses whom the Department of Justice refuses, and will refuse, to call publicly, and who therefore cannot be confronted or examined.

NO "DUE PROCESS"

It is a gross and shameful caricature of "due process" for the court to pretend that the "promulgation of rules for a hearing" by the accuser is enough to outweigh the reasoning of the lower court, which threw the tenants' loyalty oath out.

Up to now, the government has disingenuously claimed with a straight face that the attorney general's list has only the limited purpose of acting as a guide to government departments for hiring. If the New York Appellate decision is sustained, this bureaucratically conceived and executed "listing" apparatus reaches into the very lives of people, in determining where they can live. Previous decisions by the U. S. Supreme Court leave a great deal of room for expectation that the "subversive list" will be given a rough time when it gets to the high bench in connection with this case.



Oil Workers Unions Decide to Set Up New United International

By BEN HALL

Thirty-one unions of oil workers, represented by 149 delegates, met in convention on February 15 in Philadelphia to plan the unification of scores of scattered, small local and regional independent unions into a single, united union. Nine small unions called the gathering, but the Oil Workers International Union (CIO), which was fully represented, provided the backbone. Altogether 212,000 workers were represented.

At its four-day sessions, the convention wrote and adopted a proposed new constitution, to govern the proposed new union, to be called the Oil and Chemical Workers Union. This document is not yet binding upon the participants who are to act individually, under their own procedures, upon ratification.

At its regular meeting, this month, the CIO union will take up the question of how to present the ratification suggestion to its membership.

The AFL was represented only by two local groups: an Office Employees' local of 600 members and a local of the Operating Engineers, with 1,600 members. Neither the fuel-oil drivers of the Teamsters Union nor the AFL Chemical Workers were present.

Dominant position in the industry is held by the OWIU-CIO. It now enrolls 131,000 workers, the only strong national union in the oil fields. However, it does not represent the majority of workers in the industry. If the new union is formed, and prospects for this are good, it would mean the organization of the majority into a single union, for the first time; and it would emerge from the outset as one of the largest and most powerful unions in the country.

Among the issues to be settled is the question of affiliation. The conference took no position on relations with the CIO.

O. A. Knight, OWIU-CIO president, naturally wants the new union to become a CIO affiliate; but he has announced that he will not press the issue if it would delay merger plans. It is remotely possible that the new union will maintain an independent existence for a brief period until some of its diffident sections become reconciled to the inevitable linking up with the CIO.

In recent months, the CIO union in its newspaper *The International Oil Worker* has been conducting a spirited public debate among its members and readers on CIO political action policy. Defenders of the Democratic Party have been ex-

changing heated letters with their pro-Republican critics. The union has been backing and publicizing the cases of Harvey O'Connor, its former editor, cited for contempt by the McCarthy committee. O'Connor, author of several books discovered in State Department libraries, refused to answer a McCarthy interrogation, taking his stand on the First Amendment (not the Fifth) guaranteeing free speech and press.

Longshore Strike

Shipping in the Port of New York gradually came to a halt when a stoppage called by supporters of the old International Longshoremen's Association began on March 5. The National Labor Relations Board, arguing that the ILA was officially responsible for the strike, seeks court action and fines against it, but ILA officials maintain that the work stoppage was a "spontaneous" rank-and-file movement.

One thing is clear: the strike is not against the employers; it is purely and simply aimed against the AFL. And that raises an interesting angle.

The new AFL longshore union has been fighting for recognition of its stewards by the shipping companies. Neither the ILA nor the AFL enjoys official bargaining rights; the issue of who is to represent dock workers in this area is now in a state of suspension pending NLRB action on the recent collective-bargaining elections, whose validity has been questioned by the AFL on the grounds of gangsterism and intimidation at the polls.

In several cases, the AFL was compelled to call strikes of its supporters at local piers in order to gain recognition of its stewards or to win their reinstatement after firings.

Wherever the AFL was victorious, the ILA countered with strikes of its supporters. In this seesaw contest, the AFL International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 807, which handles most of the trucking to New York piers, intervened on the side of the AFL. Wherever the ILA acted against AFL longshoremen and posted pickets against AFL longshoremen, Teamsters Local 807 stopped all trucking to those piers.

The ILA thereupon declared a port-wide boycott of all trucking handled by Local 807. The NLRB went to court, and got an injunction against the ILA, banning its boycott. It was in protest

When Welfare Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby invited a Negro, Paul Phillips, to take a post as special assistant (a post from which she had ousted another Negro office-holder for making anti-Jim Crow speeches), Phillips declined.

Among others he gave the following "personal reason": in the opinion of his wife and himself, "it would be unfair and unwise to ask my family, and especially our 7-year-old son, to live in and attempt to adjust to the rigid pattern of racial segregation that exists in Washington."

Testifying before a Senate subcommittee on a bill to end racial discrimination in hiring, A. Philip Randolph, prominent Negro leader of the Sleeping Car Porters' union (AFL) said:

"The U. S. government as an employer is the largest single enterprise in our national society maintaining a policy of racial discrimination in its hiring practices. In the hiring of the White House staff, racial discrimination is practiced. The lone Negro who can be found among the White House personnel is employed in a limited clerical classification. An American Negro on the staff of the congressional committee or in the office of a member of Congress is, very rare indeed."

Regarding the State Department, "it is impossible for a Negro to crack the lily-white color area." In the Atomic Energy Commission, Negro Americans continue to experience outright exclusion from employment in many job classifications."

against this injunction that the March 5 so-called "wildcat strike" began.

Note: In the NLRB elections, 7,500 workers voted for the AFL; 9,000 voted for the ILA; 4,500 ballots were challenged. The split was very close, a fact which amazed almost everyone, since the AFL had little time for campaigning and the ILA seemed invulnerable. The vote showed that it was possible to break through gangster and racketeer control; if the AFL could win one-third of the total votes in December, it could probably come close to a majority today. Yet, almost all shipping was shut down this week.

It is absurd to believe that the thousands who cast their votes for the AFL are now eager to strike to prevent its victory! Over this strike hangs the fear of pro-ILA gunmen and thugs.

There are other aspects, of course. In one respect, ILA officials have been handed an effective, if demagogic, propaganda weapon.

The Teamsters Union under Dave Beck is notoriously eager to expand its jurisdiction at the expense of other unions. Its action in rejecting the AFL-CIO no-raiding pact threatens to torpedo not only the pact but the possibilities of unity in the labor movement. The Teamsters Union has utilized the waterfront crisis to set up a new local to take over public loading, traditionally handled by longshoremen, and has gone to court to enforce its demand, announcing that it would fight against both the ILA and the AFL longshore union if necessary.

ILA officials hold their own supporters in line by frightening them with visions of teamsters taking over their jobs if the ILA loses. And now, in the course of events, the ILA is able officially or unofficially to call a stoppage ostensibly against a local of the Teamsters Union.

Intimidation explains why AFL sympathizers stay undercover and why neutral elements go along with the ILA. But deep-rooted suspicions of the motives of AFL waterfront leaders help keep ILA sympathizers from breaking.

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

Spider Schneider in Paris

U.S. Embassy Runs a Passport-Snatching 'Confidence' Racket

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, March 1—The French left-wing neutralist weekly L'Observateur carries in its current issue (Feb. 25) the following letter from an American reader which calls attention to a little known aspect of the State Department's passport policy. The author of the letter is personally known to the editors of L'Observateur but prefers to remain unnamed for obvious reasons. Excepting a few inaccuracies of secondary importance, the facts check with our own observations.

There is in the American Embassy in Paris a woman named Agnes E. Schneider. She has the rank of a consul and of an embassy attaché. The Americans who live in the French capital (students, artists, office workers, etc.) call her "Spider Schneider." They like to receive mail, but not from her.

Her letters can be something else, and the more innocent they look the more dangerous they are.

"There seems to be some question concerning your passport," writes Spider Schneider, "would it be possible for you to come to see me to straighten this out?" So the innocent American goes to the embassy.

The Spider receives him politely. She looks at the letter which the victim presents to her and says, "Oh yes, certainly. And now I would like to see your passport." The innocent American gives her the passport and she puts it in a drawer with the letter. This is the last the American hears about it. He doesn't get the passport back, not even the letter that was sent to him, which would enable him to prove that he ever had a passport.

He is never told of any charges against him. The Spider only says: "You will straighten all this out with Washington. We will give you the necessary documents for the return voyage."

HOW TO BE A SUSPECT

What has happened? Another American, playing the role of FBI stoolpigeon, has made an unfavorable remark concerning our friend. He might simply have said that his victim was "neutral." An American abroad is expected to be a propaganda agent for his country; otherwise, let him go back where he came from.

Some have tried never to talk about politics; this in itself may be sufficient to make them suspect. The American administration considers that a passport is a privilege granted to particularly meritori-

ous citizens, bestowing on them the protection of their government while they are abroad, and that it is only fair to ask them in return to act as voluntary ambassadors.

But nowadays a passport is necessary to travel. Whatever the country may be one wants to go to, it is impossible to leave the U. S. without a passport. If an American is sent back to his country by his embassy under the pretext that he is undesirable abroad, he has few chances to obtain a passport in the future. Therefore an incident with the Spider may mean that the American is properly locked up in his own country without having had a hearing and with sinister implications on file concerning his "loyalty."

In general the French support the American point of view and expel the "undesirables" when these latter are accused of having participated in French politics. Undoubtedly this accusation has often no basis in fact and is only brought forth to justify the expulsion. But the important fact is that a nod from the Spider is now considered as an order by the police.

CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE

In some cases the French government respects the revolutionary tradition of the right to political asylum and renews or grants residence permits to Americans who have been deprived of their passports. These cases are no doubt exceptional, but they do exist. When this happens, the American embassy rarely presses the case. It avoids drawing attention to these goings-on.

On the other hand, the victims also remain silent for the most part. They usually prefer to return quietly to the U. S. and to find a job there rather than to become the object of a diplomatic incident.

Thus everybody remains silent. There is a kind of conspiracy of silence between the hunter and the hunted, and the story of the witchhunt in Paris will probably never be entirely known.

Subjected to this sort of pressure, the Americans who remain in Paris become increasingly conformist. A good number adopt publicly and semi-publicly views which they do not actually hold. Their example sets the tone for the new arrivals, who rapidly align themselves on their elders. When one talks to them, at the cafe or even in their homes, one notices that they talk openly only when their conversation partner has himself "confessed." There are no leftist books on their bookshelves—they are kept in

discreet hiding places. The American colony in Paris can read something besides the New York Herald Tribune but does so discreetly.

It is important for Europeans and Americans alike that this situation be changed. Many students, for instance, play this game so well that they will be more conformist when they return to the U. S. than they were when they left it. What is the use, then, of going abroad?

IT'S NOT NICE BUT—

The Americans in Paris should know that they have several ways of defending themselves. Some of them, whom we know, have used them.

First of all, they can break the conspiracy of silence and alert public opinion, at home and in Europe. Secondly, those Americans who have difficulties with their embassy in Europe must fight back in the open, with courage and fearlessly.

We do not talk about those who are Communists. There are hardly any of them left in Western Europe anyway, since the CP called them back to the U. S. four years ago, when the international situation became tense, and since then it has not been easy for them to go out of the country. It can therefore safely be said that the Americans who live in Western Europe and who are in trouble with their embassies are radicals or, at the most, socialists.

Thirdly, Americans should know that an invitation to come to the embassy is not an order and that, when their passport expires, it is sometimes possible to have it renewed in towns or in countries where there are less difficulties than in Paris.

Finally they can apply the tactics described by Alexander Weissberg in his book on the purges in Russia. He talks about the arrest of a doctor in the '30s who, when forced by the police to name his "accomplices," gave them the complete list of all the doctors of his town.

If the American authorities are prepared to take action on the basis of anonymous denunciations, as we have good reason to believe they do, why not answer by denouncing as a "Communist" some high official who has never dared to think for himself? Letters of this kind to McCarthy, to Republican papers, to the Paris embassy, might succeed in ridiculing the whole witchhunt. This may not be a very nice procedure, but is it any worse than accepting the anonymous "denunciations" which daily cause great damage to a large number of irreproachable Americans?

X . . .

Mau Mau Get Proposal for Kenya Truce

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Mar. 4—Warnuhio Hote is the man known to his friends and enemies as "General China," in command of 4000 members of Mau Mau in Kenya who have been fighting against fully armed British soldiers and their tanks, artillery and heavy bombers. It was an unequal struggle, and not long ago he was wounded and captured by "security forces." For "consorting with terrorists," he was sentenced to death.

Not long after the imposition of this sentence, General China revealed "during interrogation" that Mau Mau had suffered very heavy casualties during the past few months, and that there were people in it who were prepared to come to terms. If the Kenya government offered reasonable terms, he believed that the leaders of Mau Mau would stop the struggle.

General China was then taken in disguise to the Nyeri district where there has been a great deal of fighting; he wrote 26 letters to various Mau Mau leaders, stating the government's terms if they would surrender.

So far five have replied favorably and one noncommittally. Although Sir Evelyn Baring has refused to reveal the terms offered to Mau Mau, one would imagine that they were the usual ones offered under such circumstances; namely, that if all the "terrorists" surrender with their arms, only those believed guilty of specific crimes will be tried. Membership in Mau Mau and taking its oath would not be considered crimes any more.

Presumably, for his part in these negotiations General China's death sentence has been commuted to life imprisonment. During the same week, incidentally, a Kikuyu woman was sentenced to death for possessing seven rounds of ammunition.

It is very interesting indeed to notice that Blundell, head of the European Elected Members of the Kenya legislature, is rather annoyed about the offer. He wants to fight the war to the point of exterminating all Mau Mau and thus leave the Kikuyu in a state of terror. When the Parliamentary Mission from England published its report recommending some governmental responsibility for the Africans, the settlers were against this on principle, although some were prepared to allow Africans into a war cabinet solely to help the fight against the Mau Mau.

It is not without reason that the white settlers are fighting tooth and nail against any African representation in the government. The first African who is given power will be the thin edge of the wedge; for once it has taken this move the government will have to go on to enlarge African representation. The pressure of events will move toward an Africa ruled by all Africans.

The right-wing mission also recommended immediate increased wages for Africans; if Africans had any power in the government, their arguments would become more cogent.

The reason the European community in Kenya is so resistant to change is that the low wages and low income-tax make it an ideal country for investment, especially of "funk money." Once the Africans had strong trade unions and even some political power, the motive of many investments would cease to exist. One of the few parts of the empire where you can still expect a quick return on your money would cease to have any attraction.

was going up from \$5.60 per year to \$8.40. This fee is paid by every set owner and provides revenue for running the television service; so far there is no commercial television in this country.

This came as a severe shock to the three million TV owners. Of this extra money \$11,200,000 will go to improving the BBC service.

But to add insult to injury, \$2,100,000 is going to be put aside for a commercial television company, which will compete with the BBC. What Herbert Morrison, Labor's deputy leader, and all Labor supporters want to know is this: Why should we, who oppose commercial television, be forced to subsidize it out of the license fee which we have to pay to BBC?

If Labor comes back to power, they may find it very difficult to abolish commercial television after it has been in existence for some years.

LONDON LETTER

British Debate Arms Policy

BY DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Mar. 4—Last week, a meeting of about 180 Labor MPs reversed the party's previous policy of opposition to German rearmament, by two votes (reported in last week's London Letter). The arguments for and against were the typical ones, heard so often, that remain within the framework of capitalist politics. There were, however, two remarks of special interest.

Richard Crossman said that he was not satisfied that the government had done all it could to obtain peace with Russia at the Berlin conference. This was the general tenor of most of the opposition.

Criminal in its nature, from the socialist point of view, was the ground given by Harold Wilson, a leading Bevanite, for preventing German rearmament. If we rearm the West Germans, he said, they might go to the support of East Germany in case of another rising!

In the backs of the minds of quite a few Labor MPs was the fear of German competition in international markets; they hoped

that if they could preoccupy them with making arms, they might be hindered in their competitive industries.

CHURCHILL TAUNTS

By 295 to 270 votes, the Conservatives defeated Labor opposition to their arms program, which is costing \$4,600 million this year—the highest in the country's peacetime history.

Attlee argued that if we made an agreement with Egypt, we could save the 70,000 men who were locked up in its "defense." The Suez Canal Zone, anyway, was not fit for troops to live in, and that (he thought) was a deterrent to recruiting. It was clear, he said, that the expansion in Russian trade with the West showed that they were turning to producing more consumer goods. Attlee also thought that it was false economy to cut the information services, one of the vital media for fighting Communism.

John Strachey said that the arms burden was 12 per cent of the national income and it should be reduced to 10 per cent. He said that we should cut the program by \$280 million, while Richard Crossman suggested twice this sum. Crossman said that we should invest the money thereby saved in the engineering industry, and then if war came the economy would be in a much better situation to withstand it. Shinwell made a verbose contribution to the debate in suggesting

that conscription should be cut down from two years to 18 months.

Churchill's reply was mainly on tactical grounds. If we had a large army, he said, we could have a pad against Russian attack for a week. During this time, we could (1) take precautions for saving lives in atomic bomb raids; (2) before firing, we could appeal to Russia, if necessary by revealing the size of our atomic bomb stocks; and (3) we would be safe from paratroop attack.

Among the most enlightening remarks that Churchill made was that "it is necessary that we should move gradually, keeping in mind the three ruling purposes [of defense]—to maintain law and order [sic!], to deter aggressors, and to fight effectively for life if need should come."

Churchill claimed that the rearmament program initiated by Labor and continued by the Conservatives was largely responsible for the improvement in the world situation. He further taunted Labor by saying, "I do not understand how the leaders of the Opposition can vote for a policy of arming the Germans, and at the same time urge that we should weaken our necessary counterpoise of strength . . . the French will certainly think it odd that the leaders of the British socialist party should vote for German rearmament one week and British disarmament the next."

On top of it all, Earl de la Warr, postmaster general, announced in the House of Lords that the television license fee.

It Happened at the Intercollegiate Academic Freedom Conference

By TED BARRY

Young Socialist League delegates participated actively in the Conference of the Intercollegiate Committee for Academic Freedom, which was held on Saturday, March 6, in New York. This committee is based on representatives from a number of schools in and around New York City, with individual students cooperating with the committee.

The committee began originally with considerable student backing and with visible Stalinoid slant and control in 1953. When it became obvious that the latter was a barrier to effective functioning and involvement of major student organizations, the political complexion of the committee itself became less obvious to the naked eye.

Thus, for example, this conference featured an excellent speaker from the ACLU Academic Freedom Committee, who took a clear-cut position on academic freedom—including specifically the right of the Stalinists to teach, while making it clear that it was both undesirable and impossible to cooperate with the Stalinists in defense of academic freedom. The displeasure with which the speaker was received by a considerable section of the audience was fairly indicative of the political coloration of many delegates present.

The conference suffered from two major faults: it carefully avoided any attempt to define academic freedom (on the grounds that to do this would narrow the support such a committee could get during Academic Freedom Week), and it carefully avoided any discussion or mention of the Stalinists. The composition of the leading people involved in the committee seems to be about equally divided between completely inexperienced "innocents" who feel that it is enough to get people to support the words "academic freedom," and Stalinoid liberals who object to discussing the role of Stalinists in such a conference or in the committee because they believe that Stalinists should be within such a grouping.

STALINOID INFLUENCE

The Stalinist Labor Youth League was present in force and made itself evident in the panels which discussed implementation of Academic Freedom Week—and they, in conjunction with the more con-

servative students, barred any attempt to discuss the political basis of the witch-hunt on the campus. Their current line, with the major emphasis on some kind of a untied front within which they can function but which will be respectable enough actually to involve students, in effect was adopted by the committee.

The YSL, however, carefully stayed in the background as far as speakers and publicity for the conference were concerned. And apart from the ACLU speaker, addresses were given by the Students for Democratic Action, Student Christian movement and a National Student Association official who spoke as an individual. The YSL was represented by Bogdan Denitch who spoke after considerable difficulties which are of some interest.

The SDA speaker presented a good civil-libertarian line and, except for the overgeneralized nature of his speech, presented a viewpoint with which it is possible in this writer's opinion to organ-

ize a real student civil-libertarian movement. NSA's speaker described the NSA program on civil liberties, a program which is so general, so vague and so qualified that it is actually meaningless.

However, when the time came for the YSL speaker to go on he was informed that his speech had been cancelled "because certain people objected." Since the objections were not based on the fact that YSL was "too radical" or "too political," it seemed clear, at least to the YSLers at the conference, that the objections came from the Stalinoids who did not want a "hard" line on Stalinist participation presented to the conference. In the case of SDA objections were not raised because SDA's name provided a cover for the conference.

When it became clear that the YSL speaker was not going to be given the floor a number of liberals and SDAers present approached the chairman and insisted that the YSL be heard. The protest was so strong—and it involved a number of people on the committee itself—that at the last moment, after the panels took place, the YSL speaker was given time to address the conference.

TO BE RE-LEARNED

Bogdan Denitch, speaking for the YSL, stressed two major points in his talk: the necessity to defend the rights of the Stalinists and others, if academic

freedom is to have a meaning, and the impossibility of cooperating with the Stalinists in academic-freedom groups. He briefly dwelt on the numerous betrayals of the various progressive causes by the Stalinists and stressed the fact that if Stalinists were to be involved in the work of the committee neither the socialists nor the organized liberals would work with the committee. This, of course, infuriated the Stalinists, but the clear-cut nature of the approach drew considerable support from the "innocents" present.

It is becoming more and more obvious that the lessons which past student conferences and academic-freedom groups learned so painfully about the role and nature of the Stalinists on the campus will have to be learned again. The students now active have for most part had no background and experience analogous to those of the YSL and SDA. Some form of cooperation between SDA, YSL and the other organized democratic groups on the campus is therefore necessary if this lesson is to be driven home.

That this cooperation is possible becomes clearer in every contact our comrades have with the more consistent liberals on the campus. The slogan which therefore should be raised whenever possible is "unity of all democratic student groups in defense of academic freedom for all."

Indian Students vs. a 'Gandhian' Regime

By A. T.

The United States is not the only country whose government encourages and subsidizes the natural tendency of university administrations to whittle away the rights of students. The response of the students, however, is seldom as weak as it is in America.

The following article, from the Socialist Appeal of New Delhi, India, describes the struggle of Lucknow University students to preserve the independence of their student union. These students stood up not only against the university administration but against the armed force of the state, and rallied the whole community to their defense.

A few days later, upon hearing of the Lucknow incidents, students all over India initiated hartals (general strikes) and demonstrations in sympathy with the Lucknow students. These demonstrations provided a rallying point for workers and middle-class people who turned them into general protests against the reactionary and at best ineffective program of the Nehru government.

The Lucknow events shed an interesting sidelight on the "Gandhian" character of the Congress government of India. After the shootings at the Union building, over a hundred students started a "fast unto death," a venerable Gandhian instrument of protest and struggle. The students were arrested for "attempts to starve themselves; only the government may starve the people."

By BHARATIYA

This winter Lucknow appeared before the country in giant letters in connection with the student movement, in quick succession to the two previous state-wide movements, viz., those of the Patwaris and primary teachers.

But the students' struggle was a little different from its predecessors, inasmuch as it not only shook the whole city and the state, but the whole country. The bloody Saturday (Oct. 31, 1953), as they call it, was one of the most tumultuous days, with revolutionary tide sweeping its streets, in the history of Lucknow city.

The present students' struggle dates back to early this year [1953] when the vice-chancellors of the state universities met under the governor-chancellor of

Uttar Pradesh and resolved on certain significant changes in the university sphere, including one to make the Union an appendage of the state bureaucracy. The students' representatives represented their stand vis-à-vis the proposed overhaul of the University Union and finally a compulsory federal University Union was decided upon.

The opening session this year (1953) recorded revolts of Allahabad and Lucknow against the arbitrary steps of their respective despots to rob their Unions of their traditional autonomy and democracy. Sanity dawned upon Allahabad University authorities earlier than expected and they conceded the legitimate demands of their students.

But Lucknow University authorities were, perhaps, made of different stuff and they took their loyalty to the government to be superior to their loyalty to the University interests or to the interests of the students. They refused to profit by the Allahabad example and remained callous to student demands sitting tight with bandaged eyes on their false prestige. They also failed miserably to assess the real force of the students' rising discontent. Their self-complacency was reinforced by the government backing that was assured by the presence of a cabinet minister upon the managing body and robbed them even of the last grain of statesmanship and sensibility.

CLASH WITH STATE

Negotiations failed on the issue of a democratic referendum on the union constitution, and direct action was resorted to by the students under the leadership of the Student Action Committee. The early days of August were hot with demonstrations, representations followed with hunger strikes and a general strike culminating in an historic complete "hartal" in the whole of the capital city on September 2.

The university authorities, failing in their coercive tactics, thought to provoke a show down and closed the University on August 29 sine die. The students, in their turn, faced the situation bravely and rushed to the center for mediation, but all in vain. September was brisk with student efforts to bring the authorities back to their senses and to give them one more gesture for reciprocation lest the deadlock become complete. But the snail did not come out of its shell-world to know the real horizons. Kidwai came and went, and the stalemate continued.

The University was reopened after 7 weeks without any effort on the part of the authorities to create a proper atmosphere for normal functioning. The inevitable result was a deepening of the students' dissatisfaction with the authorities' attitude and a further complication of the unsolved tangle. The movement was again launched by the Student Action Committee, as usual in a most peaceful and non-violent way. Hunger strikes and prabhat-pheries were the only notable features of this second phase of the struggle.

But this time the university authorities went one step further in their "Hitlerite" delirium. They refused entrance of students to the Union Building. The students legitimately enforced their rights against such irrational orders and occupied it.

This made the vice-chancellor red with anger and robbed him of all sense of propriety. Unable to deal with the situation, as magnified by the lens of his own untenable notions, it appeared to him that his authority was threatened and his pride injured. The result was that he ran amuck.

BLOODY SATURDAY

Instead of handling the situation tactfully himself, or admitting his failure and resigning his post, he supplicated the state government for the restoration of his kingdom. The state government was, it seems, simply waiting for some such excuse to intervene to revenge itself upon the students for their defiance of the vice-chancellor. It promptly appeared on the scene on October 30 (Friday night). The police, armed to the teeth, in five trucks, raided the Union Building as if some dacoits, lying in ambush, were to be mopped up, and with its traditional ruthlessness and repression, seized the Union Building.

This incident—the height of Himalayan foolishness despite its savagery—put the whole town ablaze. The rest is more or less a police-action on behalf of the government and a "rebellion" on the part of the people, who by this time, came forward to back up the students, their own sons, daughters and friends, against the onslaught of power-drunkenness and brute force.

From bloody Saturday (Oct. 31) to Kali Puja day (Nov. 5), it was simply a repetition of the golden pages of the history of the Indian Revolution. The passive resist-

(Continued on page 6)

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.

Big Brain

Congressman Alvin O'Konski (R., Wis.) is the man who emerged from obscurity last year when he ignored the Logan Act and wrote to Syngman Rhee urging him to disregard official U. S. policy.

He now emerges from oblivion to set a mark for congressional intelligence.

In his state income-tax return for 1952, O'Konski claimed \$1000 in deductible income because "when I was in Paris . . . I was short-changed by \$1000 when I converted \$1400 in U. S. currency into French francs."

YOU'RE INVITED

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

New Anti-Semitic Push Under Way — —

(Continued from page 1)

the above report is only the latest, seems to tell a different story.

The reports tell of arrests, trials and condemnations of Jews in Rumania and Czechoslovakia. These trials and sentences, some of which are completely secret and others open, differ from the previous Stalinist practice only in one respect. They are no longer show trials. They are kept as quiet as possible. The object is, of course, to prevent the outcry of world public opinion that occurred during the last pogrom.

It was only late in the fall that it became known that 65 Jewish leaders of Prague and Bratislava had been tried and sentenced in secret last August. The sentences ranged from 10 to 25 years. The main charge against this group was that they had participated in helping restore Jewish property stolen by the Nazis during the occupation of Czechoslovakia. Another charge was that they aided the migration of Jews to Israel during the first post-war years. This charge is made despite the fact that it was legal then, and despite the fact that the emigration took place with the cooperation of the Czech government, which was then pro-Israel and even pro-Zionist in line.

RUMANIA TOO

In spite of the fact that the trials are hush-hush, the Czech press repeatedly points to people of Jewish descent and "Zionists" as the special "allies of American imperialism."

There are persistent reports that Jews are being purged from the army, police, and high economic positions.

While the Slansky trial and the purges were directed primarily against the Stalinists who in their majority had no connection with Jewish life and whose only crime was their Jewish descent, the current terror is directed against the bona-fide leaders of the Jews who had no connection with the Stalinist movement.

Concurrently with the trials in Czechoslovakia, there are similar reports from Rumania. Only recently five prominent Jewish leaders, who had been imprisoned for a number of years, were brought to trial. After years of prison torture, they faced a court-martial on

the charge of organizing an "underground political Zionist organization." Dr. Kenner was sentenced to 16 years; another accused, Horowitz, to 15 years; and three others were given 10 years each. In other trials Dr. Solomon and Dr. Yankin were sentenced to hard-labor terms.

For the first time in the judicial history of the Stalinist movement, there are reports of defendants standing up and refusing to confess. Dr. Kenner cried out to the court: "How dare you call me a fascist or expect me to confess to your charges when I spent six years in fascist concentration camps and was brutally tortured on the charge of engaging in Communist activities . . . I am a Zionist and believe in Zionism."

FRAME-UPS

Another military court of Bucharest sentenced Joseph Lipman, former head of the Bucharest section of the World Jewish Congress, to 15 years, and gave 10 years to Mrs. Suzana Benvenisti, a prominent leader in Jewish charities and in the Women's Zionist organization. Her husband was arrested three and a half years ago and has not been heard from since.

Lipman and Mrs. Benvenisti were arrested in September 1951 and remained in jail for over two years without knowing the charges against them. They found out what the charges were only this winter, when they appeared before a military court. The president of the court was the notorious reactionary General Alexander Petrescu, who has a long record as a police agent and for the persecution of labor and the Stalinists under the previous Rumanian regimes, some of which were fascist.

General Petrescu charged them with maintaining contact with Zionist and imperialist spies, from whom they received instructions one how to subvert the Rumanian republic; propagandizing among the students of the Women's Zionist trade schools against the regime; accepting funds from the Israeli delegation to propagandize for Israel and to defame the Rumanian regime. In addition it was charged that they informed foreign delegations that Zionist leaders were being arrested and tortured; that they had contact with the Jewish World Congress and other Jewish organizations, and had report-

ed that the Jewish population of Rumania was poor and suffering from economic hardships under the new regime. They tried, said the court, to picture "our democratic country as a land of terror and dictatorship."

Here too the defendant did not confess. After being sentenced, Lipman declared he was active in the Jewish World Congress only during the time it functioned legally in Rumania, that he did nothing to hurt the Rumanian republic, and that if the Jewish Congress were now legal in Rumania he would again be active. Mrs. Benvenisti made a similar statement.

From Poland too come similar reports. Only a relative handful of Jews remain where there flourished a large, culturally unique and independent Jewish community.

The Jews in Poland suffer from three sources: the government, the local population, and the Yeusekes (organized Jewish Stalinists, who still function as such in Poland). Paris reports in last October 22's issues of the N. Y. *Daily Forward* state that the government has begun systematically to drop Jews from various posts. This is being done quietly but thoroughly.

The local population, which is fanatically anti-Stalinist and anti-government and is waiting impatiently for a day of revenge, have

(it is reported) turned on the Jews as a scapegoat, blaming them because of the prominent positions held up to now by some Jews in the government, and accusing them of "starting it all" by leading the revolution in—Russia! The fable that Jews led the Russian revolution is world-wide but is especially strong in Poland, where it was peddled by the Polish fascists, reactionaries and Nazis.

FEAR PERVADING

Jews, it is reported, are afraid to go out alone at night, and even in the daytime are afraid that they may end up with a knife in the back. Many Jews are therefore trying to "pass" by placing crosses on their apartment doors, denying that they are Jews, etc.

In addition, Jews are extremely uncomfortable among themselves. In addition to the general surveillance by the police state, they are also subject to the spying of the Jewish Stalinists, who try to outdo other Stalinists. Fear is all-pervading, so much so that even close relatives are afraid to talk to each other.

Such is the sorrowful state of the Jews in the "People's Democracies." Only public knowledge and protest can prevent further suffering by the survivors of Hitler's terror and extermination policy.

ISL FUND DRIVE

Now—Hit Up the Pace!

by ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

Chicago continues to be the surprise of the Fund Drive. With a \$200 contribution this week, the Chicago branch now has sent in \$1435 or 78.7 per cent of its quota. It looks like our friends there are making good on their promise to complete their quota quickly, go over it, and take first place in the campaign.

Chicago is really putting the other areas with larger quotas to shame with the showing it is making. Although New York has improved its standing with a contribution of \$977 or 24.4 per cent of its quota, it is still a long way from keeping up with the pace.

We did get a response from some areas which did not show last week. Reading jumped into second place with 70 per cent, representing a \$35 payment on a quota of \$50. A contribution of \$138 from Buffalo lifted it from the zero group to third place. Buffalo, it should have been noted, voluntarily raised its own quota from \$200 to \$300, and it looks like they mean to achieve it soon.

Pittsburgh is now in 4th place with 43.3 per cent, followed by St. Louis and Streator. Newark has slowed a little and was passed by Pittsburgh.

These and other places, however, are really doing something about their quotas. But what about Los Angeles? And Detroit? And Oakland?—just to name a few.

These are the branches that are holding up the drive nationally (the N.O. is not doing well at all, either). As we go to press, \$2724.50 has been sent in, making a total of 26.4 per cent of the goal. At this stage of the campaign, we should be near a 50 per cent standing, since by

the time this appears, the fourth week of the drive will have ended!

We are now entering the crucial middle weeks of the drive, and in a sense, everything depends on the showings made in the next month. This means, of course, that those branches which haven't even made the scoreboard, have to hustle.

Our sympathizers and readers are asked to participate in the drive and to help us in this campaign to sustain our wonderful press and the activities of the ISL. That's what the blank below is for—to make it simple for you to send in a contribution.

BOX SCORE

	Quota	Paid	%
TOTAL	\$10,200	\$2724.50	26.4
Chicago	1800	1435	79.7
Reading	50	35	70
Buffalo	300	138	46
Pittsburgh	150	65	43.3
St. Louis	25	10	40
Streator	25	10	40
Cleveland	150	50	33.3
Newark	400	132.50	33.1
New York	4000	977	24.4
Philadelphia	250	22	8.8
Seattle	150	10	6
Bay Area	500	10	2
Nat'l Office	1500	0	0
Los Angeles	600	0	0
Detroit	300	0	0
Indiana	50	0	0
Akron	50	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0

The Indian Students — —

(Continued from page 5)

ance of the people, following hit-and-run tactics, was undeterred by about half a dozen firings, tear-gassing, countless lath-charges and heavy brick-bat showers, and recalled 1942, which was even surpassed in certain respects. The discontent against the government came over the surface everywhere and eloquently manifested itself in the burning of six government buses and forty-two telephone junctions, bonfires of Gandhi caps (symbol of the ruling Congress party) and police turbans, the damaging of eleven post-offices and the smashing of over eight hundred street lamps.

This mass uprising is the index of the rising unpopularity of the ruling party that stands for bankruptcy, incompetence and failure in everything. It is significant that no private property was touched during these six days of struggle. Despite their agitated minds, the people exercised remarkable self-restraint.

The government, on the other hand, appeared in steel helmets and unleashed unprecedented repression. Even women and invalids were not spared. A sixty-hour curfew was clamped. Sec. 144 was

enforced and armored Police Armed Constabulary trucks heavily patrolled the whole city. It seemed that the town was virtually in the control of the Armed Constabulary, to whom the government had apparently passed on the reins after losing confidence in themselves and in their statesmanship.

It presented the scene of a besieged town with a collapsed government. Five special magistrates and five police superintendents ruled the town for three days. The police force of eighteen districts was requisitioned and was actually on the move to surround the town on a given signal. The military was also in waiting.

Above all, the government was in a perfect state of confusion and helplessness. The chaos was really on their side, not among the masses, and every representative of the state, whether at the top or at the bottom, behaved like a ruling monarch, independently and without coordination. This bred lawlessness in its train.

The government proved to the hilt that it wants to govern for the sake of governing, whether people want it or not, and to govern more despotically than even its British predecessors.

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)

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

'Dissent' Editor Replies

To the Editor:

One learns to be grateful for small blessings, and I am grateful that the review of *Dissent* was written by Hal Draper, whose sectarianism is awesomely impersonal; after all, the job could have been given to James Fenwick, LABOR ACTION's specialist in matters intellectual.

Draper's review indicates that, with the best will in the world, we can't communicate very well with each other, at least these days. You are concerned with ideologies, "hammering out a line," scholastic inquiries into Lenin's "defeatism." You think a pronouncement in favor of the Third Camp a sign of socialist virtue (though you're hard-pressed to give that slogan consistent meaning, much of what Max Shachtman has written recently being clearly "social-patriotic" by Third Camp standards of not many years ago). And when you don't find a "line" in *Dissent* on "the war question," you naturally think it a lack of seriousness. I know this way of thinking, having suffered from it myself for a good many years. But I now find that the formulas in which you trade have little relevance to what I as a socialist face in my intellectual or personal life. You go through the motions of "taking positions" as if you were a genuine movement instead of a handful of devoted individuals. But do these positions make any significant difference in your behavior? Do ISL people in trade unions speak against supporting Stevenson? I don't blame them if they don't; the truth is that they really can't. And of what importance is it whether you have this shade or the other on "the war question," how does it affect your actual behavior?

One aim of *Dissent*, as I see it, is to put an end to such pompous comedies; to admit that there is no socialist movement in America, only individual socialists; and to stop making gestures that would have meaning only if there were a movement. Thus, the question of whether "we" should "support" Stevenson has only the faintest impotence at a time when "we" have no political significance whatever, while an effort to analyze what actually happened to the liberal intellectuals in the last election, an effort such as I made in *Dissent*, does touch upon elements of reality. The trouble is, you see, not that we have different answers, but that we're no longer interested in the same question.

That's why almost nothing in *Dissent* can be valuable to Draper: it runs counter to his ingrained habit of ideological reification. But some LABOR ACTION readers may feel otherwise; at least they should judge for themselves, and not let Draper or anyone else set up a response for them. Subs are \$2 a year, sent to 509 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. C.

It isn't true, as Draper says, that I urge people to abandon socialist groups. If anyone thinks there is useful work to be done in or through those groups, I respect that decision. I disagree, but that's something else. Actually, *Dissent* has invited people from several socialist groups to write for it, including people from the ISL. So far they've been penny (as they were when Dwight Macdonald asked them to write for *Politics*: they prefer their comfortable obscurity). The ISL chairman was invited to join in a *Dissent* symposium, but thus far hasn't troubled to answer us or have an answer set. Too busy writing, I guess.

It takes a curious logic to say, as Draper does, that *Dissent* represents a backsliding from socialism into liberalism. Unless, that is, he assumes that socialism and the ISL are pretty much synonymous, as in fact the ISL generally does. You have often said that people with my views could be members of the ISL; then, presumably, we would be "real" socialists. Hence our "betrayal" must consist not in holding certain opinions, but in . . . not being ISL members. That doesn't leave very many socialists in America, does it?

Do you really suppose that people who want to backslide from socialism need to go about collecting dollars and running endless chores to put out a little magazine? Aren't there enough ready-made literary inclines for that? And doesn't it give you at least a qualm to see that while you attack us for backsliding into liberalism, the official spokesmen for liberalism, e.g. *Commentary*, violently denounce us, attributing to *Dissent* . . . your opinions, declaring that we represent the same old unadulterated Marxism they can't abide, the same intransigent socialism they consider absurd? Doesn't this suggest that the public

meaning and effect of *Dissent* might be rather different from what you say?

But no one is going to fool Hal Draper so easily. A naive, old-fashioned sort of socialist might write: "Look, in this reactionary moment, there is a new socialist magazine, which I don't entirely agree with, and I don't even think is very good, and certainly think that some editors, like Howe and Plastrik, are rogues; but still, it's good these days to see any magazine that cares to speak out for socialism." That's what someone might write who was corrupted by the sentimental notion of socialist solidarity, and after having seen what *Commentary* said about *Dissent* he might feel all the better for having said it. But not the ISL.

For the ISL, it would have you know, remains the "organized socialist movement" which, unlike Howe and Plastrik, hasn't abandoned "the struggle." But which struggle? Except for a handful of ISL trade-unionists, who command my respect, what struggle is the ISL conducting? What struggle does Draper have except the very real one to fill the pages of LABOR ACTION each week? Actually one could say that the people who spend their evenings in 114 W. 14 Street engage in no struggles whatever (it isn't their fault) while someone like myself at least gets into brawls with the official liberals (see recent issues of *Partisan Review* and *Commentary*.) I claim no special virtue or heroism in doing this, since I enjoy it; but as for significant social or political struggle, why not be honest? You're out of it, I'm out of it, almost all socialists in the U. S. are out of it.

Before *Dissent* appeared, we asked every radical journal for advertising rates. Some, in reply, even agreed to exchange ads, a traditional device of small and poor magazines for remaining small and poor. But LABOR ACTION replied that it would have to wait and see what *Dissent* was like before agreeing to let us pay for an ad in its pages. (The ISL wasn't going to be trapped into publishing an ad for a magazine edited, among others, by Howe, Meyer Schapiro, Coser and Plastrik, for who knows? there might be a deviation in it.) Now the first issue is out. As a matter of perhaps morbid curiosity (it's my past that prompts me), I can't help wondering: Are we now "eligible" for the exalted honor of placing an ad in LABOR ACTION? Will you issue us a certificate that we satisfy the Pure Marx and Lenin Act? Or do we flunk? Are we doomed to the outer darkness, unable to touch, as we backslide deeper and deeper into the hell of liberalism, the fringe of the Seat of Rectitude?

Well, sorry to be so long-winded. But knowing LABOR ACTION's word-count and Hal Draper's gift for long replies, I feel that at least this week I've helped Draper with his struggle.

With socialist greetings,
Irving HOWE

Only the following points in Howe's letter require comment:

(1) LA has no advertising rates, and has never sold advertising space. LA carries (or exchanges) ads for political publications not for payment but as a form of political recommendation. In view of this latter point, we could not reject Howe's ad in advance of the magazine's appearance: he would then have been able to write a letter denouncing us for "prejudging the magazine sight-unseen." Our no-paid-ad policy is one well known to very unsectarian socialist movements.

(2) Shachtman was invited to contribute to a symposium on a triviality by M. Rubel in *Dissent*: raising "the question of whether it would not be better today to abandon the word socialism." (Italics in original.) We cannot take this symposium seriously. On the other hand, participation in a meaningful symposium on socialist policy is by no means excluded.

(3) But Howe is "no longer interested" in "lines" and "taking positions," i.e., in discussing socialist policy. Moreover, "one aim of *Dissent*, as I see it, is to put an end to such pompous comedies. . . ." It is clarifying to have him put this aim on paper.

Given this unconcern with policy, it is difficult to see how Howe's group can expect to grapple with real socialist problems or make any contribution to socialist rethinking. Concern with socialist policy does not imply the illusion that one is leading "masses"; but one cannot otherwise answer the question "What is this 'socialism' of yours?"

Howe's unique unconcern with "positions" flowered, it happens, in the train

YOU and SCIENCE

National Forests and Parks Are in Peril

By CARL DARTON

The age-old struggle to prevent the public heritage from being plundered by private interests is still continuing. It is well-known that the capitalists have chopped down, plowed up, smoked under, and buried with industrial waste a great proportion of the natural beauty with which America was once endowed. There are so few relatively unspoiled areas left that it is a bit shocking to learn that the old game of exploitation of natural resources is still being played.

Here and there reclamation makes some headway. The waters of the Schuykill no longer flow like tar. The rapid shrinkage of the anthracite coal industry, coupled with some effective public sanitation measures, have made it possible for fish to once again live in the river water.

In the West, however, where the federal government pushed by public concern was able to set aside some substantial areas before industry, transportation, and agriculture could raze them, we find that hard battles must still be fought to preserve the unspoiled.

In Alaska a group of enterprising Japanese businessmen, backed tenfold financially by Wall Street, are preparing to take a considerable amount of products from our national forests. Wood will be cut, shipped to Tokyo, processed into paper products, and then sent to the United States to sell at a lower price than such goods made here. A favorable price for the raw material, low tariffs, and miserable wages to Japanese workers add up to a neat profit for those who seek good investments.

No doubt vast areas of the national forest will be spoiled in appearance. The trees are on steep slopes at the ocean's edge. Trees will be hard to timber, breakage will be high, and the recovery growth will be slow because of the cooler climate. As socialists we do not maintain that the national forests should not be cut but we do claim that no profit should be made from such cutting of public property. Also the secondary values of recreation and beauty should not be ignored even in the public lands designated as forest areas.

NIBBLING AWAY

Moving down into the United States proper, we find that the forest industry is attempting to cut into the National Park areas. Private interests are attempting to reduce the size of Olympic National Park and to have part of it designated as National Forest area so that they can log it somewhat in the manner described above for Alaska. Perhaps the lumber industry can cut carefully and not spoil the natural beauty permanently but this seems to be unlikely on the basis of past experience.

Parks are for the use of all the citizens (if they can afford to visit them) and the change to a forest area would not be a step in the best public interest. It is true that good lumber is becoming scarce, even in the Pacific Northwest, but we would insist that a lot more effort be put into better lumbering practices, research for better utilization of wood products, and attempts to use more wood substitutes such as plastics and metals, before we agree to the reductions of National Park areas.

Another conservation feud has been brewing for some time in the state of Utah where the Bureau of Reclamation, aided and abetted by farming and power interests, has proposed the construction of Echo Park dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. It is claimed that the dam, 525 feet high, would flood out and ruin the scenic wonders of the area. We

of his decision to abandon certain of his former "positions," particularly on war; it is only a transitional state of mind.

The ISL is not "socialism"; Howe is not a "backslider" merely because he quit the ISL; these jibes do not deal with anything I wrote. A "naive old-fashioned" socialist might hail *Dissent* in the manner Howe wishes, but we old-fashioned socialists who want to build a socialist movement in the best way we know cannot hail a magazine which sets itself Howe's aim, one which seeks to counterpose a politically contentless magazine to the task of building any socialist organization, including a better one than ours. Especially "in this reactionary moment," when there are too many who would be grateful for a really expert rationalization for fleeing from that task.

As for the regrettable jeers which fill the bulk of Howe's letter, surely the way they look in cold type is their own sternest commentary.

Hal DRAPER.

are not convinced that the power and irrigation water is unquestioningly and desperately needed from a dam at this particular spot.

PARKS OR PROFIT?

The most correct use for public land is not always easy to determine. Shall we develop a new industrial area or shall we preserve the forest primeval? Shall it be scenic woodland or a lumbering operation needed for newsprint or housing?

Hydroelectric power, or irrigation, or flood control, or no dam? An uninhabited dense forest or open forest with food for birds and animals or even grazing for domestic animals? Recreation or unspoiled nature? Answers to these questions can be given only after considering technical aspects in each particular case as well as the public interest. Too often, however, our government makes the decisions on the basis of the needs of private capital.

Admittedly a socialist government would have the inevitable problems in making some decisions on these matters. Interests of various citizen groups and areas might be contrary. Material need might sometimes result in the destruction of natural beauty or interfere with recreational facilities. Every public interest would have to be considered. But at least the decision would not be rendered on the basis of profit for individuals and corporations, an interest which is often contrary to every public one.

S. F. 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

LABOR ACTION

March 15, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 11

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

Lesson in U.S. Imperialism — —

(Continued from page 1)

ment as constituting intervention in American affairs," and proclaims the determination of the American states to protect themselves against it. The key paragraph of the resolution reads:

"That the domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extra-continental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America, and would call for appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties."

And the specific steps to be initiated immediately by the governments in question, without *limiting* action to such steps, are stated as follows:

"Measures to require the disclosure of the identity, activities and sources of funds of those who are spreading propaganda of the international Communist movement, or who travel in the interests of that movement, and of those who act as its agents or in its behalf; and

"The exchange of information among governments to assist in fulfilling the purpose of the resolutions adopted by the Inter-American Conferences and the meeting of the foreign ministers regarding international Communism."

WIDE OPEN DOOR

Of course, this resolution is not proposed just to get something against Stalinism on the books. It is proposed at this time because of the development of a strong Stalinist movement in Guatemala which enjoys a close alliance with the non-Stalinist government of that country. And the particular form the resolution takes, the fact that it does not mention Guatemala, and that specific reference to that country was omitted from Secretary of State Dulles' speech when he presented the resolution, is a concession to the strong resistance—of many of the govern-

ments and more of the people of Latin America—to any more open or direct or harsh intervention of the United States into their political affairs.

To meet as many of the objections as possible to any resolution of this type, the United States refrained from pointing the finger directly at Guatemala, or from defining just what action is to be taken if any American government should come under the "domination or control" of the "international Communist movement." But this did not seem to satisfy the objections of many Latin American governments.

They saw in the resolution a wide-open door for United States intervention into the political affairs of the weaker states of the continent under all kinds of circumstances which could be made to fit into the broad language of the resolution. The central objection was that a *political movement* is here described as if it were the invading army of a foreign country, or at least the spies and agents which precede it. They were willing to adopt a resolution which provides for joint action against any Russian invasion of the American continent, or any attempt by Russian agents to subvert an American government but the U. S. resolution was far broader than that.

THE POLICE APPROACH

Dulles' speech, in which he sought to justify the resolution, was masterfully planned to meet this objection of the Latin American governments. He dwelt at length on the fact that the Russian Communist Party dominates the Communist Parties of all other countries, and that the agents of Moscow dictate policies and leaderships to them. He admitted that most of the followers of these movements are unaware of the organizational nature of the ties which bind them to the Kremlin, but regard them as "normal, patriotic, political impulses, led by indigenous elements."

This latter aspect of the Stalinist move-

ment is quickly passed over in the speech, however. Yet it is this native Stalinism in Latin America as in most other countries, which is what gives the movement its real political drive. Yet the U. S. resolution does not and cannot propose to counteract the political and social movements which have their roots in the poverty and exploitation of the peoples in Latin America, except by treating them as a police problem.

Of course, the resolution was immediately backed by the governments of the Dominican "republic" and one or two other Latin American dictatorships which regard any social or political opposition as a matter for the police, and which are most completely dependent on U. S. support for their survival. But those governments which maintain a more democratic system, and those which fear the economic and political pressures of the United States more than they do their own Stalinist movements, greeted the resolution with what is called in diplomatic language "reserve," and sought to amend it into some form which defines Russian intervention rather than Stalinist political activity as the thing to be resisted by joint action.

In his speech justifying the resolution, Dulles dwelt at length on the Stalinist conquest of the countries of Eastern Europe. He sought to draw an analogy between the dangers of Stalinism in Latin America and this conquest. It is interesting to note, however, that in listing the countries which had lost their sovereignty to Russia under Stalinist conquest he did not include China, the only one among them where Stalinist victory was not a direct product of the presence of Russian troops. Yet if any analogy in Latin America can be made to the advance of Stalinist conquest elsewhere, it is to China and not to Latvia, Bulgaria, Poland, or even Czechoslovakia.

What real threat to the security of the United States, or of the other Latin American countries, would a Stalinist government in Guatemala represent? Actually, it would be negligible, if any. Yet the United States is willing to resort to extreme measures against even the possibility of such a development.

ANALOGY

There is an analogy here which leaps to the mind. The Russian Stalinists demand, in the interest of their "security," that all countries on their borders be subservient to them and adopt their economic system. Any movement in any of these countries which opposes this demand is immediately labeled a "tool" of the United States and denounced as an example of American aggression, or at the very latest, intervention into the Russian "security" sphere or sphere of influence.

If the East German workers rebel, it is the work of American spies and agents. If a movement for some degree of national independence develops among the leaders of one of the satellite countries, they are eventually compelled to "confess" that they were acting as agents of the United States. Not so many years ago Russia actually invaded Finland on the ground that this country was being used as a tool by foreign powers and hence represented a threat to the security of Russia.

Dulles was quite correct in pointing out the Russian-dominated character of the world Stalinist movement. His indictment of the complete subjugation of the satellite countries by Russia was a telling one. But between the recital of these well-known facts and the *policy* proposed to deal with the problem of Stalinism, there remains the gap which is evident in every attempt by the U. S. government to fight the cold war. This gap is the lack of a social policy which can meet and defeat Stalinism on its own grounds. It is the fact that American imperialism appears to the common people of many countries, and specially to those of Latin America, as the most immediate exploiter and coeurer of their economies and governments.

And the U. S. government cannot close the gap by changing its economic and social policies throughout the world. They are a function of its own domestic social and economic system. Thus it seeks to close the gap by military and police measures, and by winning any and all allies which will support it in such measures. As often as not, the most reactionary governments tend to be the staunchest allies for these purposes.

BUT NO ONE LAUGHED . . .

In contrasting the satellites of Russia with the freedom of the American continent, Dulles said: "In this hemisphere

it takes no courage for a representative of one of the smallest American countries openly to attack the government of the most powerful.

"I rejoice that that kind of freedom exists in the Americas even if it may be at times abused. But the essential is that there be a relationship of sovereign equality. We of the United States want to keep it that way. We seek no satellites, but only friendly equals."

How the assembled delegates and newspapermen were able to keep from bursting into sarcastic laughter at this point is not recorded by these same newspapermen. But one of them had reported, the day before this speech was delivered, that some Latin American delegates to the conference "conceded that Washington, by acting tough and exerting economic pressure, could push through the resolution in forty-eight hours. . . . As one delegate remarked, 'If the United States wanted to badly enough, it could have the resolution passed, declaring two and two are five.'"

At another point, this same reporter (Sydney Gruson of the New York Times) stated that after the Guatemalan delivered a slashing attack on this government's support of the United Fruit Company in the struggle it is waging against his government, the delegates applauded.

"Senior Toriello," Gruson writes, "had said many nasty things about the United States that virtually all Latin Americans believe. They were willing to applaud him since it cost them nothing. But not many were willing to vote against the United States when they might have to get up later in the conference and ask for economic aid. In the committee vote, only Mexico, Uruguay and Argentina sided with Guatemala."

GUATEMALA AT ISSUE

There is a picture of your governmental "equals." The foreign ministers of a dozen countries are willing to applaud a denunciation of United States policy which they believe paints a truthful picture. Thus they demonstrate that they are far more free than the foreign ministers of the Russian satellites, who would never dare to publicly applaud an anti-Russian speech.

But when it comes to voting, it turns out that they are not quite so sovereign. The strongest and boldest among them can resist, as can those like Guatemala, which have nothing to lose in any event. But most would be willing to vote that "two and two are five" if the U. S. overlord got tough enough in demanding that they do it.

Everyone knows that at the moment Guatemala is the real target of the U. S. resolution; this despite the fact that almost all anti-Stalinist observers of the present Guatemalan government deny that it is run by the Stalinists. But the government has taken strong measures against the continued exploitation of the country by the United Fruit Company, has instituted land reforms on a large scale, and cooperates with a Stalinist-dominated labor movement and a Stalinist-influenced agrarian movement in its struggle with United Fruit and the landlord class of the country.

BEHIND THE FLAG

The U. S. resolution does not spell out what action is to be taken against the present government of Guatemala, or even exactly how a further increase of Stalinist influence in the country is to be prevented. But the governments of Latin America sense, with an instinct bred of long experience, that once they have committed themselves to the proposition that any assumption of power by an "international Communist movement," however democratically this may be brought about, and however tenuous its control from Moscow may be, is to be treated as if it were a foreign aggression, the door will be wide open for direct military intervention, or at the least, the harshest type of economic and political sanctions.

American imperialism does not operate in the same way as Russian imperialism, or even as the old imperialisms of Europe. Its advance positions are not held by occupation troops or by political movements controlled by it. They are held by the enormous economic pressure which this country can exert on its less developed neighbors to the South. But behind that pressure stand the planes and troops, ready for action if the other methods prove themselves too weak to achieve their goals.

SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

persuaded the president that McCarthyism is the best Republican formula for political success," what about the political politicos who have persuaded the Democratic leaders that political success requires yellow silence about McCarthyism?

If Stevenson complains that Eisenhower has disapproved of McCarthyism only "in statements to the press" while he lets the mud continue to fly, how much better is he himself when he takes a fall out of McCarthyism in a demonstrative speech while the party which he heads continues to give the galloping evil its passive toleration?

We do not doubt Stevenson's sincere detestation of McCarthy's methods (those "methods" which are to be so carefully distinguished from the very very laudable aims which the storm-trooper from Wisconsin is supposed to espouse in his detestable way . . .) but then, we also have few doubt about what Eisenhower privately tells his cronies. And when General von Hindenburg called Adolf Hitler to the head of the German state, he held his nose.

Let Stevenson do in the Democratic Party what he righteously proposes Eisenhower do in the GOP, and at least he will come into court with clean hands.

SOUTHERN COMFORT

(2) The second consideration which dims the joy to be felt over Stevenson's speech is one that has been completely overlooked in commentators' concentration on the anti-McCarthyite aspects of the speech.

While Stevenson was smugly arraigning Eisenhower for failing to fight the extreme-reactionary wing of his party by deeds and not only words, Stevenson himself was actually engaged in the act of wooing the extreme-reactionary section of his own party, in both deed and word.

Stevenson's role at this conference of the lily-white, Jim Crow and White Supremacy section of his party is part of his current tactic of making himself acceptable to these Bourbons—a project which he started a while back with another speech in the South, at the side of Hummin' Talmadge.

Outside of the disagreement in the party ranks over McCarthyism, reports Washington columnist Doris Fleenon, "Miami is reported a great success by senators in attendance, possibly because

no one mentioned the divisive issue of segregation." And listen to this: "It is being argued, both North and South, that since the Supreme Court will shortly rule on this issue, there is no need to quarrel over it again."

No, the Fair Deal wing of the Democrats which follows the Stevenson policy is not "quarreling" with the racial-McCarthyites in their own ranks. The "quarrel" which exploded at the 1948 convention, when the Democrats were frantic for votes, is not being pursued by Stevenson. Indeed, it looks as if a group of political plungers has persuaded Stevenson that accommodation to the Byrneses and Talmadges is the best Democratic formula for political success.

STEVENSON'S VIEW

(3) But still Stevenson attacked McCarthyism even though his party is against such indiscreet conduct. . . . Or did he attack McCarthyism?

To be sure, he denounced McCarthy for smearing his own Democratic Party; he denounced McCarthy for smearing Eisenhower Republicans; this, he strongly argued, was going too far. But what shall we call the following statement in Stevenson's speech where he is no longer dealing with McCarthyite attacks on such "respectable" people—

"Everyone hopes the administration will find and remove all the real subversives and keep them out of our government. A single disloyal or dangerous employee is one too many."

We note that Stevenson does not limit this sweeping hope to dangerously subversive employees in sensitive positions, whatever that may be defined to be. There must not be a single "subversive," "disloyal" or "dangerous" person employed by the government—

—Not even as a file clerk in the Veterans' Administration?

—Not even as a stenographer in the Bureau of Land Reclamation?

—And perhaps not even as a worker earning a living in a plant working on war contracts?

If this is a position "against McCarthyism," by people who deplore McCarthy's habits of loose definition, then a Stevenson-type victory against McCarthyism would only be a measure of the ground that McCarthyism has won after McCarthy's personal downfall.