

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**The Literary GPU in Russia:
That 'New Look' Is Wearing Off**

... page 3

FRANCE: REPORT ON THE SP

... page 2

**CHALLENGE TO THE CAMPUS
4-Page Issue of the 'Challenge'**

... inside pages

OCTOBER 4, 1954

FIVE CENTS

Battle of the Square-D Flares Up With Injunction and Arrest of Pickets

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Sept. 26—Full pressure of the United Auto Workers (CIO) was put to bear on the Square-D strike to force a settlement between management and the independent UE union before the situation became a political hot potato affecting the coming November elections in Michigan.

Twice during the past week, it appeared as if Detroit were going to witness a revival of the bitter strike struggles that marked the early turbulent days of CIO organization when mass picketing won victories over companies, judges, cops and scabs.

Detroit was heading for that kind of showdown last week when UAW locals kept putting more power into the picket lines to keep harassing scabs marching and riding into the Square-D plant under very heavy police protection.

Some lively skirmishing between pickets and police marked each morning's struggle, and the anger of the union pickets over the cops' obvious strike-breaking role kept mounting.

At the crucial moment, however, Judge Ferguson issued a sweeping injunction and special orders to police under a little-used and little-known riot-act section of

the Michigan labor law, and mass picketing was broken up, with dozens of UAW pickets getting personal warnings. Two UAW picket leaders were arrested with lots of fanfare. One of them, Ernest Mazey, was released the next day and charges against him dropped.

Police held Paul Silver, a UAW local union president, incommunicado, and Detroit judges refused to release him even on a writ of habeas corpus. This was intended to intimidate other strike leaders. It took much behind-the-scenes maneuvering on the part of the UAW to force Silver's release after 24 hours in jail.

In those three critical days, police discovered a "red plot," a "bomb plot," and the House Committee on Un-American Activities put its nickel's worth into whipping up a big red scare. UAW locals countered with an exposé of these tactics, and the attempt to whip up a wave of hysteria against the strikers failed.

Noticeable in those three critical days, however, was the lack of personal intervention by the top leadership of the UAW on the picket lines, and this was not missed by city officials or the judiciary.

Toward the end of the week, when the scabs were marching into the plant, near-

(Turn to last page)

The Russians Don't Have to Be Clever...

By BERNARD CRAMER

"It will tax ingenuity to find a formula [at the forthcoming London conference] that will grant Germany equality and sovereignty but provide safeguards against a recrudescence of German militaristic nationalism," says the N. Y. Times in standard editorial journalese.

A taxed ingenuity would be easy, but magic is another matter. None of the schemers of schemes in Washington, London or Paris has any idea of how to pull off this trick. The rearming of Germany under a reactionary government like Adenauer's means putting guns into the hands of the old German militarism, and the problem that the State Department is trying to solve is not how to prevent this from happening but how to sell it to France.

Similarly, the standard journalese comment on the opening of the United Nations General Assembly session is that the U.S. once more faces the clever machinations of Vishinsky designed to blacken the poor but honest American diplomats before the world. The ability of these super-clever Russians to blacken the U.S. is really re-

markable, considering that it is the U.S. that holds the whiphand in the UN majority, and that the debates and proceedings are public before the world.

The Russians, however, do not have to be diabolically smart.

At the London conference, the Big Three of the West will be washing their own dirty linen, and Moscow need only stand aside and point—to the remilitarization of a reactionary Germany.

Who will point to the fact that the Russians have remilitarized their own Germany—East Germany—and rehabilitated its ex-Nazis to boot? Many, including we socialists, can do so literarily; but the leaders of the capitalist West cannot make this point effectively before the world on the basis of their present policy. They can only fling back "You too!"

UN ISSUES

The Russians don't have to be devilishly brilliant at the UN either. All Vishinsky had to do at the opening session was raise the question of China's admission routinely. It apparently has escaped the attention of most Americans that Dulles has admitted that the U.S. cannot mobilize the votes to defeat this. The great victory on the point—so called—had to be on a motion to postpone the issue, so that countries like Britain could swallow and go along, in order not to antagonize Big Brother.

Thus the two great issues of the time clustered around the two powers which are not even members of the UN—Germany and China. While the fate of one was to be settled outside the UN in London, the problem of the other was shoved aside by the "world" body. Where events do not by-pass the UN, the UN makes sure to by-pass events.

The Russians do not need to tax their ingenuity at the UN as long as Western colonialism guarantees issues ready-made. At the current session, two were forced on the agenda against the opposition of the colonialists: West New Guinea, which Indonesia is demanding from Holland, and Cyprus, whose right to self-determination is being demanded by Greece against Britain.

NO CUNNING

The U.S., not bothering to pretend to be a bulwark of freedom in a troubled world, abstained from the vote in both cases. This did not help the small-nation blocks get the issues on the agenda, since a certain number of positive votes are

(Continued on page 3)

Liberal Party Plays Tail to the Donkey State Convention Goes Along with the Democratic Party Hacks

By PETER WHITNEY

After piously adopting a platform promising decisions based on the "deepest ethical commitments," the State Convention of the Liberal Party of New York, held on September 22 at the Capitol Hotel, descended to the level of what is termed "practical politics" and endorsed the Democratic slate with one exception.

This convention, held shortly after the major party conventions, was committed in advance to endorse Averell Harriman for governor, Franklin Roosevelt Jr. for attorney-general and most of the Democratic nominees. As some 500 delegates arrived for the convention, they were already reading newspaper accounts of their leadership's support to the Democratic slate. The convention chairman and party leaders assured the delegates (before even nominations began) that the nominees would personally appear before the convention. This steamroller atmosphere was too much for one delegate, who complained bitterly that the delegates had been called together to rubber-stamp a slate and that it was impossible to have a free discussion on the candidates under such circumstances.

The chairman rushed to defend the democratic honor of the party by assuring the delegate that the candidates were not really "waiting in the next room" to be called before the convention! But by happy coincidence no doubt, the leading Democratic candidates were discovered together somewhere nearby by a committee sent to unearth them, after they had been duly nominated.

State Chairman Adolf A. Berle Jr., in his keynote address, stressed the reactionary character of the Republican administrations both in Washington and in

Albany. The overwhelming aim to drive the Republicans out of office in New York State, and then two years hence out of the White House, determined the selections of the Liberal Party leadership.

No mention was made of the fierce fight in the Democratic convention between Averell Harriman and Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. for the gubernatorial nomination, except that Berle credited the Liberal Party with such strong influence on the Democratic Party that both possible candidates were "acceptable" liberal types. Thus, argued Berle, the Liberals have "elevated" politics in New York State; even the Republicans had to nominate such liberal types as Senator Irving M. Ives for governor and Congressman Jacob Javits for attorney-general.

In fact, one might argue that the Liberal Party suffered from an embarrassment of success—if its sole purpose in life was to get the major parties to run the best possible "liberal types" for office. For now they were confronted with two candidates for attorney-general of the most eminently liberal type—in fact, both candidates, Democrat Roosevelt and Republican Javits, were launched into the political arena by the Liberal Party and supported by the party at every election. A nice dilemma indeed for the Liberals!

What role did the Liberal Party, as a

party, play in the hot fight between Harriman and Roosevelt Jr. for the leading nomination in the Democratic Party? Was the rank and file of the Liberals consulted as to their choice?

The New York State CIO expressed its position positively and emphatically—it wanted Roosevelt for governor. The Liberals have been courting the CIO unions to join in with them to forge a stronger basis for independent political action by the labor movement in New York State. Even from the backward point of view of choosing the "best" of the Democratic candidates, the state CIO attempted to throw its weight around and at least polled its convention delegates on this score.

But the Liberals, who presume to have greater influence on the Democrats, were silent on this matter, and permitted no rank-and-file participation. The leaders operated behind the scenes—apparently favoring Harriman, along with their erstwhile foe, Tammany leader De Sapio,

(Turn to last page)

Pogo on the Subversive List?

Walt Kelly, who appeared before a Senate Investigating Committee to agree that something ought to be done about comic magazines found this month that something was being done about his own Pogo.

In Providence, R. I., readers of the Journal were told that Pogo would be suppressed ("omitted" was the word the paper used) whenever it contained a

character named "Simple J. Malarkey" who resembles Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

In Massachusetts, readers remembered that Pogo had sprung forth from a "left-wing" paper—and that at least one riot at Harvard could be traced to a Pogo club. A suggestion was made that the meaning and real intent of Pogo be investigated.

—Exposé (Sept.)

The Politics of the Left-Right Struggle over EDC — France: A Report on the SP

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Sept. 20—Of all parties here that were split by the issue of EDC, the SP is the hardest hit.

The conflict in the bourgeois parties will not affect them deeply, because, much like the American bourgeois parties, they are loose coalitions of contradictory interests, and their reasons for existence lie on a different level. In the MRP's case, the expulsions were nothing more than the settling of accounts with a rambunctious but uninfluential minority. The SP's conflict, on the other hand, is at once more unreconcilable and more profound.

Yet the split in the SP was not the result, originally, of a specific internal need but a reflection of the struggle between two opposing bourgeois factions. A historian once said that "an institution which possesses no philosophy of its own inevitably accepts that which happens to be fashionable." After failing to produce its own solutions to any of the problems before the country, the SP has adopted the contradictions of the bourgeoisie along with the latter's policies, and has broken asunder under the same blows which have split the bourgeoisie into five factions.

Therefore the real issue in the SP's crisis is not EDC alone—if this were the case, the rift could be healed more easily.

Let us take a closer look at these two factions.

The pro-EDC tendency led by Guy Mollet, André Philip, etc., largely corresponds to the traditional right wing in the party. Yet there are right-wing elements in the anti-EDC faction, and the Mollet tendency is also supported by the large working-class federations of Nord and Pas-de-Calais.

What characterizes the Mollet tendency more distinctively is its commitment to American foreign policy, in coalition with the MRP and (worse in France) in conjunction with the Morrison-Spaak wing in the Socialist International, and with Adenauer and Dulles

abroad. It is the policy of those who do not see any way of opposing Stalinism except by brandishing democratic atom bombs—a policy that has accumulated nothing but disaster for the labor movement the world over and led to the present impasse in the first place.

ANTI-EDC WING

The anti-EDC tendency likewise is not simply a left wing. It does contain a Bevanite left, represented by people such as Pivert and his friends, Depreux, Weitz, the "Courrier Syndical" tendency in Force Ouvrière, which have their own, mainly socialist, reasons for opposing EDC. Its dominant tendency, however, represented by the anti-EDC parliamentarians, is basically pro-American with anti-German chauvinist overtones.

The refusal of this group to be welded any tighter to the American defense system stems largely from the same motives that inspire the neutralist bourgeoisie. Along with the latter, they hope to find an intermediary position for France on the international scene, guaranteed by "peaceful coexistence."

At the extreme right of this tendency stand such people as Ramadier, a personification of every kind of opportunism that has plagued the SP since pre-war times, and Naegelen, the notorious organizer of the Algerian repression in 1945 and the consistent supporter of imperialist policies in the colonies. In this case too, what coherence this tendency has resides in its support to a bourgeois tendency, the one represented by Mendès-France.

The fact, however, that the factions in

the SP have not crystallized out of a compelling need for a clearer socialist policy, but because the party has allowed the contradictions of the bourgeoisie to become its own, does not mean that the present conflict is devoid of meaning for the labor movement, or that it cannot be utilized to the latter's advantage. While the occasion of the conflict has not been a socialist initiative, its repercussions in the party have a new meaning because the SP, contrary to appearances, is not a bourgeois party and still has deep roots in the working class. For this reason it is important to evaluate the political meaning and the perspectives of each tendency.

The consequences of the policies of the Mollet wing are too well known to enter seriously into consideration as a perspective for the French labor movement. It is the policy that has led the SPP and F.O. to paralysis and that has rendered them incapable of defending effectively the interests of the working class, not to speak of the interests of the colonial peoples. It represents an abandonment of any perspective of socialist leadership—there is nothing Guy Mollet can do that Dulles can't do better.

SLOWING DOWN

For the French socialist movement, this policy means self-immolation on the altar of the great crusade; it also means to practically push the French working-class into the CP's arms, for want of an alternative. This is why, at the present time, this policy will remain confined to the fortunately narrowing circle of Mollet supporters, and to the handful of demoralized renegades from *Franc-Tireur* and *Preuves*.

What, on the other hand, are the perspectives of the anti-EDC tendency? At present, its policy is one of collaboration with the neutralist bourgeoisie, of going along with the initiative Mendès-France has taken. But what will happen when the initiative slips out of Mendès-France's hands, as it must?

Already now a certain slowing down in the "New Deal" is noticeable. *L'Express*, the liberal bourgeois weekly, has already begun to enumerate the "forces of inertia" that are gathering strength against Mendès-France and says: "what is there to maintain dynamism and forward motion? Essentially, popular pressure, the pressure of new generations..." Even the bourgeois supporters of Mendès-France, then, recognize the imperative need for the French premier to seek mass support on his left.

Such mass support can come from the Stalinists, and this Mendès-France cannot accept on the terms he must govern on. It can also come from an SP that has been conquered by the anti-EDC wing.

SP'S CHANCE

In this latter case, Mendès-France would find himself entirely dependent on the SP, all the more so since he cannot attain even his bourgeois neutralist aims in foreign policy without support from the British Labor Party and the German Social-Democrats (SPD). But if Mendès-France cannot govern without the SP, then this means that the SP is in a position to impose its own terms on the domestic level, to take the initiative and to propose, in turn, a "New Deal" under the leadership of the working class. It would also be in a position to re-establish contact with the international socialist movement and to work out a common policy with the BLP and the SPD, tending toward an autonomous Western Europe—an indispensable first step if genuine socialist forces are to develop. To do this, it would not even necessarily have to be in government; it would be more powerful in opposition, with such a policy, than any of the pre-Mendès-France or possible post-Mendès-France governments could ever hope to be. A tempting perspective—but is it a realistic one?

It assumes, to begin with, that the left neutralist, anti-EDC opposition has succeeded in swinging a majority of the SP over to its views. This is by no means excluded if it is allowed to develop freely in the party. Since the July congress in 1953, the anti-EDC tendency has been gaining strength steadily, and increased its following from a third of the membership to nearly half at the present time. The defeat of EDC has only further strengthened its position.

Against this trend, Guy Mollet has fought bitterly in order to maintain control over the party. The stages of the fight are known: sanctions, suspensions, expulsions recently of the leaders of the

NEW YORKERS—REGISTER!

We recommend that New York readers register Liberal Party. You must register in order to vote. Registration takes place till Saturday, Oct. 9, up to 10 p.m.

anti-EDC opposition; threats of expulsion against the majority of the parliamentary group. It is not unlikely that Guy Mollet will attempt to save his position by wholesale expulsions of the opposition, in order to isolate them from the party before it is too late.

For Guy Mollet and the "European" wing of the SP this would, of course, mean political suicide. Regardless of the fate of the opposition, it would weaken the party organization decisively and reduce it to the state of Saragat's PSDI in Italy—a fifth wheel to the chariot of the pro-American bourgeoisie. Yet, experience has shown that Guy Mollet might not hesitate to assert his tendency's supremacy in the party even at such a price.

THE STRUGGLE WILL CONTINUE

The ability of the SP's politicians to reach unclean compromises should not be underrated; however, even if the conciliators in the party prevail against Guy Mollet, and a *modus vivendi* is reached between the two factions within the party, the split will not have been healed, the struggle between the two factions will continue, the "Europeans" will continue to lose ground, even though a clarification of the issues may be postponed for a time.

If, on the other hand, Guy Mollet has his way and expels his opponents, will the perspectives of the opposition have changed decisively? This depends in the first place on the opposition's own attitude. Mollet hopes that wholesale expulsion will cause it to disintegrate, i.e., will compel a greater part of the oppositionists to crawl back into the party on Guy Mollet's terms. If this should happen, and, given the composition of the opposition it can happen, a serious blow will have been struck against any independent socialist perspective in France for a long time to come; social-democracy will have disappeared as a factor from the political scene; with it the potentiality of an independent Left; and, as a consequence, Stalinism will be correspondingly strengthened.

However, disintegration is not a necessary fate for the neutralist opposition, even if it is expelled. The factors that would favor disintegration are the lack of stability of the opposition group and its lack of homogeneity: it does not really know what it wants, nor has it had time to reach any clear perception of its role. Yet it has been produced by a mood which expresses not only the quandary of the French bourgeoisie but also the strainings of the working class toward a new, genuinely independent solution.

TO THE LEFT?

The French working class is not a passive, amorphous mass. It is a conscious class, and it is in motion, seeking by its own devices a solution outside and in part against its traditional representatives. The tremendous decline in Stalinist influence, which is only paralleled by the decline of the SP, has not brought about a decomposition of the class-consciousness of the workers, nor the loss of their ability for spontaneous, collective and organized action. The August strikes last year have demonstrated this. The great response to Mendès-France among the people also reflects this in part. Forces are in motion that have grown larger than neutralism and larger than Mendès-France.

If it succeeds in riding the crest of this wave, the neutralist opposition would be held together—not by any internal cohesion it does not have as yet, but compelled to go forward by the pressure of a forward-going working-class. A development to the left would be all the more likely to follow from such a situation, since the left minority, in the neutralist opposition would be the only group equipped to understand and foresee such a development, and consequently to turn it to its advantage.

Whether this perspective materializes, then, mainly depends on two factors: if the SP opposition can maintain and assert its identity inside or outside the party for long enough to be able to merge with an upsurge of the working class; if the working class can recognize and seize in time the occasion it is offered to support a new alternative, to compel the neutralist tendency of the SP to become a left tendency, and to turn it into a new political weapon.

Bevan's Pro-Stalinist Speech in Peiping

Apropos of the recent discussion in LABOR ACTION of the Attlee-Bevan junket to China, we can be more specific on one point now. The text of Aneurin Bevan's speech in Peiping is now available (quotations below are translated from the French neutralist-Stalinoid weekly *France-Observateur*).

The speech made clear Bevan's political support and endorsement in general of the Chinese Stalinist regime.

As we said before: we can have only contempt for the type of attacks on the Laborite junket which have been so rife in this country; but we have our own socialist reasons for rejecting it. Not least among them is the spectacle represented by Bevan.

As Bevan put it in opening his speech: "Our presence is in itself sufficient to show the support which we bring to the Chinese people's revolution..."

And this is exactly why it is disingenuous to justify the Laborites visit with references to cementing better relations or "finding out what the Chinese think," and similar dodges.

Bevan's previously known Stalinoid illusions flowered in his Peiping speech. The bulk of his talk was devoted to explaining to the Chinese why the forms of struggle may be different in Britain but essentially we all are fighting for the same thing. It was a general political embrace.

ENDORSEMENT

Here is how he went on (we are translating from the French as mentioned above):

"It is evident that the fight which the British workers are carrying on in their own country against the forces of capitalism leads them to sympathize deeply with the struggles of the workers in the other countries. These struggles take different forms because they are carried on under different historical conditions. These conditions do not modify the ulti-

mate objectives of socialism but they do have influence on the means which have to be used to achieve it and also on the nature of the changes to come. There is no universal recipe for social progress..."

Bevan continued along these lines with more platitudes about taking into account differing national traditions, etc. The idea was that the Chinese Stalinists were good socialist fighters who were merely suiting their policy to non-British conditions.

At one point Bevan even stated that the Chinese Stalinists "have put forward and continue to put forward the only means to liberate your country from foreign domination."

It would have been difficult to go beyond this endorsement of the Mao dictatorship.

"It is this combination of social and national struggles which is at the source of the principle difference between us," said Bevan. He is referring to the aforesaid differences in tactics due to conditions, and so on. At no point, according to this text, did he indicate any criticism whatsoever.

At no point did he even indicate that there were some inadequacies in the political regime from the point of view of democratic rights.

Here Stalinoid illusions go hand in hand with old-fashioned British and white chauvinism. For it is quite clear that Bevan's thinking includes the following: A backward and benighted people like the Chinese, and Asiatics in general, who wouldn't understand democracy anyway, can't be brought to freedom by a democratic regime or by democratic methods; they understand only the whip; so let the Stalinists whip them rather than Chiang Kai-shek; at least the Stalinists will whip them into "socialism"....

Here is exactly how a species of pro-Stalinism meshes with typical imperialist contempt for colored peoples.

The Literary GPU in Russia: That 'New Look' Is Wearing Off

What has happened to the highly touted "new freedom" in Russian literature, which evidenced itself after Stalin's death and in the first period of the directorate that supplanted Stalin?

Here we publish two articles from two different publications which mesh together very nicely. The first from the weekly Soviet Orbit (London), which presents the picture up to August and ends with a question mark over the figure of Ilya Ehrenburg. The second is by Alexander Werth—an independent Stalinoid, it should be noted—writing in the New Statesman and Nation, on "Ehrenburg in Trouble." Together they tell the story up to now.

By JOHN CLEWS

One feature of the Soviet "new look" has been the loosening of the cultural straitjacket, jerked tight by the Zhdanov decrees of 1946-48. It began with an article by the poetess, Olga Berggoltz, published in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* a few weeks after Stalin's death. She said that people were crying out for lyrical poetry, and pleaded that the "institutional guardianship" imposed by the bureaucracy be ended.

The new call was for creative initiative, sincerity and originality in Soviet art. On June 4, 1953, *Pravda* complained editorially that the new plays were poorly written, and demanded a "bold and creative search" for something new, instead of "schematic portrayals of conflict."

In October 1953, Ilya Ehrenburg amplified this theme. In the monthly, *Novy Mir*, he asked, "Can one imagine Tolstoy being ordered to write *Anna Karenina*, or *Gorky Mother*?"

He supplied his own answer, "An author is not a piece of machinery. An author writes a book not because he knows how to write, not because he is a member of the Soviet Writers' Union and may be asked why he has published nothing for so long. An author does not write a book because he has to earn a living. An author writes a book because he finds it necessary to tell something of himself, because he is 'sick' with his book, because he has seen people, things and emotions he cannot help describing."

VOICES SPEAK UP

Ehrenburg must have had his tongue in his cheek when he drafted this plea for freedom to write, for he—above all—knows the situation in Soviet literature and art. But his article was followed by others. Many writers must have told themselves, "The satirist Zoshchenko has been rehabilitated to a certain extent, maybe things will improve."

In December 1953, *Novy Mir* published an article by V. Pomerantsev, who attacked artificiality and called for more real sincerity in writing.

"Our literature needs builders, not professional bards," he declared. "A bard spends his time extolling gladness, a builder creates it. The writer who derives his enthusiasms not from royalties but from our great achievements and plans, will never hush up problems. He will seek to solve all problems of our complex and most interesting times. Why should we need to idealize, when we are actually achieving the ideal?"

Pomerantsev then dealt with hypothetical cases, which were basically true. He spoke of the difficulty of getting works published which were not written to order; finally he attacked several officially approved books.

Similar thoughts appeared elsewhere. *Oktyabr* published a play—*Spring Floods* by Yuri Chapurin—which criticized the builders of the Volga-Don Canal for riding rough-shod over the feelings of a Cossack village, forcibly moved to make way for a new reservoir.

THUNDER RUMBLES

Then came a warning. On January 6, 1954, *Pravda* said that this new freedom was taken too much for granted. "Socialist realism" was "still the operative factor." A month later in *Znanya*, the critic L. Skorino accused Pomerantsev of erecting his own targets in order to shoot them down easily, of being "ambiguous" in his apparent sincerity.

Yet, surprisingly, *Komsomolskaya Pravda* supported Pomerantsev. On March 17 it published a long letter from some Moscow students, who thought Pomerantsev had gone too far in his criticisms, but agreed with his main points.

This was only a flash in the pan. On April 12 *Pravda* took up its old theme again, warning editorially against "nega-

tive phenomena" as a reaction against "idyllic tones."

In May, for "anti-social behavior," four authors were expelled from the Union of Soviet Writers, which meant that they could no longer hope to have anything published. The most important of them, the Stalin Prize winner N. Vinta, was indubitably penalized for having criticized the party line. Another, F. Panferov, was dismissed from the editorship of *Oktyabr*.

LAST ACT

Another, F. Panferov, was dismissed from the editorship of *Oktyabr*.

On May 25, A. Surkov, first secretary of the writers' Union and an old enemy of Vinta, reminded his fellow writers that the Central Committee decrees of 1946-48 were as valid as ever; *Partinost* (Partyness) was still the criterion. Surkov singled out Pomerantsev's *Novy Mir* article for attack, though he did not mention Ehrenburg's initial inspiration.

On June 5 *Literaturnaya Gazeta* reported that a party meeting of the Leningrad writers had again "sharply denounced" Zoshchenko, along the same lines as in 1946.

On August 17, the final act of this current literary drama was played to a close.

Literaturnaya Gazeta announced that Tvardovsky had been dismissed from the editorship of *Novy Mir* for publishing Pomerantsev's article and "incorrect and harmful material," for forgetting that any weakening of socialist ideology meant a strengthening of bourgeois influence. Tvardovsky's successor is K. Simonov (by now a party hack). A new code for Soviet publication is to be laid before the Writers' Congress, postponed from September to November. There the Zhdanov line will be brought up-to-date!

But one question mark remains. Why has no criticism been leveled against Ehrenburg, who started the main chain of events? . . .

ILYA EHRENBURG ON THE PAN

By ALEXANDER WERTH

Some months ago Ilya Ehrenburg, encouraged by the more liberal appearance of the Malenkov regime, wrote a long article in favor of more lively, nonconformist and "inspired" writing in the Soviet Union. Although the article was exceedingly cautious, it was still typical of the reaction that seemed to have set in against Zhdanov's absolutist doctrine of "popular art"—a reaction the most striking example of which was Khachatryan's outburst against the bureaucratic tyranny that "for some years now" had been crippling Soviet music.

But this healthy reaction against artistic conformism has obviously received no encouragement from the party, and we seem to be back in the days when *Pravda* or some other official journal could finally "condemn" a book or work of art.

The latest storm has been over Ehrenburg's new short novel, significantly entitled *The Thaw*. The very official Mr. Simonov went for it hammer and tongs in two successive issues of *Literary Gazette*, in an article of altogether about 11 columns. Here and there he grudgingly conceded half a point to Ehrenburg; but, in general, he declared Ehrenburg's new book "harmful." And that was that.

Ehrenburg's novel is, in fact, a vigorous pamphlet against the prevailing state of affairs in the Soviet world of art and literature. Its two principal characters are, on the one hand, a hack, called Pukhov, who paints the right kind of picture—"Holiday on a Collective Farm," "Factory Meeting," "Two Workers Reading a Paper," "A Happy Soviet Girl with a New Chocolate Box" (each choc being carefully rendered in oils)—and, on the other hand, a great painter called Saburov, "a man who only loves his painting and his wife," and "who seems to want

to paint not for our time, but for the 21st century."

Pukhov is aware of his own mediocrity and secretly admires Saburov, whose genius is totally ignored by the authorities; but, being a cynic, Pukhov adapts himself as best he can to the conditions and manages, for all his mediocrity, to make a living by "following the instructions"; by painting *kolkhoz* hens and cows, and by doing, on the whole, not much worse than the "great masters" of the official school of painting—by whom no doubt Ehrenburg means Gerassimov and company.

THE FREEZE-OVER

According to Simonov, one-third of Ehrenburg's book is devoted to discussions on art and literature, and he complains of one of Ehrenburg's characters, a young actress, who constantly grumbles about the awful tedium of modern Soviet plays. And Simonov is indignant because Ehrenburg has talked only of the two extremes—Saburov, the isolated and unrecognized genius, and Pukhov, the commercialized hack. He is also indignant that Ehrenburg, instead of trying to convert the genius to "the service of the people," tends, on the contrary, to put him forward as an example to others.

"On the whole, Ehrenburg proposes that our art should follow Saburov, that it should follow the road which leads to isolation, to divorce from reality, in short, to formalism. . . . Never will our art adopt this course, and Ehrenburg's novel may do great harm to our art by encouraging the naturalists amongst us to invoke his authority. . . ."

It is odd how everything not closely conforming to the party line should now tend to be dismissed as "naturalist"—naturalism becoming, in some odd way, identified with the old "formalism."

The Russians Don't

(Continued from page 1)

needed, but it was something of a side-step.

The Russians did not even need Mephistophelean cunning when Dulles sprang his big coup on the UN session, namely, a reiteration of the Eisenhower atomic-energy pool proposal coupled with the charge that Moscow had refused to participate. At this writing Vishinsky has left the door open for a policy shift, or at least for obfuscatory maneuvers, and the question is to be discussed later on the agenda; but there is no reason to believe yet that the power-pool scheme dismays them.

Any impetus toward the expansion of the peaceful use of the atom is to be welcomed, but the U.S. has still to concretize the plan so that one can see whether it means much at all. That in the first place.

Secondly, an Atomic Energy Commission official has publicly expressed his fear that Russia may be way out in front with regard to political utilization of industrial atomic power, and without benefit of the Eisenhower pool plan at all.

SECRET WEAPON

Speaking on September 28, Dr. L. R. Hafstad, director of reactor development for the AEC, "chided" American industry "for failing to venture into the field of atomic power with its traditional boldness." He was afraid that "if the United States lagged in taking atomic power to underprivileged countries, European producers would grab the market."

Here's how he tied it up with the international cold war:

"Dr. Hafstad explained later that Britain was known to have the jump on the United States in building an atomic

In Madagascar

The Union of Public Service Employees in Madagascar has presented the French colonial administration with a list of demands, headed by the claim that local French and Madagascan employees should be put on an equal basis by law in their conditions and terms of work. The union is affiliated to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Negotiations are now taking place on the demand, but the union has declared that if the results are not satisfactory it envisages a widespread strike movement to enforce it.

In describing only "the two extremes"—the unrecognized genius and the hack—Ehrenburg, according to Simonov, has identified practically all Soviet art with the latter. And he proceeds to quote a list (rather a short one, I must say) of present-day painters, sculptors and actors who could not possibly be dismissed as hacks, but who equally cannot be classed as "unrecognized geniuses."

The argument is scarcely honest: the question does not arise whether Ehrenburg appreciates Arsyian or Konchalovskiy. What Ehrenburg is suggesting is that, in the total output of Soviet art, these few goodish painters do not weigh much, and that, unfortunately, it is the hacks, the Gerassimovs and the thousands of sub-Gerassimovs (of whom Pukhov is a perfect example) who set the pace.

Privately, Ehrenburg is, of course, a great Matisse and Picasso fan; officially, he did not dare go so far. His Saburov still paints only "marvellous portraits and wonderful landscapes." In any case, Simonov preferred not to raise the awkward question of the Communist Picasso.

The significance of it all is this: a few months ago, there was good reason to believe that the ice had been broken, that "the thaw" (to use Ehrenburg's word) had set in. Today Simonov devotes eleven very official columns to denouncing Ehrenburg, for the sole purpose of defending the *status quo*.

plant to produce commercial electricity. He said Russia's progress was an unknown quantity but important. Fear has frequently been expressed in recent months that great political advantage would accrue to the Russians if they provided atomic power for economically needy areas before the United States."

And Hafstad wanted to know when industry would even begin to move to do the job which was assigned to it by the new Atomic Energy Act.

If Hafstad is correct, an atomic power pool would not mean that the U.S. is giving Europe anything it doesn't know. The Europeans are ahead; and the Russians may be even further. Dulles' big plan, therefore, while played up in the U.S. press for lack of anything better, may merely lead Europe to mutter: "Thanks for small favors."

And while the power pool got bigger headlines in the U.S., the rest of the world heard more about the first victim of the H-bomb: symbolically, a Japanese, as were the first victims of the A-bombs.

No, the Russians don't have to be clever. Western capitalist politics is their secret weapon.



LABOR ACTION

October 4, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 40

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

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

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

Liberal Party and Donkey — —

(Continued from page 1)

But the delegates remained in total ignorance of how influential their operations were. At the state convention, it was obvious that the bulk of the Liberal delegates favored Roosevelt Jr. over Harriman, but a technique whereby the Liberal Party rank and file can influence its leadership has still to be perfected.

BACKING WARDHEELERS

How about the other candidates on the Democratic slate? How about the hacks and wardheelers selected? How about the judicial candidate attacked as "consistently anti-labor"? Where was Liberal influence on these minor posts? In the case of lieutenant-governor, a committee of leading AFL and CIO leaders had petitioned the Democratic Party to name Charles Halloran, Buffalo fire commissioner and an AFL union leader. The roster of this committee included the major unions in New York State, including many not in the Liberal Party.

The Liberal Party's trade-union leaders, David Dubinsky and Alex Rose, constantly appeal to these unions to work with them on the political field. But when these unions took a united political step to call for a unionist on the Democratic slate, where were the salvos of support for the Liberal leadership? Why didn't they use their vaunted influence behind a Halloran? Is this the way, from their point of view, to build closer political ties with the CIO and AFL?

Not one word of explanation was given to the state convention on this point, although Dubinsky's Ladies Garment Workers' Union was included in the Halloran delegation. Moreover, the Liberal leadership could not even justify their silence by pointing to some great Liberal Democrat as the final selection.

The candidate, Bronx District Attorney George DeLuca, is an old-time hack of the Democratic Party, who jokingly repeated Berle's crack to him that he was a "machine man."

This ward-heeler is part and parcel of the old Flynn gang from the Bronx. Flynn's policy, still followed after his death, pitted the Democrats against the Liberals in that county, since the Democrats would not accept Liberal endorsements and thus forced them to run independent candidates. As a result, the Liberals built up the strongest county organization, and in the 1953 election became the second largest voting force, beating the Republican Party.

Now the Bronx Liberals will have to support a hack and thus strengthen a machine that they have been opposing for years.

JAVITS PROBLEM

Another Democratic hack got the Liberals' endorsement for state controller—Aaron L. Jacoby, chief clerk of Kings County Surrogate Court. Both he and DeLuca are the undistinguished gray products of their respective county machines, and the convention delegates heard literally not one word on why either of them merit Liberal support.

But the bitter must be swallowed along with the sweet, so they were swallowed along with Harriman and Roosevelt.

Of the four major candidates, only the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., described by his nominator as an "exquis-

itely controversial" candidate, maintained that reputation by arousing some controversy among the delegates. His nomination naturally raised the question of the Liberals' attitude toward his opponent, Jacob Javits. Roosevelt himself owes the Liberal Party his start in political life since they helped him win the Democratic primary against the party bosses.

The Liberal Party has endorsed and enthusiastically campaigned for both men as their type of liberal, and helped elect both to Congress. Republican Javits swung the Washington Heights area out of the Democratic column and has maintained it in the Republican column. Repeatedly, three times, he has been re-elected with vigorous Liberal campaigns and his voting record was proudly pointed to by the Liberals—just the kind of man we need in Congress. He wasn't really a Republican—just one of those labels you get stuck with.

Surely, with such a counterposing of two "favorite sons," it was incumbent upon the leadership to present its position directly to the convention. Instead, the delegates had to content themselves with a statement by Alex Rose to the press:

"As a congressman, Jack Javits had an opportunity to single himself out and vote with his conscience. A man may be a very-good liberal as a congressman, but not as part of a reactionary administration. Sometimes it is dangerous to have a liberal running on a reactionary slate."

This rationale could have opened the door to an interesting discussion on the previous policy of supporting Javits had the convention been organized along more democratic lines.

"ONE OF OUR OWN"

Instead, one delegate spoke briefly in support of Javits, but when it looked as though a free-for-all discussion might break out, the leadership was obviously nettled, and it was with difficulty that an anti-Javits speaker got the floor. Since the latter had been one of Javits' campaign managers, perhaps the leadership feared that some dirt might be revealed, but he loudly proclaimed the fact that when all was said and done, Javits was basically a Republican. The vote was quickly taken, and Javits received only 2 or 3 votes.

After swallowing the major candidates, the convention voted next on the nomination for four judgeships. Three Democrats were endorsed, but the leadership and convention drew the line at the fourth—Judge John Van Voorhis, a Republican endorsed by the Democrats. Again, a press statement by Rose had attacked his record as "consistently anti-labor," but no one even discussed the labor records of the other three judges or how substantially they differed from Van Voorhis. The delegates took these recommendations on faith.

One delegate challenged this description of Van Voorhis but even then there was no discussion but just a quick vote. Instead, the convention nominated a party stalwart from Queens, George Rifkin, a labor attorney, for the post.

His nominator presented him as "one of our own" who has done yeoman service for the party. The latent sentiment within the convention for such candidates burst into sustained applause for Rifkin, much greater than for the other candidates.

Somehow, the practical politicians overlooked a trifle: in effect, Rifkin will be pitted against a Democratic-Liberal candidate, Adrian Burke, because the other three candidates are sure of victory on a Democratic-Republican coalition basis.

Just what relationship these candidates had to the Liberal Party 1954 campaign platform, which the convention adopted before proceeding to the nominations, was never made clear. There is, of course, no reason why the candidates should take it any more seriously than the Liberal leadership, judging from the totally inadequate discussion of it.

PLATFORM DISCUSSION

Although they boasted that weeks had been spent in its preparation, the delegates were not given copies of this platform and were asked to pass on some 20 pages (and 9000 words!) of tightly written planks on the national and state scene. Pages were read and then amendments were in order—provided the delegates were equipped with keen hearing and a keen memory. Nor did the chairman possess such keen vision that he could see all hands raised for amendments or discussion.

For a party which boasts that, unlike other parties, it is a "party of principle" and stresses democracy, the way in which this platform was presented and adopted was shameful. Perhaps Dr. George S. Counts, who chaired this committee, could be persuaded to apply some of his democracy in education, or is it too precious to leave the classrooms of Columbia University?

Nevertheless, despite the pressure for speed (the candidates were waiting...), some significant amendments were raised by delegates concerning the infamous Humphrey-Dies Act passed by Congress and the Fineberg Law in New York State, as well as the lowering of the voting age to 18.

A Queens delegate pointed out that while the platform in its civil liberties section referred to "cynically motivated legislation" which can threaten civil rights, it was important to specify just what such legislation was by name and author. He proposed that the platform be amended to single out the Humphrey-Dies Bill and to oppose it.

The chairman quickly called for a vote, pointing out that this amendment dealt with the "Communist Control" Act, and it was thereupon defeated by an overwhelming vote. Only a handful voted for the amendment with many abstaining and not even knowing what the whole business was about. The Liberal Party is long on generalities but very reluctant to tap the wrist of one of its erring liberals.

ABOUT MATURITY

Another amendment by a delegate from Queens tried to put some teeth into the declarations of the platform dealing with academic freedom and asked that the delegates call for the repeal of the Fineberg law, New York's witchhunt law against teachers.

This time, a member of the Platform Committee, while not debating the merits of the arguments raised by the delegate, pleaded that it was impossible to specify every law that the party was against and if they did that, the platform would be twice as long—as though a Fineberg Law was an ordinary type of legislation. The delegate countered this argument by pointing out that the Condon-Wadlin law (prohibiting strikes against the state) was specifically mentioned in the platform and that the Fineberg Law made second-class citizens of teachers and was a serious abridgment of their rights. But again, the chairman hurriedly pressed for the vote and only a handful supported the amendment.

The amendment arousing most discussion concerned the platform's plank to cut the voting age down to 18. This was a "safer" kind of amendment to debate and so the chairman gave the discussion more leeway. One delegate feared that youth would be more susceptible to "Communist propaganda"; Berle recorded himself against the platform's recommendation; and Ben Davidson, the party executive secretary, made a strong speech for youth's right to vote.

Revealing was the surprisingly large vote which the amendment got—over one-quarter of the delegates opposed the right of 18-year-olds to vote. No doubt these delegates agreed with the argument given that our world today is so infinitely complex that youth of 18 are simply not politically mature enough to vote. However, this convention did not display much political maturity on the part of the Liberal Party itself.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

Get Acquainted!

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

the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

- I want more information about
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

- 1 year at \$2. New
- 6 months at \$1. Renewal
- Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

Battle of the Square-D — —

(Continued from page 1)

ly 250 in number, unmolested, it seemed as if the UAW had switched its tactics toward the strike; at least that is what the corporation obviously expected.

A half-page ad in Saturday's Detroit papers gave the corporation quite a shock. The UAW came out with a four-point program of arbitration for ending the strike, and indicated that its full weight and prestige was now thrown against a strike-breaking success in Detroit. It was also a pressure move against the leaders of the independent union to retreat at the bargaining table, and at the moment it seemed likely to succeed, unless management or the independent union leaders decide to force a violent crisis on Detroit.

The UAW proposals for: (1) An immediate reopening of the plant, and the resumption of work on the basis of em-

ployment status existing before the strike. (2) Submission of all remaining issues to a three-man panel of arbitrators for "final and binding determination." (3) A 30-day period in which the panel would hear both sides and give its decision. (4) A democratic vote to be conducted by the panel to determine whether Square-D workers "wish to continue their present union as their legal bargaining agent."

Latest reports are that both sides are agreed on all issues, except that the company wants to discharge 27 picket-line leaders, an obvious trick to break the union at the negotiation table.

What worries the UAW leaders is the possibility that a major battle might develop between mass pickets and the cops, even with an injunction, if the strike is not settled.

Then Detroit's Republican administration might call on Governor Williams for the National Guard (as one congressman already suggested) and the whole Democratic Party slate backed by the CIO would be put on the spot. UAW pressure is being used to prevent that unpleasant possibility for itself.

Don't miss a single week of
LABOR ACTION
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

CHALLENGE TO THE CAMPUS

Today democracy is challenged by a world in turmoil, where the established order is tottering and anti-imperialist movements are everywhere growing in strength and numbers. In such a world, there is no "defense" of democracy if some kind of maintenance of the status quo is intended by the word. Either democracy will extend itself and take on new dimensions, or it will fail, and, more often than not, totalitarian movements will rise out of the failure.

Yet America has demonstrated that it is not capable of this extension of democracy—under its present policies and leadership. In foreign affairs, the United States is everywhere the supporter of reaction and the imposer of military force. This year, even the subtleties which had marked American imperialism disappeared with the cynical intervention in Guatemala.

For the United States is incapable of answering the political appeal of Stalinism. It could do so only if it would adopt a policy of consistent democracy, political, economic and social. As a result, Stalinism is able to capture the anti-imperialist movements and to insinuate its own totalitarian leadership into the cause of freedom.

At home, the corollary of this political bankruptcy of American politics is the witchhunt, a fierce reaction which strikes out at every unorthodox idea, which must be sure that housing and education and jobs are only for the politically pure.

For the student, these realities have unfortunately remained abstractions. The response of the American campus to the growth of these reactionary forces has been, in recent years, one of apathy and lack of concern or else of conformity. The student movements of the thirties, or even of the immediate post-war years, are nowhere in sight.

The American student is in grave danger of giving up his part of the struggle,

and his rights, by default. Freedom, at least that part of it which affects the student, could be lost with the tacit approval of American youth.

In such a situation, a concrete program is important, but there is another element which must precede the struggle on specific issues. The American student must break out of his apathy, must become aware of his stake in these events. Without this minimal awareness, nothing will happen, and the dire possibility of the voluntary disappearance of democracy from the campus will take place.

WHAT YOU FACE

Therefore, underlying the concrete program which the Young Socialist League puts forth, and prior to its specific positions on the various questions which are raised in this issue of *Challenge*, is our determination to try to create some kind of reawakening on the campus. We are, of course, interested that such a rebirth of the student movement will go in the direction of a consistently democratic program, and, ultimately, toward the only consistent expression of such a program, socialism. Yet the important need right now is that the awareness come.

In order to aid in this awareness, we have tried to state the issues of American politics today in the terms in which they become real to the student. We must repeat over and over again that—

If you are a student:

—you face ten years of military obli-

gation (under UMT as now proposed) because of the failure of American foreign policy; or, worse, actual participation in a war against popular independence movements;

—you face forces of repression if you speak up against some of the curtailments of freedom that have taken place on the campus;

—but you also face a more terrible consequence if you fail to speak up, for then, it may soon be impossible to speak at all.

These are the immediate realities, and the American student must understand them as such, must see that they affect him and his life, if there is to be such an awakening.

Yet at the same time that we realize that it is this minimum awareness which must be the first step, the movement of the students into their own political organizations, it cannot be the only step. It is here that the immediate program of the Young Socialist League becomes important. For we believe that the cause which can unite the American student body is the defense of a consistent democracy. The program which we offer is not directly socialist, nor would a student have to be a socialist to see that the defense and extension of democracy is the main task of the struggle for freedom today.

Still, over and above this immediate program are our reasons for advancing it. For as a socialist organization, such a broad and immediate putting forth of issues cannot be our total purpose. Behind our defense of democracy lies our belief in socialism—or rather, we cannot conceive the one without the other.

For us, it is no chance, no mystery, that the United States acts as it does. As the last great capitalist power in an anti-capitalist world, America seeks to shore up the interests of its own political

and economic system. Yet today, this does not mean simply pro-capitalism—in fact, it rarely does. In order to shore up capitalism in the revolutionary world of 1954, it is necessary to support dictators and oppressors of the people. The colonial bourgeoisie is either not reliable, or else incapable of defending American interests. Thus, the semi-fascist or fascist allies like Formosa, Spain, Thailand,

DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM

These are actions of the self-interest of a capitalist status quo in a world in turmoil. Yet, paradoxically, they have not maintained the status quo. Far from it. The real result of American policy has been to create a situation in which the Stalinists are able to take over the leadership of the various popular movements. Because there is no democratic anti-capitalist leadership, totalitarian anti-capitalism is able to succeed.

Is there a way out? We believe that there is. On one level, it is consistent democracy. But then, in the modern world, if democracy is consistently and truly followed out, in all areas of life, political, economic and social, it is seen in a new and greater dimension—that of socialism. It is no longer possible to advocate the bourgeois democracy of 1900 or even of 1932 or 1936. The labor and colonial movements of the world seek more than the abstract rights of all men and the very real rights of private property.

Therefore, in advocating this program, we believe that it can be most consistently held by a socialist, by a socialist who refuses support to either of the war camps, Washington or Moscow.

But at the same time, as an immediate program, we believe that students of varied political beliefs can join together on the immediate issue, the crucial issue of today: the issue of democracy.

(Continued on page 4-C)

A Program to Defend Democracy for All

Today we must struggle to defend democracy.

Yet the only way that this can be done is by fighting to extend democracy, by understanding that we are not for this-or-that version of democracy, American or Russian, but rather for a consistent democracy, for all, everywhere, without qualification.

The Young Socialist League will work within the American student movement for such a program. Now, at the beginning of the school year, we present specific ideas on what this must mean in terms of actual issues.

I. Against Universal Military Training

Universal Military Training is the concrete instance where the American student is made to pay for the failure of the United States to have a democratic foreign policy.

Our government has built its foreign policy upon support of political reaction—Chiang, Bao Dai, Franco, Syngman Rhee, the cynical intervention in Guatemala—and upon military force. Because it has refused to join with the democratic labor and anti-colonial movements of the world, it must rely on foreign dictators and a conscript army. Universal Military Training now proposes a ten-year service obligation for the American youth. It is the logical consequence of a militarist and reactionary foreign policy.

We must oppose UMT; but more than this, we must counter to it a democratic foreign policy as a positive answer to the totalitarian threat of Stalinism.

II. Against the Witchhunt

Just as the American foreign policy supports the anti-democratic forces of reaction, American domestic policy, under both Truman and Eisenhower, has been creating a tremendous reaction within the United States.

We stand for consistent democracy. We are against the "liberal" attorney general's list under Truman as well as against McCarthy. We are against the bipartisan undemocracy of the Humphrey-Dies bill to outlaw the Communist Party. We are for democracy

for all, and specifically, democracy for those with whom we disagree, like the Stalinists.

Concretely:

(1) We believe that teachers must be hired on the basis of their academic competence, and not on the basis of their political beliefs; and we specifically include both Stalinists and fascists in this statement.

(2) We believe that students not only have the right to organize for discussion, to publish their views, to hold meetings, but that they must use this right.

(3) We believe in democratic student government.

(4) We defend the right of Stalinist and fascist students to organize, and we shall participate in the struggle to convince the student body that they must reject the leadership of these, or any other anti-democratic groups, freely, openly and democratically.

(5) We call upon the student movement to link up with the progressive forces in society and to broaden the struggle for democracy; particularly, we feel that the students must orient toward the labor movement in its struggle.

III. For Jobs for Youth

The new worker and the young worker are the hardest hit in the current recession. They are either not hired or else they are laid off first. The student movement has a real stake in the struggle against boom or bust which has plagued America for years, as it has a part in the fight against a prosperity built upon war. In the name of consistent democracy, we are for the people controlling their own political, economic and social destiny.

Democracy does not stand still. To "defend" it, it is not enough to be against reaction. We must be positively for democracy. The student today faces UMT, the recession, the curtailment of his campus' freedom. Opposition to these reactionary measures means the affirmation of democracy—for a democratic foreign policy, for the democratic control of the economy, for democracy on the campus.

NEUTRALISM vs. THIRD-CAMP SOCIALISM

We Are Not Neutral, but Fight Both War Blocs—Capitalist and Stalinist Imperialism

By MAX MARTIN

As part of their preparations for the third world war, the war camps of Stalinist totalitarianism and American imperialism seek to muster support from the peoples of the world. Each in its own way tries to line up behind itself the governments and peoples of every remaining independent or semi-independent, neutral or semi-neutral nation in the world.

The policies of Washington and Moscow in this period are directed more or less exclusively to this problem. Each endeavors to win support for its aims where this is possible; to neutralize or keep neutral nations whose direct allegiance cannot at this time be gained; and to create rifts in the alliances of the other camp.

This program for the United States has meant increasingly reliance upon and bolstering up of the most reactionary social and political forces in Europe and Asia, since these are Washington's most reliable allies. American foreign policy tries to achieve greater economic and military unification of Western Europe, a Western Europe led by the most conservative and authoritarian political groups and regimes, under its hegemony, through such schemes as EDC.

To this basic tendency there arises resistance from the peoples of the world. Masses of workers, sections of the middle class, and even members of the reactionary social classes and groups oppose the war danger in general, and in particular the plans of America for EDC, German rearmament, etc. The opposition to the war

and to the various schemes of American imperialism today often takes the form of "neutrality." As a mood, neutrality is rife among all sections of the population of Western Europe.

As a more concretely formulated but still vague ideology, it can be found in the Bevanite wing of the British Labor Party, among both right and left wing socialists of France and Belgium, and in many political movements of a bourgeois character, including ones as reactionary as De Gaulism in France and some neo-Nazi circles in Germany. As a vague ideology it embraces positions ranging from the pro-American to the Stalinist.

NEUTRALIST CONFUSION

This neutrality has a dual character.

Insofar as it is a mood among the masses, insofar as it is an expression of the resistance of the workers of Europe to American domination and to the aims of Stalinism, it is a sound and healthy reaction. This neutrality indicates the aspirations of the masses to independence from both the camp of Stalinism and the camp of capitalism, and the desire of the people for democracy and the right to be their own masters. It is a step

in the direction of the Third Camp, a tentative and unclear step to be sure, but a step nevertheless.

As an ideology, even though a vague one, however, neutrality is another matter. Its policies and proposals are confused, sterile and in some cases downright reactionary.

Its ideas are shot through with anti-democratic strains and on the part of some groups are chauvinistic. In other movements the politics of neutrality is colored with apologies for our white-washes of Stalinism. Such movements and their policies have little or nothing in common with the politics and program of the Third Camp.

At bottom, the idea behind such neutrality consists of the notion of coexistence of the two reactionary war camps and of negotiations between them to settle the points of issue which concern them and over which they dispute. Such an idea is based on an illusion and serves to spread further illusions among the war-weary of all nations who seek to find a road out of the impasse confronting mankind. Thoroughly false and misleading is the idea that the struggle between Stalinism and capitalism is a fortuitous one; or that it results from blunder and misunderstanding; or that the two social systems and blocs can permanently exist harmoniously in the same world.

More than that, however, it involves acquiescing to and even actively supporting an imperialist division of the world between the two colossi, a division made at the expense of the peoples of the world and their democratic rights and living

standards. These neutralist views mean giving up the struggle against Stalinist and capitalist reaction and becoming indifferent to the fate of millions of people enslaved by Stalinist barbarism. Such ideas posit the program of neutrality toward the two reactions which seek to dominate the world and advise appeasement of Stalinism as a means of averting the war.

THE ALTERNATIVE

Third Camp socialists reject these ideas.

Third Camp socialism is not neutral in the present global struggle. It opposes irreconcilably both capitalism and Stalinism, as well as the conflict between them.

In opposition to the idea of neutrality toward capitalism and Stalinism, socialists pose the need for unrelenting struggle against them.

Socialists believe that the fight for peace can be conducted only by means of the class struggle of the workers, by the independence of the working class from subordination to all of its oppressors and would-be oppressors. The road to peace is the road of struggle against both Stalinism and capitalism and for a socialist world of freedom and plenty.

Neutrality has manifested itself most recently in the left wing of the British Labor Party and among Frenchmen of all classes in regard to the question of EDC and German rearmament. The opposition of European workers to the schemes for a European army and for German rearmament, which the United States has tried to shove down the throat of an unwilling Europe, is progressive and democratic, for these schemes amount to the military unification of Europe under the aegis of bourgeois reaction, which will subordinate Europe to the needs of America's war preparations.

But this opposition is shot through with the most bitter and poisonous anti-German chauvinism and with the attempt to continue to deprive the German people of its elementary right to national independence and sovereignty, including the right to a national military establishment of its own.

SOCIALIST ROAD

Against the chauvinistic opposition to EDC which the neutralists and many socialists proffer, the workers of Western Europe and their political parties must counterpose a genuine democratic and socialist opposition to American imperialism. Such a socialist program would insist upon the right of the German people to assume full national independence and sovereignty and all of the rights flowing from them, including the right to decide its own military policy. A meaningful socialist opposition to EDC requires an overall socialist policy for Western Europe, a policy designed to unify Western Europe politically and economically on a consistently democratic and progressive basis.

Such an Independent Western Union could begin to take steps to solve the political problems created by the present artificial division of Europe into different nations as well as provide for the political and military defense of Europe against Stalinism. A democratic Independent Western Union requires that the workers take command of their respective nations in opposition to their bourgeoisie and to the Stalinists.

A dilemma faces all who do not base their programs upon the perspective of a Third Camp struggle of the workers and colonial peoples against all exploitation, oppression and imperialism. Either they must become supporters of American imperialism or else they have to reconcile themselves to the perspective of an imperialist deal between Washington and Moscow and the continuation of oppression and imperialism, including Stalinist slavery. To make the latter choice results of necessity in abandoning the struggle against Stalinism and ultimately muting one's criticism of it as well.

This is the road which many neutralists have taken. But in a larger sense, and in other forms, it is a problem for many others too—for American liberals, for example.

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.

The Tradition of the Socialist Youth

By MAX MARTIN

In a strict sense the Young Socialist League has neither a long nor a clearly defined tradition. The SYL was founded last February, the new organization being based primarily on the merger of the Young People's Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League. Thus two streams of heritage flowed into the YSL, a non-Marxist left-socialism brought by the left-wing, anti-war youth of the Socialist Party, who included many pacifists in their group, and the Marxian socialist tradition of the SYL.

These two traditions exist side by side in the new organization, interacting with each other. Moreover, by conscious and deliberate decision of the YPSL and SYL, our organization was created as a broad one, welcoming into its ranks all Third Camp socialist youth.

But in a broader sense the YSL does have a tradition and past with which to identify, the tradition of the revolutionary wing of the international socialist youth movement.

The youth organizations of the socialist movement have always been to the left of the socialist parties with which they were affiliated; it is among the youth that left-socialists like Liebknecht during the First World War in Germany, and Trotsky in the twenties in Russia, received an immediate response. The more revolutionary character of youth organizations has manifested itself particularly in regard to the questions of war and militarism.

LEFT WING YOUTH

If one were to draw up a list of the characteristics of socialist youth groups today, it would include the following items. First, the international socialist youth movement is more radical than its adult counterpart. Concretely, the International Union of Socialist Youth has a more left-wing tone on such questions as the war, colonialism and imperialism, and the class struggle, than the Socialist International, which was more or less reconstituted at the Frankfurt Conference of European social-democracy, despite the fact that most of the organizations of the IUSY are the youth affiliates of those social-democratic parties. This situation, of course, reflects the fact that youth groups of most European socialist parties are to the left of those parties.

Secondly, within the youth organizations there exist currents which are still more radical: within some European youth groups, revolutionary and Third Camp tendencies are stronger and more pronounced than in the "adult" parties—in France, for example.

And thirdly, there exists a constant struggle between the youth and the social-democratic patries over such questions as the aforementioned political ones, and over the right of the youth to have its own point of view and have a measure of autonomy and democratic rights. These struggles lead to frequent splits and expulsions of youth leaders, sections of youth organizations or the entire youth groups.

ROOTS GO BACK

France has since the end of the war had several splits from the SP by the youth, and the PSDI (the Saragat party) of Italy recently expelled the entire leadership of its youth organization. We have seen the same situation here in the United States also: last year the majority of the Socialist Party's youth group, the YPSL, split from the SP and later united with the SYL to form the present Young Socialist League.

These characteristics, however, are not new. A description of the situation in the socialist youth movement would have included these elements at any time in its history. To be sure some of the reasons for the existence of this situation today differ from those of the past.

The radicalism to be found in the IUSY, for example, can be partially accounted for by the fact that it includes among its members groups from the colonial and former colonial nations of Asia and Africa. These are the youth affiliates of socialist parties, more radical than the SPs of Europe, which have arisen since the Second World War and which do not belong to the Socialist International. (The Asian socialist parties held a conference of their own at Rangoon, and expressed their independence from European social-democracy.)

At the same time, however, the current situation among socialist youth does represent a continuation of the tradition of the past and a confrontation of and grappling with the same kind of problems as those existing in earlier periods. Indeed, the creation and development of socialist youth organizations at the end of the nineteenth century took place in many countries in relation or response to these very issues.

A number of early youth groups were given an impetus for existence by the program of anti-militarist struggle. The Jeunes Gardes (Young Guards) of Belgium were organized in 1886 during a severe industrial crisis in which a strike wave among the miners was met by the intervention of the army and the shooting down of strikers. From the outset the Jeune Gardes was anti-militarist and published two newspapers directed toward anti-militarist work, *Le Conscript* (The Recruit) and *Le Casserne* (The Barracks) in the French and Flemish languages. The example of the Belgian youth had a strong influence in other countries, particularly in Holland and in Italy.

When the threat of a war between Sweden and Norway arose in 1903, the Swedish young socialists also adopted an anti-war line and began anti-war activity.

The main resolution of the Stuttgart Conference of socialist youth in 1907, which founded the first socialist youth international, the International Union of Socialist Youth Organizations (later shortened to Socialist Youth International), was on the question of war. Karl Liebknecht, leading the anti-war fight at the conference, gave the major report on "The Struggle Against Militarism." This report later became the basis for his famous work, *Militarism and Anti-Militarism*, for which he was sentenced to prison for one and a half years.

OUR HERITAGE

That the youth have been more radical than their adult parties can be easily explained. The reasons in the main lie in the objective conditions which young people face.

Young workers, for example, are the first to bear the brunt of the iniquities of capitalism. During periods of crisis they are the first to be fired or laid off and even in normal times there is job discrimination against youth.

Young people are the first to be affected by war or the threat of war, being forced to give up careers and part with family and friends for a stint in the armed forces, and later give up their lives on the battlefield. In addition, young people are more rebellious and turbulent; they are less hardened in their ideas and ways and more open to change of viewpoint.

It is highly desirable for young socialists of today to learn about and be conscious of the heritage of socialist youth of the past. From their struggles and ideas there are many valuable lessons to be learned for use today and in the future.

STUDENTS and POLITICS

Common Interests with Labor Point to Political Action

By CHARLES MARSHALL

During the last five years American students have been increasingly separated from the struggles going on about them.

Although American college and university students have never participated as fully and vociferously in political and economic activity as their counterparts in Europe, the Middle East and many other countries, there have been periods—notably during the depression of the '30s and with the post World War II anti-war movements—when American students fought militantly as part of the struggles on the American scene. During these periods of activity the students provided a left force in their arenas of action.

With the pressures of the cold war toward conformity and the growth of the garrison state, we find that in the main students have succumbed and have become "the silent generation."

It is as though the student feels that he has no role to play in real life, and

that the events of the world around him will not matter, and therefore he has given up the struggle and become apathetic and conformist.

Such feelings, however, are unsound. More than ever the students of America are affected by events going on around them, and by united action they could play a vital and progressive role in the battle against the McCarthyite and anti-labor forces moving to the fore.

Students in America must come to realize—as many of their fellow-students abroad have long known—that their in-

terests and the interests of the working class are in reality one and the same. There is, as we shall show, a vital interconnection between adverse forces affecting the workers and those affecting the students, and the two sets of events must be fought against together by progressive forces fighting on the same side, each in its own arena but aware of the contribution made by the other.

For the student the drive toward reaction manifests itself in the suppression of civil liberties and the abridgment of academic freedom. For the worker it manifests itself as economic difficulty and the attempt to take from workers the gains they have made in wages and union rights.

These manifestations are two sides of the same coin. They result from the failures of American policy in the cold war and from the disappearance of the possibility of imperialist expansion through the struggles for independence of the colonial peoples. They represent the attempts of a decaying capitalism to maintain itself.

FACING UNCERTAINTY

The economy in the United States is kept alive largely through the measures of the Permanent War Economy—that is, through the maintenance of high military expenditures which give the economy a falsely based boost and keep it from complete collapse. Even this policy is not wholly successful, as note the present decline in the state of the economy. All of the attempts of the Eisenhower administration to talk the decline out of existence are unsuccessful.

Even at the moment, after all the favorable predictions of the past months, we are faced with what is pleasantly called a "stabilized" economy—that is, unemployment will continue at least at the present 5,000,000 level, and production, so well characterized by the fact of steel production at 66 per cent of capacity, will continue at reduced levels. This presages the continuance of layoffs and economic pressure upon the worker. It makes difficult the continuance of his battle for improved working conditions and allows employers to press him to the wall, putting pressure on for wage reductions and lessening the strength of unions.

For the young worker in particular, this is a difficult period. With less seniority and fewer earning years behind him, he is in a far more precarious position economically than even the average worker and is subject to all kinds of anti-union pressures. Only the strictest union militancy can offer hope in this period and union militants must fight against the tendency toward retreat which is creeping in around the edges.

While it is difficult for the student to participate directly in this aspect of the struggle he certainly feels its effects. If he is dependent for support upon a working father, there always hangs over his head the threat that his father may lose his job or be laid off and that he may therefore have to leave school. If he assists in his own support or makes his own way via part-time work, the slowdown in the economy makes difficult the finding and keeping of such work, also constantly threatening to force him to withdraw from school. Therefore, for the student to feel that he has no stake in what is going on is ridiculous.

For the student the struggle is more directly centered around the fight to maintain civil liberties and defend academic freedom. In this fight the students can play a leading role and call for the rights of even those with whom we vi-

The YSL's Aim

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

lently disagree namely, Stalinists and fascists. In order for this fight to be meaningful and effective it must recognize that the attack upon civil liberties stems from the present attempt of the reactionary forces to turn the United States into a Garrison State and must be fought on a broad base and by large numbers of aroused students. We support any steps in this direction and call upon students to begin moving along these lines and to realize that it's to their interest to do so.

TOWARD A WORKERS PARTY

It is on the level of political activity that the connection between the interests of the students and workers becomes clearest, and it is here that they have made their most serious error by tying themselves to the Democratic Party. Both to student liberals and militant workers very often the ideal is the Roosevelt era and the period of the New and Fair Deals. However, as we have pointed out before, the Keynesian manipulation of this period in economic life were largely unsuccessful in mitigating the depression of the '30s; and the witchhunt, whose most serious consequences are only now becoming clear, was initiated under Roosevelt and Truman.

As socialists we understand that to break from the failures of the past, to move progressively forward in the present, the workers must form a party of their own supported by the farmers and students, which will battle consistently for their rights. However, we feel further that any militant efforts on the part of the workers and the students will lead to their alienation from the Democratic Party in the not too distant future as they come into conflict with the reactionary forces in control of that party. And therefore we support such militant activity with the perspective of its leading to a break and the emergence of a workers' party.

A NOTE ON THE POSITIVE ALTERNATIVE—

What Is Socialism?

By AARON ROTH

Most *Challenge* readers know that the Young Socialist League defines itself as a Third Camp socialist organization—opposed to both capitalism and Stalinism.

Our criticisms of these two reactionary exploitive social systems, and the methods we propose to combat them, are fairly well known to our readers.

What may not be so clear is the nature of the positive alternative we pose. That is, what is socialism?

Living as we are in the shadow of the Big Lie—an era in which falsification and distortion have been elevated to the status of fine arts and everything must be taken with at least two grains of salt—it is little wonder that the word socialism has been kicked about so badly that we must again and again define what we socialists mean by socialism.

The Stalinists claim that Russia has achieved "socialism." The Republicans (and not only the most backward ones) inform us that the Democrats are socialist. Even Hitler found it useful to toss the word socialist into the name of his fascist party, and dozens of similar cases can be cited.

Leaving aside the element of emotional appeal involved in these cases (i.e., using the word in some cases as a scare device, in other cases to attract support) they all have one feature in common, different as they are.

This one feature—which for purposes of definition is the one that concerns us—is the false implications that socialism can be equated to simple nationalization of industry or the extension of the state in the direction of control of industry.

To the socialist, nationalization of industry is only one criterion, not alone decisive, and the extension of the powers of the state (or state control over industry) can be either progressive or reactionary, depending upon the nature of the state.

That is, socialism is a form of societal organization based on collective ownership of the essential means of production and distribution, democratically controlled and managed.

AIM: A NEW WORLD

This distinction must be underlined time and time again. It is not a catchword or slogan—rather, it is the essence of modern socialist thought.

The socialist, unlike the anarchist who rejects the state out of hand and blames all social evil on its continued existence, recognizes the need for a transition period between society as it now exists and society as we would like it to be.

It would be a fine noble thing if the day after tomorrow, socialism having come to power, all social, political and economic conflicts were to disappear and all ignorance and prejudice sweep away into history's wastebasket. Unfortunately, such is not likely to be the case.

What then is it that socialists believe must happen? Do socialists expect simply

to take over the existing state apparatus (whatsoever its nature) and fill its top posts with socialists?

No, this is not the socialist aim. We believe the existing state apparatus must itself be transformed, not merely "socialistically" administered—in that sense, replaced. In our opinion it must be founded on a socialist basis, created and controlled from the beginning by the class forces that represent a majority in modern society, so that it can democratically lead mankind from class society with its contradictions based on human exploitation to a classless society, in which mankind will be free to achieve its ultimate expression.

Precisely because socialists and internationalists, socialism by its very nature being an international social system, and because we are realists, we have no "blueprint" of what the world will look like the day after capitalism and Stalinism lose power.

CONCRETE APPROACH

Conditions will no doubt vary from country to country depending, not only on how "advanced" each individual country may be, but also in terms of each country's history, traditions, resources, etc.

That socialists do not consider their major activity to be that of drawing up a precise blueprint of the future society for each country does not mean that we ignore the very legitimate questions involved.

For example, the extensive nationalization in England under the Labor government provided a context in which British socialist thinkers could realistically apply themselves to such concrete problems as that of workers' control in industry—how it could be implemented, how it would work, etc. They could do this because the question involved was one which faces them in a real way and which they must work out.

Obviously the problems facing the British working-class movement are different from those of socialists in America—not to mention Asia or Africa—and therefore socialists everywhere, as real people existing in a real world, apply their main energies to the immediate and real questions confronting them.

Our whole approach to these questions, however, is founded on a broad theoretical basis, which, unfortunately, cannot be more than briefly touched upon or implied in an article of this length.

Articles on specific aspects of socialist theory will appear in *Challenge* from time to time and the YSL National Office can supply any interested individual with low-cost pamphlets or bibliographies and read first suggestions.

Get the Challenge

every week — by subscribing to Labor Action. A student sub is only \$1 a year!

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the *Challenge* or the YSL.

JOIN THE YSL NOW!

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- I want more information about the Young Socialist League.
- I want to join the Young Socialist League.

NAME:

ADDRESS:

CITY: ZONE: STATE:

SCHOOL IF ANY:

At UCLA, Opposition to Loyalty Oath Organizes Student Committee for Action

By BILL HOWARD and ARLO TUSING

LOS ANGELES, Sept. 23—A little publicized rider to the Department of Defense appropriations bill has made signing a loyalty oath a requirement for thousands of college students. The last Congress in its flurry of legislation against political liberty voted a provision which makes all ROTC students sign the new army "loyalty certificate."

This particular oath requires testimony on "standards of conduct" which include far more than membership in organizations on the attorney-general's list. Besides those groups now on the subversive list, the certificate proscribes organizations which may, for instance (we are paraphrasing here because the oath is not before us), teach, advocate or favor alteration of the economic, political or social order of the United States by or with the aid of intimidation, force, violence or revolution, or which teaches or advocates the desirability of depriving anyone of his rights under the constitution by or with the aid of intimidation, force, or violence, or which teaches or advocates principles which influence opinions to favor such a course.

The "standards of conduct" which must be either listed or denied include a list of activities which range from membership to circulating publications or attending social activities of such organizations. The variety of people who would be compelled to "incriminate" themselves, if the government interprets the oath in a sweeping fashion, is large. The person who unwittingly attended one party of a Stalinist-front group years ago, someone who campaigned for General MacArthur in 1952 (when he was the Christian Nationalist candidate for president) or anyone who has given away a copy of *State and Revolution* or of a radical newspaper is faced with the alternatives of a possible prosecution on charges of perjury on the one hand, or possible harassment, blacklisting, and discrimination for years to come on the other.

TWO ATTACKS

At many State universities and land-grant colleges, ROTC is compulsory for all male students in their freshman and sophomore years. At these schools the

new oath has become a political test for all such students; hence a condition of attending. As such it is both the most extensive attack yet on civil liberties on American campuses, and the greatest potential impetus to the development of a student civil-liberties movement.

At the UCLA campus two student organizations distributed leaflets on the oath by the second day of classes. One, the Robin Hood Club, an outgrowth of last year's "green feather" movement against McCarthyism, simply urged students not to sign the oath.

The second group, the Student Committee for Action, was formed as soon as the imposition of the oath was made known. Its leaflet asked students to delay signing the oath until the legal issues had been clarified, and gave a number where affected students could obtain information and legal advice. The leaflet said to watch for an announcement Wednesday of the time and place of a public meeting to discuss the students' rights and to prepare a fight against the oath.

Simultaneously, Colonel Moore of the Air ROTC stated through the *Daily Bruin* that the certificate would not be a requirement for admission to the university, because non-signers might enroll for university credit "informally," but that under the law no uniforms or equipment could be issued them. This, however, left unclear the status of students who might refuse to sign the oath.

ACLU ADVISES

The Student Committee for Action was not allowed to meet on campus because of the University's notorious Rule 17 which forbids student religious or political activity. The *Bruin* refused to print an announcement of the Committee's Wednesday night meeting, and leaflets could be distributed on campus only in violation of University rules. The public meeting Wednesday evening was held in a fraternity house off campus. Its objective was to set up an organization which could wage a campaign against the loyalty oath and also give students legal aid and advice.

Eason Monroe, executive director of the local ACLU spoke on the legal implications of the oath and related it to the state of civil liberties in the United

States. He presented the situation of three different students when confronted with the loyalty certificate. Student A who has had past association with a listed organization through conviction, may or may not have continued his connection with it. He must so state on the certificate. He then may be subject to cross-examination by the ROTC department, the FBI, investigating committees and possibly the university administration concerning his loyalties, his friends, and his activities. He then can be placed in a position where he has the choice of becoming an informer or being blacklisted in future employment or even indicted for contempt.

Student B has had only the remotest contact with a proscribed organization. He may have a friend who might be a member of something, or he may have attended a meeting once, or had some literature. Even though he himself had never been interested in politics, a state subversive activities committee seldom makes such nice distinctions, and Student B is faced with the same alternatives as Student A.

Student C has never had any contact with radical politics. He is simply concerned about protecting American traditions of freedom. He feels that the oath is a violation of his rights under the First Amendment to the Constitution, and refuses to sign it.

Monroe addressed himself to the potential "student C's." While he did not wish to advise any particular student either to sign or not to sign, he pointed out that it was in the interest of anyone who decided not to sign the oath to get as large a group of non-signers as he could. He suggested that those students who had to drill without uniforms adopt their own uniform of Lincoln green and a crossbow.

HOOIGANISM

At the time Monroe finished his speech, there were about 45 students in the room. As the discussion period began, a crowd of about 20 people, mostly advanced ROTC students, came in singing *America the Beautiful* and noisily seated themselves around the room, breaking some furniture in the process. They interrupted the speaker and the chairman, and shouted belligerently at the students who were given the floor, and clearly indicated they had come to break up the meeting.

They were treated as if they were legitimately interested in the loyalty oath and its implications for civil liberties. The chairman, Mark Golden, maintained an orderly question period, and gave each student, including the hecklers, the floor in turn. A debate developed over whether the best way to defend democracy was to support the oath or to oppose it. This discussion focussed on two main questions: whether one can defend democracy by restricting it, and why anyone who is not a subversive should oppose the oath. Supporters of the committee raised the question which was really "subversive" of American democracy, the oath or those who opposed it; who were really the advocates of force, violence, and intimidation, the sponsors of the meeting, or those who came to make noise at it and break it up?

A number of students who had come to the meeting because of curiosity or a general concern with civil liberties told Committee spokesmen that the conduct of the advanced ROTC students at the meeting had convinced them that there was an effort to intimidate them into signing the oath, and that they wanted to work with the Committee.

ASK REPEAL

Thursday morning the Student Committee for Action set up an official center on campus where non-signers could come with their immediate problems, and where at least a part of the Committee could sit in continuous session to coordinate activities against the oath. Students were under pressure from their ROTC instructors to return the completed certificates at once. The center counseled about twenty freshmen and sophomores the first day, and a Committee delegation got the ROTC officials to delay the deadline for turning in the certificates.

The Committee sent a letter to President Eisenhower, who is visiting Los Angeles, appealing for his support and requesting an interview. The letter asked the president:

1. To issue a public statement opposing the certificate.
2. To ask the next session of Congress to repeal the ROTC loyalty oath.
3. Instruct the Department of Defense to establish a consistent national policy including
 - (a) Informal enrollment in ROTC of non-signers.
 - (b) Non-discrimination against non-signers.
 - (c) Provision for legal counsel for all students desiring it.

A letter to the Board of Regents of the University urged that they could eliminate the worst effects of the law by dropping ROTC as a requirement for graduation and making it an elective course. (Texas A and M has done so this year). At the time of this writing (Thursday night) the Committee is starting an intensive campaign to get press coverage for its activities against the loyalty oath.

OPPORTUNITY

The student response to the ROTC loyalty certificate is a heartening contrast to the response to dozens of earlier reactionary attacks on the UCLA student body and faculty. For the first time the issue has been big enough to arouse more than a handful of students, and an excellent campaign was initiated before interest had a chance to die down. Whether or not the oath is defeated, however, this campaign by itself cannot maintain either student militancy or a functioning organization for many weeks. What has been needed at UCLA for several years is a continuing organization which could deal with civil liberties issues as they come up, could provide legal aid to students and faculty members who need it and perhaps start an offensive for civil liberties, challenging Rule 17, for instance.

Since the American Civil Liberties Union is building neighborhood branches in the Los Angeles area, there is an excellent opportunity for the students working with the Student Committee for Action and with the Robin Hood club to cooperate with the ACLU in establishing a branch in the University area to function much like the very successful Student Civil Liberties Union at the Berkeley campus.

Challenge--

(Continued from page 1-C)

Above all, we believe that there must be a reawakening on the campus. We believe that the American student must regain his concern for those things which not only effect him but the entire world as well.

This is our challenge to the campus for 1954. This is the program, the motivation, which will guide our activity in the coming year.

YSL Class in N. Y.

WEDNESDAYS
at 7:30 p.m.

- Oct. 6—American Capitalism.
- Oct. 13—Stalinism.
- Oct. 20—Socialism.
- Oct. 27—The Third Camp.
- Nov. 3—Labor Party.
- Nov. 10—Socialist Perspectives.

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

SUBSCRIBERS—ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

18-40

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

RENEW NOW!

Martin Tour a Success for YSL

Max Martin, national chairman of the Young Socialist League, has recently returned from a nationwide tour of YSL units, and college and university campuses, where he spoke at unit meetings, public forums and street corner rallies. This tour succeeded in its purpose, which was to bring the members of the YSL into closer contact with one another, to help build the units of the League and organize new ones, and to bring the ideas of Third Camp socialism to the student community.

Following are some of the highlights of the tour: After meeting with comrades and friends in Pittsburgh, Comrade Martin went to Chicago where he spoke to a meeting of members and friends of the unit there on the then lively issue of "Guatemala." As was reported in the August 16 issue of *Challenge*, he gave an informative talk in which he sketched in the background of the political, economic and social conditions in that country, tracing the role of American capital and imperialism throughout the past 30 years, which culminated in the overthrow of the democratically-elected government by force and violence. Several new members were recruited after the meeting.

In Los Angeles Comrade Martin spoke at a public forum on the topic of "Co-existence vs. the Third Camp." He pointed out the reactionary role of the two war camps and the reactionary nature of any deal which they might make. He concluded by saying, "The idea of coexistence offers no progressive solution to the colonial peoples and international working class. It can mean only an imperialist division of the world. Only when the oppressed of all countries take their destinies into their own hands and struggle for a democratic socialist world, can a progressive and democratic way out of the current international impasse be realized."

At an outdoor meeting in front of

Sather Gate at the University of California in Berkeley, Comrade Martin spoke to several hundred students on "Why the CP Should Not Be Outlawed." Attacking the then-pending anti-CP legislation as anti-democratic witchhunting, Martin discussed the theory that Stalinism is merely a conspiracy and pointed out that this is the government's method of explaining away its international defeats, since the bourgeoisie cannot permit itself to recognize that Stalinism's successes flow from the revolutionary appeal it can make because of its anti-capitalist program. A lively discussion period followed the talk, in which it was noticed that although the anti-democratic moods of the witchhunt have been accepted by many students, they were interested in listening to a pro-civil liberties point of view.

Speaking at the Church of the People in Seattle, Comrade Martin discussed "The Third Camp—The Hope of Humanity." During the course of his talk he spoke about the aims of the YSL. A new unit of the YSL was organized in Seattle, which has excellent possibilities for growth and for influence both on and off the campus of the University of Washington. This is the second new unit to be organized since the founding of the YSL in February.

In addition to speaking at public forums, Comrade Martin met with leading comrades of the YSL, both formally and informally, in each city, discussing with them local and national problems of the YSL. The tour therefore had the effect of strengthening the character of the YSL as a national organization and enabled the national office to obtain a better picture of the various YSL units, as well as giving the comrades across the country an idea of the activities and problems of the YSL in other localities. In this respect, as in others, the tour was a very successful one.