

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 25, 1954

FIVE CENTS

'Lily-White' Criminals at Work

... page 5

State of Socialism in Denmark

... page 7

The Trial of the Puerto Ricans

... page 3

THIS FRIDAY, OCT. 29 — Community Church

## Shachtman, Waldo Frank, Houser, Muste, Asians to Speak at Anti-Colonial Day Rally

This coming Friday evening, a broadly sponsored rally in New York will give the American response to the Asian socialists' appeal for International Freedom Day meetings all over the world.

Featured speakers at the October 29 rally next week are: WALDO FRANK, writer and authority on Latin America; GEORGE HOUSER, chairman of CORE, who has just returned from a trip to Africa, on which he will report; MAX SHACHTMAN, national chairman of the ISL; PURSHOTTAM TRICUMDAS, adviser to India's UN delegation and Executive member of the Praja Socialist Party; a representative from Burma (still to be announced); and A. J. MUSTE as chairman.

The rally will take place at Community Church, 35 Street at Park Avenue, at 8:15 p.m.

Initiated through the Third Camp Contact Committee, the rally is being sponsored by a number of prominent personalities as individuals. Added information in the following list of sponsors is for identification only:

Prof. Robert Alexander, Rutgers, leading authority on Latin America; David Dellinger, of Peacemakers; Waldo Frank; Robert Gilmore of the N. Y. American Friends Service Committee; Irving Howe, author, editor Dissent; Rev. John Paul Jones; Murray Kempton, N. Y. Post columnist; Conrad Lynn, prominent civil-liberties lawyer; Max Martin, national chairman Young Socialist League; Prof. C. Wright Mills, Columbia, author; A. J. Muste; Joan Parnes of Students for Democratic Action; A. Philip Randolph, head of the AFL Sleeping-Car Porters; Bayard Rustin, WRL staff; Max Shachtman; Prof. Meyer Schapiro, Columbia; George Shepherd, secretary American Committee on Africa; Arlo Tatum, executive secretary WRL; Rowland Watts, secretary Workers Defense League.

The general theme of the rally is well given in the brief declaration which solicited sponsorship. The sponsors, it stated after quoting parts of the Asian socialist call, are united around the following ideas:

"They oppose the evils of colonialism, oppression, exploitation and political terror, not only as practised by some nations, while abetting or condoning the same practices by others, but by whatever nation or whichever dominant military power bloc they may be practised.

"They hold that colonial and dependent peoples have the unconditional right to self-determination and freedom now, and not merely in theory and for some future date to be determined by others.

"They hold that Americans joining in the observance of an International Freedom Day have a clear obligation to register their protest not least against imperialist, oppressive and exploitive practices by the United States and American interests in Latin America and elsewhere in the world."

The widely representative nature of the rally is one which has not been seen around these parts in a long while. LABOR ACTION urgently asks all its readers in the New York area to turn out in force, each with a troupe of friends, without fail.

IN A LISTLESS ELECTION CAMPAIGN —

## Any Choice Between Dems And GOP on Foreign Policy?

By GORDON HASKELL

One of the dreariest electoral campaigns in recent American history is shuffling to its climax on November 2. There is plenty of oratory, but the issues of program and policy between the two major parties have been reduced to the point of absurdity. In no field is this as evident as in the all-important field of foreign policy.

Last week, Harry Truman and Adlai Stevenson made speeches which were billed by Democratic

campaign headquarters as major statements on foreign policy. In his speech, Stevenson referred to "the catastrophic loss of our moral and political prestige in the non-Communist world during recent months," and to "our sudden decline in world esteem." Truman spoke along similar lines.

Yet the simple fact is that neither of these qualified Democratic spokesmen had anything whatever to offer in the way of a serious alternative to the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration.

"IDENTICAL"

As a matter of fact, both of them stated or implied that there is no basic difference between the foreign policy of Eisenhower and of Truman-Acheson, but that the Republicans, due to division in their own ranks and refusal to consult with the Democrats, had carried out this policy in a confused and inefficient manner.

Stevenson insisted that "the objectives and ambitions of all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, are identical." He set as a shining objective of Democratic victory in the elections the possibility that "we can even encourage the secretary of state [Dulles] to be himself and

to sponsor a foreign policy which will represent the country as a whole and not just a reactionary minority."

Thus Stevenson (and to a lesser extent Truman) are ready to go along with the myth that Eisenhower really knows better than he and Dulles have been doing in foreign policy. They are telling the voters that what is wrong with American foreign policy is not that the policy pursued by Truman in Korea came to a dead end in Indochina and that the European Defense Community, fathered and nursed by Truman-Acheson, finally expired under Dulles.

Quite the contrary. Both Truman and Stevenson are trying to convince the peo-

(Turn to last page)

## The Case Case & Other Stories

Being a Discussion of How to Tell Democrats From Republicans Without a Scorecard

By HAL DRAPER

There is no doubt that this is an extraordinary country. In "backward" and underdeveloped countries like India or the Gold Coast, elections may still be fought on issues, but in modern and advanced nations such conventions are semi-obsolete.

For example and to wit, there is a gigantic struggle unto death going on in New Jersey between McCarthyism and liberalism, as Republican right-wingers try to knife their own party's candidate in the back with a "Communist" smear. Candidate Clifford Case's sister, it was charged, had once supported an organization which in turn had supported the demand for the release of a City College professor who had been imprisoned on charges of lying about Communist affiliation. Note that it was not the candidate who was accused but his sister.

Our liberal hero Clifford Case jumped into the breach. McCarthyism had to be exposed. So he proved that his sister had never done any such thing; it was somebody else's sister, a case of mistaken identity. He was still eligible for election because his sister was pure. Furthermore he revealed—in a speech on TV—how he had proceeded to investigate, probe and loyalty-check his sister himself, his own very self.

To the public at large Mr. Case disclosed that his sister had indeed once told him that she had once had an association

(Turn to last page)

## How the Dog Story Exploded in Detroit

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Oct. 17—Unless you actually heard the press conference remarks of C. E. Wilson, and watched the wave of white heat of anger sweep through the shops and unemployment lines here, it may possibly be somewhat difficult to understand just how significant that dog-story of Wilson's turned out to be.

The full flavor of Wilson's faux pas is lost in a mere reading of the quotation in the press. It was the tone, the contemptuous grin and laugh that went with it, that made the comparison to kennel dogs an insult to every auto worker and all unemployed workers. The UAW used a tape recording of the Wilson conference to inform Detroit of what Wilson actually said. It was strictly dynamite, and that is why first efforts to dismiss it lightly, with the aid of the daily press and radio commentators, failed to bury the story. It earned Guy Nunn, UAW radio reporter, a bitter blast from the Republican state chairman.

Nunn simply quoted each alibi statement or claim that the remark was distorted, and then used the tape recording of the Wilson press conference for re-

buttal. The results were devastating. No wonder the New York Times, which on Tuesday had said "Wilson Aids GOP, Speaks in Detroit," changed the tenor of its stories and found it necessary to comment editorially in mild criticism of Wilson.

NO ONE IS KIDDED

What with a Ford Windsor strike, the shutdown here of a parts plant employing 500 (lack of business), a demand by Borg Warner that the UAW here take a 15-cent cut-last week, the usual unemployment due to model changeovers, and the permanent unemployment here of 153,000 workers, the social tension has been building up to some kind of explosion. The reaction to Wilson's insult was a hint of the real bitterness that prevails here.

Of course, Wilson said what he really thought. No one is kidded on that score

in Detroit, and that is why the reaction in union circles is so strong. There are few bargainers for the UAW who haven't run across that attitude in management dozens of times in recent years. The way the foremen treat the men, or try to, tells the rank and file what management thinks of the workers.

It was not so long ago that a spokesman for Chrysler called the workers "dumb clacks" in arguing against any pension. "If they didn't drink it all up, they'd save enough money to retire on their own," a vice president of Chrysler told negotiators, and this led to the 102 pension strike of 1950.

Only last spring Henry Ford II told the country that unemployment in Detroit "didn't amount to a hill of beans."

The reaction here, thus, was so intense that Walter Reuther, CIO president, forgot his role as statesman and issued a sharp criticism of Wilson. It caused the ever-humorous Mr. Wilson to remark, "I've sold my Reuther stock."

Reuther once warned Congress that if the Taft-Hartley Law passed and employers continued to press against labor, the law of the jungle would prevail in

(Continued on page 2)

## LONDON LETTER

# Dock Strikes Challenge the Bureaucrats

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Oct. 13—Two important issues are at stake in the strike of lightermen which is occurring today at London docks.

The first is to protest about the National Dock Labor Board's refusal to discuss 103 complaints made by the Stevedores' Union, until the union has removed the ban on overtime working.

The principle involved is whether or not the employers have a right to insist on the stevedores working more than a 44-hour week. The stevedores are not unwilling to work overtime, but maintain that they cannot be disciplined if they do not want to do so.

So the stevedores gained the sympathy of the Watermen, Lightermen, Tugmen and Bargemen's Union. By Monday 4,500 of its members were out on strike; by Wednesday only one in 130 ships in the Pool of London were being worked, and over half the export cargoes were at a standstill. Soon other workers on allied jobs came out in sympathy.

Ten thousand members of the Transport and General Workers Union came out on unofficial strike organized by unofficial committees. They did not, of course, draw strike pay. Altogether by Wednesday 19,200 barges and dockers were out, as well as 8,000 ship repairers.

Then another factor appeared. The union of Watermen, Lightermen, Tugmen and Bargemen which led the strike was seen to be gaining ground at the expense of the TGWU. The latter huge union with 1 1/4 million members attempted to call off the strike. It convened a meeting of its 10,000 members involved, to be held at the Royal Albert Hall.

## TWO AIMS

Twenty-six hundred people turned up, and were addressed by Arthur Bird, National Docks Organizer, and Tim O'Leary, London Executive member. These gentlemen, however, received short shrift from the TGWU members.

Their speeches appealing for the end of the strike on the grounds that it would harm the export trade were frequently punctuated by jeers and booing. So fierce was the opposition that the TGWU Executive was frightened of putting forward the resolution calling for the end of the strike.

Twenty-one thousand two hundred dockers are now on strike and the executive of the TGWU has been utterly defeated. The much smaller lightermen's union has won a considerable victory, which it claims it deserves. It has pointed out that all its officials, unlike the TGWU, are elected, and it is a much more democratic union.

Now we see the two aims of the strike. A real attempt is being made to guarantee the right of a man not to be coerced into working more than 44 hours a week. At the same time a more democratic and militant union is attempting to bring about the betterment of conditions against the resistance of the larger one, whose head is Arthur Deakin, incidentally.

Needless to say, solidarity has been shown by workers in other ports; at Southampton, Glasgow and Merseyside, lightning strikes have shown where their sympathies lay.

## BUSES HALT TOO

On top of the dock strike, the London bus drivers and conductors are also out. Yesterday 87 routes were affected, today 134, and probably by the end of the week the whole London bus service will be at a standstill.

The issue this time was similarly over wages. The men had asked for a minimum of \$28 a week; their average wage for a 44-hour week was about \$4 less than this. On August 27 the busmen decided to ban overtime working in order to force the London Transport Executive (a Nationalized Service) into negotiating to give them higher wages.

The London Transport Executive reacted by rearranging bus schedules so that overtime working would be unnecessary. However, bus drivers and conductors would have to work harder during their ordinary time. The Transport and General Worker's Union did not, of course, support the strike, which is still unofficial.

For some time now, the Executive has been unable to get recruits for the buses. It had, therefore, to increase the working week from 40 to 44 hours, with extra pay of \$3.35 per week. But the workers maintained that they must have more labor, and the only way to attract the 2000 men needed was to offer better incentive. So

they called for this minimum of \$28 per week.

About a fortnight ago, the fares on London trains and buses went up by about 10 per cent, and it is extremely unlikely that the Executive will now be prepared to increase wages, when they think they have just about cut even. Railway and bus fares being essential services have increased since before the war by considerably less than the general rise in prices.

## THEIR PARADOX

We have the dilemma of a state in which the "essential services" are nationalized. Having more of a social conscience than private industry they have not put up their prices indiscriminately, or even to that of the general level of increase. Thus the workers in their sectors have had to suffer. They have not always been able to compete with private industry.

In the television industry a similar process is happening since the beginning of commercial television; likewise the British Overseas Airways, and most of the other national responsibilities. Having to compete with unscrupulous businessmen who have no responsibility for the national economy they have been unable to keep the best technicians and workers. What is more ironic still, is that the private sector of industry is flourishing precisely because of the cheap prices at which essential services are maintained.

These are the paradoxes of a mixed economy. You can either run capitalism on a completely competitive basis, or Socialism which will iron out its difficulties. But to put the nationalized industries under the control of boards (of ex-capitalists), and to expect them to compete for labor, materials, etc., and at the same time to have some sense of national responsibility, is to attempt the impossible. It is only a matter of time before they realize this.

## How the Dog Story — —

(Continued from page 1)

industrial relations. Of course, management, as Wilson's attitude shows, recognized the class nature of the struggle and proceeds along that line.

"Looks like we didn't educate Mr. Wilson much in the past 15 years," Reuther declared. That's right. Who had illusions but the UAW leaders that the capitalists could be educated?

In some respects, this situation reminds one of the mood of social unrest that dominated in the early post-war years. The 1955 UAW negotiations with the Big Three are going to take place in an atmosphere far different than either Reuther or the auto manufacturers thought. The bitter mood of the people and the continued unemployment raise a new set of problems for both sides to take into account.

It is interesting to watch how the Michigan politicians are vying with each other in being pro-labor and pro-farmer. The Republicans sound like New-Dealers in their speeches. The Democrats, to quote Richard Nixon, do sometimes sound like socialists.

McCarthyism, foreign policy, etc., may be acute issues elsewhere, and they cer-

By BEN HALL

"Unfair!" remonstrated the Republicans at the AFL convention, reproving the federation for failure to credit Eisenhower for his self-discovered efforts on behalf of the workingman. The delegates listened politely and then went on with their business of excoriating the administration and rallying union members to the polls to defeat it in November.

In this, the labor movement is virtually unanimous. Nothing in the record of the Eisenhower regime has allayed the unions' hostility.

Eisenhower has not taken any startling or dramatic union-wrecking actions; nevertheless, a continuing stream of relatively minor administrative measures subject labor to a process of slow, cold attrition.

This process is most clearly illustrated by decisions of the National Labor Relations Board since its domination by the Republicans, a series of actions which continue and intensify the erosion of union rights. Here is the record of the new board's most significant decisions since 1953:

- Limitation of the NLRB's jurisdiction. For example: it will not handle "local" or "inconsequential" cases; it exempts retailers who buy less than \$1,000,000 worth of goods or sell less than \$50,000 in interstate commerce.

- Established the employer's right to make anti-union speeches on company time and property before representation elections and ruled that he need not give the union opportunity to reply.

- Ruled that an employer could tell workers that the plant would be forced to move if the union came in. This, it held, was not "coercion" but "prophecy."
- Held that an employer could legally interrogate an employee on his union affiliations.

- Gave members of an employers' association the right to lock out their work-

ers if the union struck against any association member.

ers if the union struck against any association member.

- On "wild-cat" strikes: ruled that the union is guilty even when it denies responsibility; that workers not engaged in the strike would be fired if they did not take positive action to disassociate themselves from the strike; that a union could lose its place on the NLRB ballot if it failed to end an "illegal" strike.

- On "authorized" strikes: The board decided that a union could not strike for its demands even if it gave 60 days notice unless its contract specifically provided for a reopening or was about to expire; that failure to give a 30-day strike notice to the Federal Mediation Service made a union's strike "illegal" under the Taft Law.

- Illegalized contract clauses which gave the union final authority in deciding seniority questions.

- Tightened up provisions to penalize unions for withdrawing election requests.

- Established the right of the employer to challenge bargaining rights of a union within a year of its certification.

- Ruled that a union engaged in an otherwise legal strike had to take "unmistakable and unambiguous measures" to persuade members of other unions not involved in their strike to cross their own picket lines. If not, the union ran the risk of violating the secondary boycott provisions of the Taft Law.

## A COMMITTEE IS BORN

Postscript to the welfare fund investigations:

At its meeting in Washington on October 5, the CIO Executive Board set up a special committee to investigate charges of dishonesty in the handling of welfare funds. Here are some excerpts from its resolution:

"The CIO Executive Board will unhesitatingly use its powers, under the CIO Constitution, to preserve the integrity of our movement and to keep it free from any taint of corruption. . . . The CIO, furthermore, will not delay action to prevent or remedy abuses until a case has been formally established in the courts. Just as we did in expelling Communist unions, we will, in accordance with our own democratic procedures, take prompt and effective action on our own initiative against financial corruption by union officials. . . . There is no substitute for internal vigilance to insure that union office is held as a trust by responsible individuals."

And, according to the CIO News Service, Reuther told reporters that "CIO would not stand for shady practices which might be inside the law and still be unethical. CIO, he said, would not tolerate legal ways to rob workers."

It should be suggested, that this committee enlarge its scope somewhat to include an investigation of demands made by former high officials of the National Maritime Union that the union itself investigate a membership book-selling racket. One of the admitted participants in the racket accused some of the NMU's officials of leading the crooked ring.

## CURRAN'S ON

The CIO call for quick internal union action brings to mind the words of Joe Curran, NMU president, opposing the demand that his union investigate the racket:

"This book issue is very simple, and the council can tell me whether we are operating right. The matter is now completely in the hands of the police, where I think it should remain. A rank-and-file committee can do no good before this thing is processed with the police. A rank-and-file committee or a Trial Committee will come after the police have done their work and we find out who was guilty because not only will they go to jail, but then we will call a Trial Committee together and we will take their membership away from them, that is, if they are guilty of that kind of business. But that comes secondary, that is, a rank-and-file committee. A rank-and-file committee could only interfere with the police; it couldn't help the situation." (At NMU National Council meeting, Feb. 15.)

It would be quite handy and convenient for the committee to go into the NMU situation—for one of its members, appointed by Reuther, is Joe Curran.

### OPPORTUNITY FOR LABOR ACTION READERS

To all readers of LABOR ACTION:

Here is your chance to give your friends the opportunity to get to know LABOR ACTION.

We will send LABOR ACTION for one month (four issues) to anyone whose name is turned over to us by a present subscriber. At the end of that period, the person receiving the sample copies will get a letter asking him to subscribe. No obligation—just an opportunity.

How many of your friends have not had a chance to read a number of issues

of LABOR ACTION, to get the full impact of the week-by-week quality of the paper? How many people do you know only slightly who you think might be interested in the paper? Perhaps you do not know them well enough to feel you can ask them to subscribe directly. Perhaps you are not a salesman by nature. Well, here is your chance to do them a favor without having to "sell" anything. Send us their names and addresses. LABOR ACTION will sell itself.

L. G. SMITH  
Business Manager

### NOT IN THE HEADLINES . . .

A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, socialism, minority groups, national and world politics—for \$2.00 a year.

A Labor Action sub is \$2 a year.  
Get it EVERY week!

RUTH REYNOLDS ANALYZES THE INJUSTICE OF

# The Trial of the Puerto Ricans

By RUTH REYNOLDS

On October 12 in New York, an American jury declared thirteen Puerto Rican defendants guilty of seditious conspiracy to overthrow the U. S. government by force and violence. The defendants, who had been on trial for five weeks, were supporters of the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party.

The case was an outgrowth of the March 1 shooting in Congress, by four Nationalists led by Lolita Lebron. The government had not been content with the punishment of the four Nationalists involved. It followed up with roundups and a crackdown on many members of the Puerto Rican community in the U. S.

As the evidence showed, the government was unable to connect the 13 victims of the present trial with the shooting in Congress or with any illegal action. The government's case was based almost entirely on the statements of three turncoats and one FBI plant.

Only Gonzalo Lebron, brother of Lolita Lebron, spoke of any widespread plan of action, and even though he pleaded guilty, he stated that he and other defendants had opposed the plan and had never intended to carry it out.

And what had the conspirators done in furtherance of this plan during the four-year period included in the indictment? They had purchased fewer than a dozen firearms—not tanks, not atom bombs, not warships, but pistols and one rifle—with which to overthrow the government of the United States of America by force and violence!

## WEAK CASE

Three of the weapons which Gonzalo Lebron testified were purchased in compliance with instructions issued by himself were used in the congressional shooting on March 1 of this year. This act, the government states, was part of a plan to overthrow by force and violence the United States government in Puerto Rico (!) and, ipso facto, anyone who had touched those guns or even seen them, or even known of their existence, was party to a conspiracy to overthrow that government by force and violence.

Only four of the defendants are alleged to have actually assisted in the purchase and transportation of these weapons. Even Julio Pinto Gandia, delegate of the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party in the United States since 1949, is not alleged to have done so.

The FBI witness went so far as to state that Pinto Gandia had been ousted from his position as delegate because he had not "thrown even a tomato or an avocado" during the past four years. Nevertheless the government implied, without presenting supporting evidence, that he, being in a position of leadership, ordered the use of these guns in Washington last March 1.

Manuel Rabago Torres, a Chicago defendant, is said by Gonzalo Lebron to have been out of sympathy with the path the party seemed to be pursuing. He had nothing to do with the purchase or transportation or use of firearms. But soon after March 1 he allegedly approached Gonzalo Lebron and told him that Wilfredo Sanchez Morales (a Chicago Nationalist who mysteriously was not indicted although he was allegedly engaged in the transportation of weapons) had suggested that he go to Puerto Rico. According to Gonzalo Lebron, Rabago asked him whether he was under Sanchez Morales' authority, and was told that only he, Gonzalo Lebron, could issue party instructions in Chicago.

Rabago Torres had seemed to this turncoat to be willing to carry out party instructions. Police Lieutenant Astol Calero, bodyguard of Governor Muñoz Marin at public celebrations, testified that Rabago Torres had been a bodyguard of Don Pedro Albizu Campos, Nationalist leader, in 1948. This was enough to convince the jury that he was conspiring to overthrow the United States government by force and violence.

## SHIFTY EVIDENCE

Carmelo Alvarez Roman is not alleged to have had anything to do with the weapons that went to Washington, but is alleged to have stored others in his home for a long period of time.

No one who has visited there would believe this to be true. His household is full of alert, active children, and barren of all but the most essential furnishings. His five-year-old, Ignacio, visited in my home the weekend and could, I am sure,

LABOR ACTION invited Ruth Reynolds, an American pacifist who has long been active on behalf of Puerto Rican freedom, especially through her group American Committee for Puerto Rican Independence, to write the accompanying article on the trial of the Puerto Rican Nationalists in New York. Of course any views expressed in it, with regard to pacifism or the Nationalist Party, are her own and not necessarily LA's. The article itself will be informative to all our readers, who could scarcely expect to get a fair version of the case from the daily press.—Ed.

give the FBI a pretty complete inventory of my possessions. Where his father would hide rifles from him, even if he could hide them from the FBI, I am sure I don't know.

Yet because the FBI agent and two ex-Nationalists testified that Carmelo Alvarez Roman had once held two parts of a rifle, and had told them that he had other weapons (which the government has not yet located), he is now convicted as a conspirator.

Juan Bernardo Lebron is not alleged to have seen these guns at all. He allegedly had a package in the back of his car several years ago, from which three inches of metal protruded. He allegedly told the FBI informer last March that he had thrown away a gun clip. He was president of the New York branch of the Party from 1947-1949, before the term covered by this indictment, and presided at public meetings sponsored by the party. That is the evidence against him.

## EDITOR CONVICTED

Rosa Collazo saw Don Pedro Albizu Campos, president of the party, in San Juan last January. After her return to New York a meeting was held at which the announcement was made that Pinto Gandia had been supplanted by Lolita Lebron as delegate in the United States. The FBI informer stated that Rosa Collazo had brought this message. She was treasurer of the party in New York, and is also the wife of Oscar Collazo, serving a life sentence for attacking Blair House in Washington in November 1950.

All that Jose Otero Otero is alleged to have done is to edit the monthly paper, *Puerto Rico En Marcha*. It praised the spirit of self-sacrifice of Nationalists killed in the October 1950 revolution. It informed its readers, after March 1 of this year, that Albizu Campos had called the congressional shooting an act of "sublime heroism." For this he is convicted. (It was in the *New York Times* that I first read about Albizu Campos calling it "sublime heroism." I wonder when Arthur Hays Sulzberger will be indicted.)

The conviction in this case was achieved by (1) bringing several witnesses to describe to the jury the shooting in Washington last March 1, for which four of the defendants have already been sentenced, and (2) by permitting the government free reign to picture the history and attitudes of the Nationalist Party as it chose, while restricting the defense very severely in its attempt to correct that picture.

## COP TESTIFIES

Astol Calero, a police lieutenant who has testified against some 300 Nationalists during the past four years, spent three days on the witness stand. He could identify only three of the defendants, and knew nothing about Nationalist Party activities in the United States.

But he was uncurbed in his presentation to the jury of the Nationalist Party as composed of terrorists bent on murder. He assigned responsibility for the Ponce Massacre of March 21, 1937 (in which police killed 21 unarmed men and women and wounded 200) to the Nationalists who were in reality its victims.

When American Civil Liberties Union counsel Arthur Garfield Hays, who investigated that massacre and concluded that then-Governor Blanton Winship was responsible for it, took the stand as a defense witness, he was not allowed to open his mouth. Other defense witnesses were

severely limited in what they could say.

If my recollection is correct, more than half of the questions put to me during the three hours I was on the stand were objected to by the district attorneys, whose objections were sustained by the judge. What I could testify to that might have a strong bearing on the case would be the atmosphere of police terrorism in Puerto Rico, which would lead Nationalists (who have never pretended to be pacifists) to arm themselves in true self-defense. Without that atmosphere being made clear to the jury, they might easily assume that any gun purchased and destined for Puerto Rico would be intended for simple, unjustifiable murder of government officials.

Yet neither I nor any other defense witness could get more than a few words in to counteract the erroneous picture which the government had been unrestricted in presenting. Neither was it possible to bring impressively before the jury the strong diplomatic and educational program on which the Nationalists have always relied as their primary tactic.

## JUST SUPPOSE—

To comprehend how ridiculous was the charge of "overthrow of the U. S. government by force and violence," we must consider just what is the relative physical strength of Puerto Rico and the United States, and therefore how impossible it would be for any sane Puerto Rican to dream of successfully conquering this government, even in Puerto Rico, by force and violence.

Suppose that Russia should invade the United States and destroy its government. And suppose that, instead of possessing only two and a half times as much land as we, and a few million more inhabitants, Russia had sixty times as much land as are in the five continents of the earth, and 13 billion people, or 6½ times the population of the world. Then Russia would be as powerful in relation to us as we are now in relation to Puerto Rico.

Now suppose that, after invading our country and putting down our government by force and violence, Russia should take all of New England, all of Long Island, all of Texas, all of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, and assorted smaller areas, for military bases, forbidding any native-born American to set foot in them except as a servant of the Russian army.

Then suppose that Russia should proclaim the Rocky Mountains and the Appalachians—and all territory lying in-between—to be "National Forest of the Soviet Union" and therefore under the supervision of the Russian Forestry Service.

Suppose that Russia should determine unilaterally the economic framework within which we could struggle to feed ourselves, making virtually impossible trade with other countries, and encouraging industrial development only with profits going to the Soviet Union.

And suppose that Russia should administer economic aid to bolster an ever-weakening economy through politicians that praised her government here, and do nothing to contradict the assumption that such aid would vanish should we elect other administrators, and yet proclaim that, so far as internal matters were concerned, we were completely free.

Then the United States would have, in relation to Soviet Russia, the same political relationship that Puerto Rico now has with us.

Perhaps we ought not to use "Russia" as our example, since any comparison of ourselves with her must offend every standardized American. Perhaps we should choose some friendly, democratic country, like France, for example, or Great Britain, from which we did once win freedom through force and violence. Yes, let us choose Great Britain, which in this modern age imprisons saints like Gandhi, and mows down Mau Maus when they seek to regain control of their country by the same means the British used to usurp it. Yes, Great Britain is bad enough for our example; we need select nothing worse.

If Great Britain should possess 60 times as much land as comprises the five continents of the earth, and 13 billion inhabitants, wouldn't it be ridiculous for any American to dream of overthrowing Great Britain by force and violence, given our relative size and population and absolute military and economic domination by such a giant Great Britain?

And isn't it just as ridiculous to think that the most wild-eyed fanatic from Puerto Rico—comparably weak in comparison to the United States—could seriously contemplate the overthrow of our government by force and violence?

## IT HAPPENED

This conviction—and others which the district attorney implied might follow it—will not kill the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico. For twenty years every bullet fired at a governmental official by a Nationalist has been followed by incarceration of the party leadership on conspiracy or advocacy charges. The Nationalist Party has survived, and individual Nationalists have been foolish enough to fire more bullets.

I wish they would give up gun-toting altogether, because it is difficult to know what methods the government would then use to obstruct them, short of outright massacre, which even "liberals" of the Baldwin-Thomas school would be hard put to it to defend.

What this conviction has done is to fasten fantastic conspiracy and built-by-association convictions more firmly in the American pattern of law enforcement.

When I was convicted on false charges in Puerto Rico three years ago I told my companions, "It happens here in a colony, but it couldn't happen at home, not in the United States proper." They laughed at me and said, "You don't know your own people. If you'll do it here, you'll do it there."

I'll have to try to get a message through to them—for they are all in prison again—admitting that I was wrong. It has happened here.

## PLEA FOR HELP

Finally, there is one last aspect to the case which deserves the attention of LABOR ACTION readers. It is adequately expressed by the following excerpt from an appeal recently used by the Committee for Justice to Puerto Ricans, entitled "Must We Punish the Lawyer Along with His Clients?"

After describing the background of the New York trial, it says:

"In the past—whatever their views on these matters—thousands of Americans would have rallied to the defense of the 17 Puerto Ricans.

"They would have been concerned about these human beings and their families, members of a minority caught in a desperate situation. They would have been stirred by persons deeply committed to a cause and would have felt that such persons were entitled to a defense, no matter how mistaken they might be in their methods. They would have seen the danger to civil liberties. There would have been no difficulty in obtaining lawyers of the highest standing—and as likely as not of conservative background—to undertake the defense."

But this did not happen in this period of witchhunts and conformity. The appeal explains:

"Until recently one of the most crucial cases in the history of American civil liberties was in danger of going by default.

"Several lawyers approached by the Committee for Justice to Puerto Ricans estimated that the minimum cost of an adequate defense would be \$30,000. No funds were on hand and no prospects of raising anything approximating this amount. All but one of the lawyers felt, understandably enough, that they could not undertake the case.

"Conrad Lynn was the exception. He could not rest knowing that the case of these individuals and the crucial civil liberties involved were being lost by default. So with no money and no adequate assurances of money to come, Lynn took on the case. To date, for his days and nights of arduous work, for his challenging the might and power of the FBI and the U. S. Department of Justice, Conrad Lynn has not even received enough money to cover his outside costs. . . .

"Whatever your views on Puerto Rico—and amongst the Committee for Justice to Puerto Ricans there is a wide range of individual opinion—we hope that you are one of those who will come to the support of Conrad Lynn, of the civil liberties issues, and of the individuals and families involved. Send whatever you can to Julius Eichel, Treasurer, Room 201, 271 West 125th St., New York 34, N. Y."

## An Exchange of Opinion on

## The Arabs, Israel and Zionism: Two Views

Comrade Gallienne, who sends us the letter below, is a French revolutionary socialist who has been living and working in Syria in recent times.—Ed.

To the Editor:

I have read various articles in LABOR ACTION on the question of Palestine. Since I have been living for four years in an Arab country, I think my opinion on this question may be of interest to you....

In the articles written by Hal Draper in reply to Maksoud [Aug. 23, 30] I think the question is badly posed. The author disregards its essential aspect: around 800,000 Arabs, peasants or urbanites, have been driven out of Palestine by the Zionist colonists and are living precariously in the neighboring countries. Is this just? Can any socialist movement approve of this? The answer is given that every person ought to be free to settle down in the country of his choice. Agreed. But on the condition that it is not for the purpose of colonizing it. The influx of foreign Jews into Palestine is nothing but a phenomenon of colonization. The ethnical make up of the country has been changed; a large part of the inhabitants have been driven from their lands to the benefit of people who have come from elsewhere and who have superior technical means at their disposal. Is it possible at one and the same time to disapprove of the expropriation of the black people of Kenya by the English, for example, and to approve of the expropriation of the Palestine Arabs by the Zionists?

You will reply that you condemn this expropriation. But then how do you reconcile this condemnation with the approval of the very existence of the state of Israel that can be read constantly in the columns of LABOR ACTION?

Hal Draper compares Israel to Libya and to Pakistan, and declares that wherever a religious or racial group wishes to form a state it has the right to do so. Agreed, as to the principle; but on the condition that a group occupying a definite territory is involved. Libya is based upon the equilibrium between Christian and Moslem sects in the midst of a Moslem country. Pakistan is the result of different concepts of life of Moslems and Brahmins. In India, as in Syria, socialists should, it seems to me, fight against these divisions and work for the union of the workers of all religious faiths. Nevertheless, when a religious group cannot understand the necessity of such a union, it has the right to form an independent state.

The case of Israel is entirely different. There you have people who have come from all over the world, installing themselves in Palestine in order to conquer a land that they did not occupy originally and to colonize it for the benefit of a religious or ethnic grouping, call it what you will.

It is vain to make a distinction between the state of Israel and Zionism. One doesn't go without the other, each supplements the other. The official doctrine of the country is the reassembling of all the Jews of the world into a single state, which cannot be effected without taking new lands away from the Arabs, thus achieving the program put forward by the extremist Zionists: an empire run-

ning from the Nile to the Euphrates.

The result is easy to understand: the hatred of the Arabs for the Jews is becoming an insurmountable obstacle in the East. To believe that this hatred is maintained by the feudal chiefs is to be gravely deceived. In reality, the Arab governmentalists, who make the distinction between Judaism and Zionism in their official declarations, very often show themselves to be more moderate than their peoples. If I have not noticed, since my arrival in the East, any anti-Jewish persecution (as a general rule, the Jew who is a citizen of the country is not hated; nonetheless he is looked upon with a certain distrust), I must add that on the other hand the hatred of the foreign Jews is complete, fierce, and the resumption of the war against the state of Israel would be extremely popular in all the Arab countries. This will give you an idea of the importance taken on by the army in the countries which feel their very existence threatened by Israelite expansionism, and the political role that the army has played or still plays in certain Arab countries.

Finally—this point is particularly serious for us—the support that the official socialist movement throughout the world has been giving to Zionism, the sympathy it has been showing toward it, repel the Arab masses from socialist ideas, impels them to look sympathetically toward the fascists, that is, toward their worst enemies. That is how it happens that some of the Nazi refugees are so attentively heard, or that the demagoguery of Franco yields fruit. There you have the fine results of the existence of the state of Israel.

What then can be the solutions to the Palestinian question? It is possible that in the long run the Arab governments, tired of the present situation, will accept a compromise, a "modus vivendi" (and not a genuine peace) which would record the accomplished fact? But that would not settle the situation to any extent and would not bring the Arab masses an inch closer to socialism.

What is needed is that the Arabs driven from Palestine shall be able to re-establish their homes and that they

shall not be treated like pariahs in their own country. That means that the state of Israel, whose very name indicates that it is exclusively the state of a religious grouping, should give way to a state of Palestine, which would belong to Arabs and to Jews without distinction. Palestine should be united; there should be an end to the sight of a city like Jerusalem cut in two by an uncrossable frontier (for the Judaeo-Arab iron curtain is harder to cross than the one separating the capitalist world from the Stalinist); and the country should then be free to regulate as it wishes its relationships with Transjordan. Such a program means the end of the Jewish immigration into Palestine. The Jews in the world who are seeking asylum ought to find it in the free countries or those that call themselves free. The United States, Great Britain, France should open their doors. Those who wish to leave Israel, where they have not found the life they expected (they are numerous) should be free to leave and to return to the country they came from. The Jews, Moslems and Christians of Palestine should enjoy the most complete political equality.

If these conditions were achieved, peace would reign in the Middle East and the Jews there would be looked upon as one religious grouping among others, without any animosity against them.

I believe that the position I defend is in conformity with the tradition of the international revolutionary movement. It is only after the war, out of sentimental reaction toward the Jews persecuted by Nazism, that certain groups of the extreme left wing revised their position on the Palestinian question (*Democratique Proletarienne* in France, *LABOR ACTION* in the United States). I am convinced today, after a long period of living in the East, that the revisionists are traveling the wrong road on this score, and that they must return in the interest of socialism to the revolutionary tradition opposed to Zionism and to the state it has engendered.

In all friendship;

J. GALLIENNE

Damascus, Syria, Sept. 21.

## Reply: Is a Second-Round War the Solution?

## 1. Posing the Issue

Comrade Gallienne neglected his main opportunity to cast light on the Arab socialist position by not answering the central challenge which we presented to Maksoud. We pointed out that this Arab position of calling for the overthrow of the state of Israel meant a program to solve the question by war against Israel, for in no other conceivable way can "the very existence of the state of Israel" be eliminated.

Is this what Comrade Gallienne is for? (Not necessarily immediately, of course, but as the objective.)

This and nothing else—we said, and we repeat—is the essential programmatic difference between our solution and that of the Arab socialists.

If Gallienne is not for a "second-round" war perspective, how does he propose to do away with "the very existence of the state of Israel"?—since this seems to be the central question in dispute between us.

Against this program of overthrowing the state of Israel by Arab arms, we counterposed a political program: (a) transform Israel from a Zionist-Jewish state into a "binational" state, and (b) merge this state into a federated Arab-Jewish Palestine and a wider Near East Federation.—That's a 25-word partial summary of the program explained in the ISL's resolution and LABOR ACTION articles.

In sum: We differ from him in seeking to develop an anti-Zionist program which can save both peoples from internecine war; which in fact is an alternative to the war which the Arab socialists see ahead.

## 2. Anti-Arab Atrocities

Comrade Gallienne says that we disregarded the "essential aspect" of the question: the Zionists' expulsion of Arab masses from their land. He is grievously unjust. LA has carried reams of words denouncing the Zionist anti-Arab policy. It was not even in question in the discussion with Maksoud, being common ground.

The issue is: a program on how to fight the Zionist policy. If we do not go

sought. This we patiently repeated to Maksoud, and now to Gallienne.

Secondly on this point, we felt that the Palestinian Jewish community had the right to make the mistake they did (self-determining for partition). Comrade Gallienne says he would agree if "a group occupying a definite territory is involved." Well, we too stressed the territorial aspect four times in our article. That should have been enough.

Therefore we wrote in this clear context that "Israel has as much 'right' to existence as Pakistan." (Didn't mention Libya at all; don't know where that came in.) We are against the choice of communalist partition; it is a question of a national group's right to make what we (or Gallienne) consider a serious mistake.

We discussed in our article on Maksoud the point about the geographic origins of the Palestinian Jewish settlers. Gallienne's re-mention of the point does not add anything.

## 5. Arab Hatred of Israel

We do not doubt that this popular hatred exists among the Arab masses, as Maksoud adequately stressed. But what exactly follows for Gallienne?

Zionist anti-Arab hatred or hostility blankets the whole Israeli population also, workers and masses included. What follows for socialists?

Maybe the masses are right; we can argue that politically. But the fact of this hatred, and its fateful political consequences, should not overwhelm Gallienne. To Maksoud we directed the appeal that the Arab socialists play a *vanguard* role among the masses. It is not unthinkable that socialists should hold out against chauvinistic hatred among the masses. The same applies to Israeli socialists, those few who are ready to listen now. It is not necessarily a catastrophe for Arab socialism if it cannot join in with popular outcries. In the young Arab socialist movement, opportunistic trends are not absent; swimming against the stream might even be good for its soul. But this is not the way the question can be decided, by Gallienne or by us.

Socialist pro-Zionism, says Gallienne, repels the Arab masses from socialism. Granted. But are the Arab masses, or at least their best progressive elements, equally repelled by an anti-Zionist policy which does not call for destruction of "the very existence of the state of Israel," nor for solution by war? We know of objective evidence to the contrary; but if Gallienne insists even on this, then the Arab socialists have a harder row to hoe than we think.

## 6. Programmatic Planks

Gallienne's specific programmatic solutions, in his last part, are the best part of his letter, as we see it. Leaving out already-discussed disputed questions, they agree with our programmatic planks on (a) return and recompensation of Arab refugees; (b) reunited Palestine—we propose a federation; (c) freedom of emigration from Israel; (d) complete equality for all peoples. Such a program should also include many other planks which we have raised.

Hal DRAPER

### Have You Read Labor Action's Pamphlet-Issues?

No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism.

No. 2—Independent Socialism and War.

No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis.

No. 4—Socialism and Democracy.

No. 5—What Is Stalinism?

10 cents each



**LABOR  
ACTION**

October 25, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 43

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

# 'Lily-White' Criminals Fan Race Hatred In the Fight Against School Desegregation

By SCOTT ARDEN

The fight to implement the Supreme Court's decision outlawing racial segregation in the schools is well under way.

As socialists we of the YSL have an especial interest in this struggle. School integration will go a long way toward breaking down the barriers between Negro and white youth, and it can result in considerable advance for the American people as a whole.

Just as the Supreme Court ruling is of unquestionable importance, equally without question is the fact that this progressive development will be opposed all the way by the race-ridden lunatic fringe of the far right.

Milford, Delaware, a quiet market town with a population of about 5700, of whom some 2000 are Negroes, has been the main storm center of the fight for integration for the last month. The disorders in other towns and cities seem to have been at least partially stimulated by and patterned after the Milford events.

According to all reports the attempt at integration, which began with the opening of the fall term on September 8, went smoothly for at least the first ten days and met with no difficulties and no open hostility on the part of Milford's white students.

Originally involved were eleven Negro students who, if not integrated, would be forced to travel at least 18 miles to reach the nearest "Negro high school."

The students, white and Negro (the New York Post reports) took the change in stride. Classes went on as normal. A

school dance was held with students of both races present. Two Negro boys tried out for football and one of them made the team.

Some of the adult whites in and around the community, however, responded differently. Rumors spread, several meetings were held, and progress ground to a halt.

## STATE TAKES OVER

Ugly crowds gathered about the school building and threats of violence were common. The school board panicked and ordered the schools closed.

Harry Mayhew, a member of the school board who is a Democratic candidate for the state legislature, resigned from the board. The Post reports that he had decided that integration was not worth risking his campaign chances.

Two of the remaining three board members then met with the state Board of Education and insisted on a clear vote of confidence in their integration attempt. The state officials took refuge in a technicality. They pointed out that their instruction had been that local authorities should submit plans for integration.

Since Milford had submitted no plan the state officials said that they could take no responsibility for what had happened. Then they ordered the schools reopened that week. The Milford board, at this point, resigned in a body and dumped the problem in the lap of the state officialdom.

Delaware's Governor Boggs, a Republican who is said to hold a liberal point of view in racial matters, took charge. He directed the state superintendent of education to supersede the local principal and superintendent and reopen the schools on an integrated basis—with state police protection.

In the meantime the Milford superintendent, Ramon Cobbs, received an anonymous telephone call threatening him with a beating if he allowed the school to reopen on an integrated basis. The call was followed up by several men who smashed the windows of his house.

Dean Kimmell, then president of the school board, the largest fuel oil dealer in Milford, was called by several of his customers who canceled their orders because he was "for the Negroes."

## RACE-HATERS MOVE IN

At this tense point, with the schools scheduled to reopen on September 27, the local racists were reinforced by out-of-town (out-of-state, actually) professional race-hate peddlers.

On Sunday, September 28, the New York Times reports, a mass rally of perhaps 3000 (many from Maryland and Virginia) met just outside of Milford and cheered speakers who urged them to keep their children home, rather than let them attend integrated schools. Local Negro people who attempted to attend the meeting to raise issues were turned away on the grounds that it was a "private meeting."

The tone of the meeting was set by two speakers. One, the least important of the two, identified himself as "the 74-year-old mayor of Cedar Creek," got on the platform and cried into the microphone: "Hurrah for the red, white and blue. We are not here to fight the colored people . . . but I am thinking about my grandchildren."

The other speaker was the center of the orgy. He described himself as Bryant W. Bowles of Alexandria, Va., the founder and

president of the alleged "National Association for the Advancement of White People" (NAAWP), the "organization" that called the rally.

Bowles, 34, a drummer in the Marine Corps during the last war, outlined the purposes of his "rock-bottom American" organization. One, of course, was "separation of the races." He then declared: "If you people want to maintain separate schools, you will not win in the end through violence. There is another way."

He continued, "You could be fined for keeping your children out of integrated schools, if they could find a jury among you that would convict you. But you certainly have the right to protect your child by keeping it home if you are afraid there is going to be violence. I'd lock the door before my child got out."

He added that he would not permit his daughter, aged 3, to attend school with Negroes "while I have breath in my body and gunpowder will burn."

In view of the fact that the schools of Milford were closed for a week because of violence and threats of violence, Bowles' recipe of non-violence and gunpowder is revelatory rather than amusing.

## CAPITULATION

Unfortunately, not all the people of Milford were ready to demonstrate that Bowles' gunpowder was all wet.

On Monday the schools reopened and a crowd of about 250 (many of them farmers from neighboring areas) stood about muttering. The day passed without major incident and it seemed that, despite the fact that many white parents kept their children home, the fight was about over. Until September 30 attendance was returning to normal.

On the 30th a newly appointed school board capitulated to the racemongers and dropped the Negro students from the enrollment records at the end of the day's classes. Hours before the board's announcement, the Post reported, Bowles told reporters that he had an understanding with the authorities that the "new Milford board would remove the Negroes as their first order of business."

Events moved rapidly. It was revealed that one of the ring-leaders in the Jim Crow demonstrations was a certain Willis V. McCall, the backwoods Florida sheriff who three years ago shot down two Negroes in cold blood, murdering one of them.

This killer spoke to a second "NAAWP" rally, again numbering about 3000, and praised the white racists for their "victory." He urged them to continue the fight in other Delaware communities and assured the mob that "thousands of people would come up from Florida and the rest of the South to help them."

## GUNMAN BOASTS

McCall—who killed Samuel Shepard, 23, and seriously wounded Walter Irvin, 23, on November 6, 1951 while "escorting" them to a new trial which had been ordered by the U. S. Supreme Court (they were among four defendants in one of the South's most blatant "rape" frame-up cases)—cited "victories" in race relations in Florida.

As an example of a "victory in race relations" he pointed out how the home of Harry Moore, Florida organizer for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, had been dynamited on Christmas eve three years ago, and how

(Continued on page 6)

## The Dangers Of Democracy

Each year, the Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion, which is composed of the American Speech Association, the American Forensic Association, and several honorary forensic fraternities and sororities, decides upon the debate topic of the year, a topic to be debated in intercollegiate competition by college and university debating teams. The committee makes its decision on the basis of recommendations of speech teachers and debate coaches.

The topic selected for the 1954-1955 school year is: "Resolved, that the United States should extend diplomatic recognition to the Communist government of China."

Such is the witchhunting temper of our times that several reactionary educators immediately saw a victory for the Kremlin in the choice of this subject. One Charles R. Koch, debate instructor at Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio College, and Sister Mary Lorenz, Director of Speech and Drama at Mount Mercy College, a junior college for women at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, have begun a campaign aimed at getting the committee to change its decision.

What is interesting is the reasoning behind their proposals. Koch is afraid that some of the debaters who are assigned to defend the affirmative may become convinced of this point of view. Moreover, he said, "students might be driven to radical publications" in their research for the debates. In his view, naturally, neither of these things must be allowed to happen.

In support of Koch's position, Sister Lorenz pointed to the fact that some students she knew who had been participating in a discussion of improvement of congressional investigation committee practices had become anti-McCarthy.

The drive to subordinate everything to the interests of the American Party line goes on.

## The New 'Year of the Oath'

According to *The Campus*, undergraduate newspaper at New York's City College, the new "loyalty oath" has been instituted at that school. More than half of the approximately 900 ROTC cadets have already signed and no refusals to do so have yet been noted. The number of students who may have signed despite unvoiced reluctance cannot be ascertained.

One thing is certain: the pressure to acquiesce undoubtedly had its effect. Colonel Hamilton of the CCNY ROTC made abundantly clear that any student refusing would be dropped from the Reserve. "If they had belonged to any of these organizations," he added, "why, we just don't want them in ROTC."

ROTC at City College is not compulsory; the most reactionary features of the new oath, which are present at the University of California, for example, do not exist there. Nevertheless, there undoubtedly are many draft boards which make student deferments contingent upon ROTC enrollment. Thus even at campuses where ROTC is voluntary the oath will have a reactionary and discriminatory effect.

## WRONG FRIEND

An oath "case" seems to be in the making at University of Wisconsin, one which shows how this new feature of the witchhunt will be utilized.

A student admitted having known another student who was "leftish" during his sophomore year. He was told to turn in his ROTC uniform until a loyalty check could be made.

Greatly disturbed by being thus singled out for harassment, he decided to drop out of school. He was finally per-

suaded, however, not to take this step and will continue in school under conditions of a temporary ROTC deferment.

It is to be hoped that civil-libertarian students at Wisconsin will come to his aid as well as generally conduct a struggle against the oath.

## ON BERKELEY CAMPUS

Activities against the oath continue at the Berkeley campus of the University of California. The Student Civil Liberties Union (SCLU) there held a meeting on October 5, at which Lawrence Speiser, staff counsel of the ACLU, spoke on "Legal Ramifications of the ROTC Loyalty Oath."

The presence of the chairman of the "Americanism Committee" of the local American Legion post in the audience helped to make the meeting a lively one. During the discussion the elderly Legionnaire counterposed a "patriotic" view to Speiser's attack on the oath and stated that in his view the oath could not be made too rigid.

In addition to this meeting there has been an exchange of letters in the *Daily Californian* between supporters of the oath (including a well-known campus McCarthyite) and its opponents. A letter submitted by a YSLer to the student newspaper pointed up the dangerous and anti-democratic requirements of this new "loyalty" questionnaire by showing that a rigorous interpretation of its provisions would perhaps make even this McCarthyite ineligible to sign the oath, for it is known around campus that he has spent many hours arguing with Stalinists, liberals and socialists and therefore could be regarded as having been in association with "subversives."

## A DISCUSSION OF KUZNETS' CLAIMS

**Has There Been an 'Income Revolution'?**

By JIM BURNETT

There are a number of treasured legends in the bourgeois propagandist's book of "All's for the Best in This Best of All Possible Systems." One of the favorites is the one about how so many Americans own stock that we are just one big happy nation of capitalists. This oft-retold myth was recently rudely debunked by the findings of the Brookings Institute survey of stock ownership which showed most of the stock concentrated in the hands of a small percentage of wealthy individuals.

Another oft-heard tale out of the capitalist story-book is the one which goes: "Even admitting that there has been much injustice in the distribution of income, the situation is improving and becoming more equitable all the time. In short—the rich are getting poorer and the poor are getting richer."

This legend is embodied in the book, *Shares of Upper Income Groups in Income and Savings* by Dr. Simon Kuznets of the National Bureau of Economic Research and the University of Pennsylvania.

## REFUTATION

The refutation of this myth is ably and convincingly handled by Victor Perlo in his recent pamphlet, *The Income Revolution* (1954, International Publishers). This work is remarkable not only for its able handling of the material but also because it is a strange and rare occurrence to find the Stalinist press coming out with anything so worthwhile.

Dr. Kuznets' main assertion is that while in the decade 1919-1928 the top 1 per cent of the population received over 13 per cent of the personal income, during the period 1939-1948 they got "only" about 10 per cent (8.4 per cent in 1948). This means that the super-pulocrats are now, according to Dr. Kuznets, getting only ten times their share instead of thirteen times.

But before you begin to jump from joy at this glad revelation I'm forced to

*This article by Comrade Burnett was written for last week's Chicago-edited issue of Challenge, from which it was omitted.*

*We note that, as against Kuznets' claims, it leans heavily on the pamphlet of the Stalinist economist Victor Perlo. We would also like to refer readers to the discussion of this question by T. N. Vance in the May-June issue of the New Internationalist.—Ed.*

tell you that Kuznets' assertion turns out to be much more the result of wishful thinking than of accurate research and calculation.

Perlo lists the major factors which Kuznets forgot to take into account in his figuring. First there's the matter of undistributed profits.

## ONE ANSWER

Kuznets counts as income only that part of profits which accrues to the stockholder in the form of dividends. Perlo points out that the figures show that in the past it was the tendency of stockholders to reinvest much of their dividend income. The rate of undistributed profits was relatively low. The tendency in recent years on the contrary has been to use much of the dividend income for living expenses and leave an amount of undistributed profits in the corporation fills to keep the wheels turning and new dividends coming, thus letting undistributed profits do the job which once had to come out of personal income.

Secondly, Dr. Kuznets bases his personal income on federal income tax returns, thus allowing himself to be influenced by the notoriously under-reported statements of income by the wealthier groups. But, says Perlo, "If Dr. Kuznets had understated the incomes of the wealthy to the same extent in both 1929

and 1948, his most important conclusion would still be valid." Perhaps the decline of upper-group shares would be 20-17 instead of 13-10 but a decline nevertheless.

"However," Perlo continues, "under-reporting of income on a vast scale is something which developed after 1929." Rising tax rates since '29 have given added impulse to the well-to-do to understate their incomes. The enactment of the Ruml plan for withholding of taxes on wages and salaries at the source of payment ruled out the possibility of large-scale evasion on the part of most wage and salary owners. But there was no such control over incomes from dividends, interest, rent and capital gains.

## MANIPULATED FIGURES

Perlo mentions some of the many gimmicks used to evade taxes: disguising income as "business expenses," bonus and commission schemes, etc. He provides frequent references to other economic researchers whose findings impressively validate his claims.

Perlo then goes on to give his estimates of income distribution, starting with income reported on tax returns and making allowance for unreported income, share of undistributed profits, etc. He goes into some detail in the step-by-step making of these calculations. The figures finally arrived at show the top 1 per cent receiving 17.2 per cent rather than 8.4 per cent in 1948.

Perlo points out—fairly enough, I'm inclined to agree after examining his calculations—that he has given the wealthy the benefit of the doubt in his figuring; and allowing for this and the range of error in statistical estimates in a study of this type, the figures would probably be even more striking.

This has been a very brief and incomplete sample of the material and interesting analyses to be found in the *Income Revolution*. It is a book I sincerely recommend as a valuable asset to any socialist bookshelf.

**The 'Lily-White' Criminals — —**

(Continued from page 5)

both Moore and his wife had been killed in the blast!

He went on to say: "There are some NAACP national officers in Florida right now," and "the white people in Florida know all about them being there and they are going to have a hard time getting out of Florida." (He presumably was referring to Thurgood Marshall, NAACP chief counsel, and Herbert Hill, NAACP labor specialist, who were then in Miami to address the convention of the International Union of Electrical Workers, CIU.)

Shortly after McCall spoke, the Delaware state police denounced Bowles as a bogus-check artist who had been arrested in Baltimore and had been wanted in Tampa, Fla., and Belair, Md. on false-pretense and bad-check charges. It later turned out that he had been arrested for larceny in Maryland, and that he had

been brought to court six times this year for attempting various frauds.

**Bowles deserves more than passing notice since his recent flurry of activity (and popularity) has been notable—and not confined to Milford.**

His finances, as indicated above, are obviously one of his major concerns and the police revelations did not interfere with his collections of \$5 per head and up, from local bigots as he signed them into his new moneymakers, the "NAAWP." Already, according to all press reports, the group has collected many thousands of dollars. One columnist reports that Bowles claims to be taking in \$2000 per day—not a bad haul for a small-time petty swindler!

Bowles is now out on \$600 bail on separate charges in two Delaware counties of seeking to disrupt the educational system, and his organization has been required to show cause why its charter should not be revoked.

**Ku Klux Klan-style action, including use of the actual Klan symbol, the burning of a wooden cross, has not been absent in Milford, but Bowles and his gang have modernized race hatred. Car caravans, carrying racist placards, and airplanes with trailing banners and loud speakers blasting out his filth, are among the innovations.**

## IN THE FIGHT

He now is hinting at an economic boycott of business establishments that do not share his racist line. His attitude toward the NAACP, the *Times* reports, is that "there is no need in this country for an organization to 'advance' the Negro." "If they need to be advanced," he said, "the road is open in the jungles of Africa."

The most recent development, as we go to press, is that the Delaware courts have ruled that the Negro students dropped from Milford's high school have a "clear legal right to be reinstated." The NAACP has assured the press that it intends to press for this reinstatement and decisive action is likely within the next few days.

**Needless to say, the Young Socialist League looks forward to a speedy reopening, on an integrated basis, of Milford's schools. Wherever possible our units and members will participate in attempts to publicize the fight for integration and expose the reactionary forces working against it. All of our members and friends should seriously consider the possibilities of public meetings and rallies, in conjunction with campus NAACP branches and other democratic groups wherever possible.**

This is not the fight of the Negro student alone. This is the fight of everyone who still believes, whatever his or her specific political convictions, that the struggle for human dignity, equality and progress is meaningful.

**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

**Modest Proposal:  
How to Recruit  
For West Point**

By BOB BONE

According to recent reports in the *New York Times*, the eager young élite which has traditionally staffed America's service academies is neither as eager nor as élite as it used to be.

**Quoting from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal, the Times correspondent reveals that "appointments to service academies, once eagerly sought by the youth of America, are now going begging." The flower of American youth, which once rushed to apply for openings at West Point and Annapolis, seem to have developed ideas about their future, ideas which do not include a permanent officer career.**

The facts, from the Pentagon's point of view, are appalling. Three years ago, the Naval Academy had three applicants for every vacancy; this year the rate of application has fallen off to a ratio of two to one. Moreover, midshipman resignations are no longer considered abnormal at Annapolis.

At the new Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, scheduled to open next July, things are in even worse shape. To date there have been only 500 applications received, whereas the air force had hoped to choose its first class of 300 from at least 5000 applicants!

Nor is concern over this state of affairs limited to the Pentagon. On Capitol Hill, Representative Norblad (R., Ore.) of the House Armed Services Committee is quoted as admitting that he had only one applicant for a vacancy at West Point, and only two for his ten nominations for the Air Academy.

At least one branch of the service is refusing to take the situation lying down. The Naval Academy is studying the feasibility of broadening its base by reducing the age limit from 17 to 16, and increasing the present height limit.

## SOLUTIONS?

Neither of these solutions, however, seems very practical. In the one instance, as the navy reaches down into early adolescence for its ensigns, it is sure to run afoul of the comic-book lobby. On the other hand, the Navy can only raise the present height limit of 6 feet 4 inches by risking god-knows-what revolutionary changes in naval architecture.

In the face of these difficulties, I have a modest proposal to advance. It involves the enactment of legislation which will revive the ancient custom of primogeniture. By amending the present inheritance tax so that only the first-born male can be legal heir to a family fortune, we can make any number of younger sons immediately available for recruitment to the officer corps. To be sure, primogeniture was abolished in America by the Revolution of '76, but this must be regarded as a frivolous objection in the present climate of American political life.

More seriously, however, one can note that the increasingly weighty role of the military in American life has apparently not had the effect of making youth desirous of a life in the officer corps. The failure of young Americans to respond with enthusiasm to militarism is a healthy and progressive sign.

**Higher Education**

The New York City Board of Higher Education's hunt for "subversives" among faculty members in the city colleges has taken a new term.

The board's investigating committee summoned a college student, one Selma Gorkin, to appear before it. Although it was pointed out that her summoning resulted from her being a former employee of the board—she had been a clerical worker at CCNY at one time—the college administration made it clear that it was embracing the most reactionary implications of her appearance at the investigation.

City College President Buell G. Gallagher, who several years ago acted as if he were going to resist the more outrageous elements of the witchhunt, announced that it would be "desirable" to question students who might have information about "subversives" employed in the city colleges. The prospect of a wholesale attempt to get students to become informers now becomes a possibility.

**JOIN THE YSL!**

Young Socialist League

114 West 14 Street

New York 11, N. Y.

Send me more information about the Young Socialist League.

I want to join the YSL.

(NAME—PLEASE PRINT)

(ADDRESS)

(CITY)

(STATE)

(SCHOOL IF ANY)

**YSL Class in N. Y.  
WEDNESDAYS  
at 7:30 p.m.**

Oct. 27—What Is Socialism?

Nov. 3—Labor Party

Nov. 10—Workers' Control of Industry

Nov. 17—Socialist Perspectives

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

# A Report from Copenhagen: THE STATE OF SOCIALISM IN DENMARK

By C. H. PETERSEN

In Denmark, as in Sweden and Norway, the labor movement represents 40-50 per cent of the population in the elections. This has been the case during the past 10-15 years. The social-democratic parties and the reformist trade unions have hundreds of thousands of members and are the largest organizations existing in these countries.

However, in the last elections the number of social-democratic votes showed only small increase anywhere. Moreover, within the great organizations of the working class, the level of participation and of intellectual life is low.

The Swedish social-democrat Tage Lindbom has discussed this situation in two books (*The New Front and After Atlantis*) and has recognized, in his own country, a crisis of organizational life: fewer and fewer people attend political and union meetings, the original sources and motives of the social movements are disappearing. The technicians, specialists and administrators are increasing their power over the mass organizations and the state.

This same situation also prevails in Denmark. A deep-going discussion of socialist theory, its validity and its applications to the present situation, is limited, as in other countries, to small circles. Only the social events organized by the working-class organizations are able to attract large numbers of people. Yet the May Day demonstrations in Copenhagen remain an impressive show of strength.

## STALINISTS DECLINE

The trade-union federation has approximately 700,000 members. This organization is closely connected with the Social-Democratic Party. The trade unions founded the social-democratic press. They also own this press and pay its annual deficit of more than \$150,000. (Only half of the social-democratic voters read the press.) In every electoral campaign the trade unions also pay for a large part of the social-democratic propaganda.

The struggle inside the trade unions between the social-democrats and the Stalinists often enlivens the internal life of these organizations, especially in the large cities. The influence of the Stalinists continues to decline.

In Denmark, as in Sweden and in Norway, the Stalinists have suffered continuous losses in the trade-union movement since 1945-46; in Iceland and in Finland, on the other hand, they remain strong, and their influence there seems fairly stable. Even in Iceland, however, they lost their majority in the trade unions a few years ago, and in Finland the social-democrats have a small majority in the federation of labor.

In Copenhagen the Stalinists have lost more than 200 union local delegates since the beginning of 1946. As against the social-democrats' 1410, they still have 140 delegates today. Aside from these, there are 67 "non-party" delegates to

the trade-union council, part of which are Stalinist followers.

In Copenhagen 189 unions out of 206, with a membership of 200,000, are under social-democratic membership. Seventeen unions, with 35,000 members, are led by the Stalinists. In the country the social-democratic position in the labor movement is even stronger.

As in other countries, the development of the CP reached its high point in Denmark in 1945. At that time it polled 250,000 votes in the elections, as compared to only 94,000 in 1953 (4.3 per cent of all votes). As a democratic socialist, one notes this Stalinist decline with satisfaction.

## PASSIVITY

Unfortunately, however, the factional struggle in the trade unions only takes the form of a power struggle, from which a fundamental analysis of the actual social problems of the country is absent. For this reason, and because the trade-union bureaucracy is brutal as well as strong, most union members have lapsed into passivity.

Even during the negotiations over the collective agreements in the winter of 1952 and in 1954 one could observe a surprising indifference and passivity on the part of the workers. These agreements were accepted by the trade unions with a majority of 70 per cent, the largest majority ratifying such agreements since the end of the war, probably because they included provisions for three weeks' paid summer vacations (in 1952) and paid holidays, except Sundays, (in 1954). Nevertheless the Stalinists voted against them, even though in the summer of 1946 they had endorsed far worse agreements.

In the summer of 1945 the Danish CP had a membership of 60,000, of which about 20,000 are left today. Their central organ, *Land og Folk*, dropped in circulation from 65,000 copies in the fall of 1945 to 18,000 copies today. This paper is absolutely worthless—it peddles the usual brand of Stalinist propaganda and is written in the stultifying style in which the Nazis were past masters.

## POST-WAR UPSURGE

In the years 1944 and 1945 the Social-Democratic Party suffered heavy losses. Its reformist tradition and practice, and especially its "collaboration" with the Germans from 1940 to 1943, completely isolated it from the great national and social upsurge of the late war and post-war period.

This upsurge, expressed by a spontaneous strike wave and by the powerful resistance movement, entirely dominated the political scene at that time. The strikes especially usually took place against the government and threatened the position of the SP parliamentarians and of the social-democratic trade-union bureaucracy. Consequently, in the October 1945 elections the party lost a fourth of its votes and representatives. Today most of these

positions have been recovered, thanks to the policy of the Stalinists.

Even so, from 1950-1954, the SP lost several thousand members, and its youth organization lost during the same period fully a third of its membership, falling from 30,000 to 20,000 members. Today the youth in Denmark, as in other countries, is "non-political."

The policy of the SP is unequivocally reformist. Lately, however, more radical notes have been struck in its propaganda. Many of its followers are opposed to the great rearmament expenses and are doubtful about the official foreign policy. For this reason, the leadership of the party has begun to take a more reserved attitude toward U. S. foreign policy—especially after Guatemala—and the military expenses have been reduced by 20 per cent. Even with this reduction of the budget, the cost of living has still remained high.

Although the social-democratic press is naturally written on a higher level than the Stalinists', and has also become a little freer in recent years, its contribution to socialist information and theoretical clarification still confines itself, on the whole, to the material considered harmless by the leadership.

## THE PRESS

It is significant for this situation that the most important contributions to the debate on social questions and the most complete international information should come from a liberal bourgeois daily, *Information*, which originated in the resistance movement, much like the *Paris Combat*. This paper provides intelligent and stimulating discussion on political as well as on social questions, without any doctrinaire limitations. Even its coverage of the international labor movement is better than that given by the social-democratic press. But on all questions of economics it is rather reactionary.

In the ranks of the socialist press, the monthly *Verdens Gang* represents a bright spot. It is now 8 years old and is the successor of the old *Socialisten*. It may seem natural that this monthly is more thorough than the socialist dailies, but in addition it is also freer and more alive than the latter, even though it is also published by the SP. It is edited by three younger social-democrats who stay well within the party line but also publish con-

tributions and discussion articles by socialists of other tendencies. Moreover, it also publishes independent information material, especially in important special fields (economics, literature, film, etc.).

*Internationale Perspektiver* is the name of a review which first appeared in 1951. It is published by a group of younger "neutralist" socialists, and contains translations from foreign reviews and newspapers, among which the neutralist and Bevanite publications and authors are particularly well represented. *I. P.* often publishes articles which are far too "neutral" toward Russia and Stalinism, but it also carries interesting critical articles which are always on a high intellectual level. In summer 1951 *I. P.* introduced Bevanism to Scandinavia by its translation of *One Way Only*.

## BEST ELEMENTS

It also carries articles which support the socialist and national liberation movements in Asia and Africa. It remains critical against Stalinism, as well as against the old imperialisms and against American foreign policy. In the last months it has published several special issues devoted to a single topic: Israel, Latin America, the Bevanite pamphlet on German rearmament.

One more publication should be mentioned here: *Frit Forum*, the review of the social-democratic student organization. This magazine, first published in 1952, represents critical and oppositional elements in the party. It is independently radical, without Marxist orthodoxy, but also without clearly defined program. This can be an advantage as well as a danger.

However, in spite of its lack of clarity and its relative weakness, this group still represents, in my opinion, the best elements in the Danish working-class movement, inasmuch as it is completely free of Stalinoid tendencies, of dogmatic limitations and of party for leader worship.

On the outskirts of political life, there exist small "sections" of the Fourth International and of the International Workingmen's Association (syndicalist)—both without any influence whatever. It is interesting to note, on the other hand, that in Sweden the syndicalists have their only important organization outside Spain, the "Sveriges Arbetares Centralorganisation" (SAC) with 18,000 members and a daily paper *Arbetaren*.

## It's a Crime to Be Bombed If You're a 'Subversive' Negro

A case that deserves becoming a national scandal is on in Louisville, Ky. As reported by the *N. Y. Times* on Oct. 10, the facts are as follows.

A Negro family, the Wades, moved into a previously white block. The next night a burning cross flamed nearby. Rocks smashed the front window; six shots were fired into the house. Then on June 27 a bomb explosion shattered the wall.

The law investigated. At the beginning of October, a man was arrested for causing the explosion.

So far it seems like just an ordinary scandal, part of the new pattern of anti-Negro bombing that has succeeded lynching.

The difference is this: The man who was arrested was a FRIEND of the Wades, not a Jim-Crower. This man Bown was also indicted for advocating sedition. Five other friends of Wade have been indicted for advocating sedition, as a result of the "investigation" into the bombing. The government's declared theory is that the bombing was a put-up job, a "Communist plot," just as the Wades' moving into the neighborhood was just to cause trouble.

There is not a scintilla of evidence against Bown. No one has been bothered among Wade's hostile neighbors.

The bombing of a Negro's home by Jim Crow hooligans has been turned into a witchhunt against the Negro and his friends, who are on record as being active in the Progressive Party.

There has been no real sign of an investigation other than the detectives' work in digging into the "Communist literature" possessed by Wade's friends. The grand jury which indicted the six made the political views of the defendants evidence of criminal propensity.

The actual bombers have been protected.

The character of this case has been denounced by Louisville's leading newspapers. The *Courier-Journal* defended the right of two of the defendants to answer questions put. The state attorney, it said, "has produced not the slightest evidence to uphold the theory of a Communist plot." It called the proceedings a "witchhunt" and a "display of local McCarthyism." It deplored "the prevalent hysteria." The *Louisville Times* also denounced the affair by and large.

## They Spelled Out Americanism

The 70,000-member Slovene National Benefit Society (SNPJ), holding its 15th convention on the 50th anniversary of the founding of the organization, adopted a "Reaffirmation of Principles" which represents a heartening note in this country. As published in the society's organ *Prosveta*, the principles are:

"(1) Free-thinking, that is, the right to worship as one chooses, or the right not to worship at all, if one so chooses, without coercion or discrimination from any course because of such a choice.

"(2) Complete economic security, or as it is sometimes called 'cradle-to-grave security,' for all people without any exception whatsoever. This security to be attained within the limits of our resources in the SNPJ, from our local, state and federal governments, and from employers through action of our Unions.

"(3) For complete freedom: Not of the kind which permits some people to exploit others, but of the kind which permits each person the fullest expression of his or her talents and abilities, so long as that expression does not trespass on the rights of others.

"(4) For a better social order: Not one which exalts possessions and ownership, but that which instead exalts

achievement and social good. That those things which are privately used should be privately owned and those which are socially used should be socially owned.

"(5) Against totalitarianism under whatever form or name it masquerades: In other words, against the police state, one party rule, domineering bureaucracy and concentration camps. We deplore the practice in recent years of adjudging people and organizations as so-called subversives, without knowing or being permitted to face their accusers. We protest the infamous method of "guilt-by-association," of punishing people for what they are presumed to be thinking instead of for their perpetration of overt criminal acts. We are against the imposition of loyalty oaths as distinguished from the routine oaths required for the faithful performance of appointive or elective officials.

"Instead, we stand for freedom of the press, speech, petition and assemblage, and the right to criticize anybody from the humblest citizen to the highest ranking public official, without fear of reprisal.

"(6) For greater democracy, that is, for the right of people to have more voice in their affairs—political, economical and social."

See you at the New York ISL's  
**HALLOWE'EN HI-JINKS!**  
at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street  
SATURDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 30

# The Case of Case — —

(Continued from page 1)

with a "left-wing study group." He did not consider it necessary to go into the nature of the association, the leftness of the wing, or whether it had occurred before, during or after his sister's adolescence, since he intimidated very strongly anyway that it had occurred during a period of nervous illness. In other words, any left-wing association that might be proved was due solely to temporary insanity. And besides he had asked the FBI to investigate his sister and never heard about it again.

No sister could ask a better defense of her right of free expression and association. To the McCarthyite smear, Clifford Case answered in effect: "She didn't do it, and besides she was spifflicated at the time."

No democracy could ask a better defense of its principles. Against the McCarthyite tactic of guilt by association and mud-slinging, Mr. Case replied that he was not associated with any guilty parties and therefore was innocent, and besides he had sicced the FBI on his own sister himself.

No liberal could ask more, for isn't it true that if this embattled liberal Clifford Case is elected, McCarthyism will have suffered a defeat? And anyone who doubts this proposition will hardly stand a chance of being elected to the Senate from New Jersey, which obviously proves that he is unrealistic.

### HOAX

So much for the Case case, illustrating the clarity with which fundamental principles are posed in U. S. elections. Then there is the Stringfellow case, which also revolves around a tear-jerking TV appearance.

Utah Congressman Stringfellow, running for re-election, had been capitalizing on his war record. Everybody knew how he had been hero of a gallant OSS adventure in which scientist Otto Hahn had been saved from the Nazis. A movie was going to be made of it. The TV program "This Is Your Life" had featured it. Then the hoax was exposed, and Stringfellow confessed he had fooled his public, in a TV speech in which he left up to the state GOP whether he would withdraw or not.

The distinctive point to the story is that Stringfellow in effect admitted that he is a congenital liar. "I fell into the trap which in part had been laid by my own glib tongue," he sobbed. (He didn't say who or what laid the other part of the trap.)

The Republicans at this moment are meditating whether the confessions of this self-confessed congenital liar had made him more or less popular among his voters.

There seemed to be a feeling abroad among the statesmen of Utah that a man

shouldn't be, witchhunted for a little escapade. Even the Democratic state chairman of Utah expressed sympathy for the poor fellow, even though he was cruelly partisan enough to add: "I don't think that the man should repent by asking to be elected to Congress."

Obviously Democrats feel that a candidate who has not confessed to being a liar has a point in his favor.

You can see how clearly one can state The Issues in this election.

### A TALE ABOUT BUTTER

The Burning Issues of the Day have also been prominent in the New York election. This is the advanced state of an advanced country where both major parties have nominated liberals to head the slate, Ives and Javits for the Republicans versus Harriman and FDR Jr. for the Democrats. This is presumably in line with the famed utility of the Two-Party System in giving the people a choice. As we go to press, the embattled liberal opponents are battling over the number of anti-Communist references in the Democratic Party platform. Ives had charged that the Democrats had forgotten to put any in, and the Democrats had charged right back that they had a "greater number" in their own platform than the GOP.

The clarity of The Issues in America plainly puts all those underdeveloped countries in the shade. To symbolize it, we can well quote an advertisement—typical of the American Way of Life—which is staring us in the face at this very moment as we read the Monday papers. Word for word, it goes this way:

"Emily was a lonesome typist. At a dance she met Fred, a truck driver. Three months later, they were married and moved into their own apartment. Four years passed and now Emily has a girl of three—and a baby boy. She doesn't work any more, but that's okay too, Fred has his own trucking business and has bought a ranch house. Emily's mother always used Hotel Bar Butter and so does Emily. I don't claim that Hotel Bars made this marriage a success—but it sure helped give them happy meals! Today ask for FARM FRESH HOTEL BAR BUTTER."

Or better still, vote Demopublican.

### FORTUNE SURVEY

Not even Republican businessmen can get worked up over the issues of the campaign—at any rate, apparently not anywhere near as much as labor has worked itself up in favor of the Democrats.

Thus, in the current issue of Fortune magazine, "Fortune's latest survey of the business world" shows, it says, that—

"Most executives think the Republican

administration has succeeded in providing a better climate for business . . . but, surprisingly, 70 per cent of the businessmen do not think the forthcoming congressional elections will have much effect on business one way or another. . . .

"A Kansas City department-store manager, for instance, is confident that 'Business is going to be good, regardless of whether the Democrats or Republicans win.' A West Coast man says, 'We've learned we have to do business under both Democratic and Republican administrations. Political changes are having less and less effect.' A Chicago retailer: 'We did pretty good under the Democrats, even.'

"Another reason for the lack of election worries is the feeling of some businessmen that 'The majority of the opposition party goes down the road with Ike,' or that 'The administration will still have a working majority, counting the Southern Democrats.' About a quarter of the businessmen, however, feel that a Republican victory is needed. . . ."

The Fortune surveyors seem to be impressed with this trend, whatever the percentages may mean practically. Perhaps the Democratic Party's propaganda has been successful in convincing businessmen that the party is sincere in no longer talking about New Deals, or Fair ones, but in terms of backing good old Ike, who after all owes everything he is to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

A 94-page booklet issued by the Democratic Party, for instance, on "The Issues and the Record," concludes on the following note:

"Judging from the record of the 83rd Congress, a Democratic Congress represents the best chance of . . ."

"Enacting the Eisenhower trade program."

"Enacting the Eisenhower public-housing program."

"Shutting off another attempt to pass the Bricker amendment."

All of this hasn't stopped the political leaders of labor from enthusiastically supporting the Democratic Party, instead of thinking in terms of building a workingman's political party of their own. While it is perfectly true that the GOP still represents, in the big picture, the right wing of bourgeois politics, as distinct from the Democrats, it is also true that in no election of the last two decades has the difference between the two capitalist parties been so elusive.

But for some labor leaders, the closer the Democrats move over to the GOP, the more involved they get in saving the good Democrats from the bad Republicans. On roughly similar lines, the Reading Labor Advocate claims that the situation reminds them of the Hollywood actress who turned to her husband after several rounds of drinks. "Henry, please don't drink any more," she pleaded. "Your face is already getting blurred."

## The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print) \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_

ZONE STATE \_\_\_\_\_

# Choice on Foreign Policy — —

(Continued from page 1)

ple that everything was going along just fine until the Republicans won office. And even then everything would have been all right, but things went wrong because Eisenhower and his advisers are afraid of the reactionary wing of the Republican Party and hence cannot carry out the "Trumanite" programs which really lie near and dear to their hearts.

It is true that Stevenson gave lip-service to criticism of "our reliance on military strategy and neglect of the underlying political and social problems." He added, along the same lines:

"And in the East the debacle of Indochina ought to make it clear that military power alone will not carry the day, for the greatest power in Asia is nationalism and the greatest problems are political and social."

But he then went on to demonstrate that such ideas are strictly of oratorical significance to him, by adding that "the Southeast Asian defensive alliance Secretary Dulles has negotiated has definite military value, and it could and will, we

hope, become far more than what the Asians call the 'white man's protective association.'"

### POLITICAL NOSTALGIA

Throughout Stevenson's speech it was possible for well-intentioned people (or people who are determined to bank on the good intentions of Stevenson) to find implications that he is strongly for Point Four-type programs. But all of it was left hazy and misty, as is quite proper. For it is one of the hard historical facts that Point Four got short shrift not only from the Republicans, but equally in the days when the Democrats had undisputed control of both Houses of Congress and the White House to boot.

Stevenson made some telling thrusts at the sheer confusion and stupidity which have been such outstanding features of Dulles' regime at the State Department. But his whole approach was based not on the advocacy of a new foreign policy for this government, but rather on the assumption that things were going along just fine until the voters made their mistake in 1952. All we have to do is to get back to those good old days.

Above all, the two Democratic spokesmen called for a return to bipartisanship in foreign policy. Their heaviest indictment was on the charge that both friend and foe abroad are confused by the babel of Republican voices making contradictory assertions on foreign policy. What would reassure America's friends, and strike terror into the breast of its enemies, would be to hear only one monolithic voice on foreign policy echoing

throughout the American land and from its shores to the whole world!

### U. S. MONOLITH

Now, there can be no doubt that the various policies put forward by the spokesmen of the different wings of the Republican Party help to confuse people abroad, or, rather, they make them aware of the confusion which reigns in the United States. But this did not begin when Eisenhower stepped into the White House. We seem to recall a certain difference of opinion between Truman and his commander in the Far East, MacArthur. And McCarthy, Knowland, the late McCarran (a Democrat) and others were just as voiciferous under Truman as under Eisenhower.

From the standpoint of unity things may be even worse now than they were then. But that is not really what is wrong with American foreign policy. The governments and peoples of the rest of the world could well stand a good debate on foreign policy in the United States—provided that they felt that someone among the debaters was proposing policies which were designed to solve the world's real problem.

In fact, contrary to what Stevenson and Truman think, the greater the appearance of American unanimity behind the policies based on military power instead of social appeal which have characterized both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, the greater becomes the isolation of the United States from the rest of the world.

To the millions of workers and peasants in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin

America, the United States talks the language of imperialism. Its resources are poured out to keep a France in control of Indochina or a reactionary regime in power in Thailand. The trickle of money that seeps through for Point Four purposes and programs is lost in the flood of military and economic backing for reaction.

The thing which scares these peoples most (and often right into the arms of that other imperialism, Stalinism) is the appearance of unanimous support for these policies in the United States, or disagreement only from a section of the Republican Party and the military which want even more reactionary and warlike policies than those of the government.

Stevenson and Truman have made it clear from their speeches that they have learned nothing in the years out of office. What they hanker for is national unity behind a foreign policy controlled by the Democrats as of old. What is needed is a democratic foreign policy which puts the United States on the side of the common people of the world rather than on that of their imperialist and reactionary oppressors. Returning the Democrats to control of Congress would represent no step, not even the tiniest, in that direction.

### WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!