

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

May 16, 1955

FIVE CENTS

SPOTLIGHT

Salk Vaccine Scandal

The Great God Private Enterprise has once again taken a gruesome toll of life and limb. As so often in the past, his victims this time are helpless little children.

That is the only conclusion which can be drawn from the welter of confusion which surrounds the Salk vaccine scandal. The government, dedicated to a fanatical support of private enterprise *über alles*, stands indicted as the chief criminal in this whole sordid affair.

NO PRIORITIES

First, the government failed to establish controls and priorities over the vaccine. This meant that except for the first and second grade children, for whom vaccine was to be provided by the Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, the availability of the vaccine would be determined by the ability of cities or other public authorities to procure it in a scramble for the inadequate supplies . . . or by the amount of money parents could afford to pay private doctors to get it. In the first week, before the safety of the vaccine came into question, adults who could afford it were getting vaccinated while the children had to wait.

That was scandal number one. But now, that scandal is being buried under a more dramatic one. It is the inescapable conclusion that in the rush to get out a maximum amount of vaccine, and cash in on the vast profits to be made as a result of the short supply, the drug companies involved have cut

corners on their production and control procedures.

No other explanation will account for the decision to hold up all further vaccinations until another check has been made on all the vaccine which has been delivered as well as that now in production. At first the government officials concerned stated that supplies on hand (except from the Cutter Laboratories) were to be used, but no further supplies were to be issued. A few hours later, the country was advised to hold up all vaccinations "in the light of new information." The government refuses to say what this "new information" is. But this can only mean either that the number of infections after vaccination have begun to mount far beyond the originally announced figures, or that other evidence has turned up indicating that the commercially produced vaccine is not safe.

GREEDY FOR PROFIT

And why should anyone be surprised that the "great pharmaceutical houses" have been capable of producing defective vaccine? The drug industry is as greedy for profit as any other sector of private enterprise. There is a vast literature exposing the shoddy or overpriced goods which it has foisted on the public over the years. This time the results were dramatic, and the whole nation was watching. But the government seeks to cover up this crime by vague and misleading double-talk rather than telling the people the truth.

(Turn to last page)

Calif. Student Confab Succeeds

. . . page 5

Housing and the Negro Ghetto

. . . page 4

Hot Fight in British Elections

. . . page 2

Ruark's Book on Kenya

SINS AGAINST TRUTH

. . . page 7

A Four Power Meeting: Opportunity or Illusion?

By GORDON HASKELL

After much pulling and hauling by its European allies, the American government has finally agreed to propose some kind of a meeting of the heads of the governments of Britain, France, Russia and the United States.

Ever since Churchill proposed a meeting of these governments "at the summit" three years ago, this has become one of the big shibboleths of neutralist sentiment in Europe. From time to time the Stalinist leaders in Russia have kept the pot boiling by implying that they would not be opposed to such a meeting. Of all the governments involved, the American has been the most reluctant to agree to it.

The idea that a "big four" meeting of chiefs of state can make a big difference in the cold war is actually an illusion. It flows from an ardent desire for peace which makes people willing to grasp at any straw. Even more, it is closely linked with a very old notion which arises among people who feel helpless before the power of their governments: the idea that their wrongs are caused by governmental underlings whose actions are unknown to the head of the government. *If only the Father in the Kremlin knew what his governors are doing, the Russian peasants used to say, he would take care of us.*

FACE TO FACE

And now the idea seems to be: if only the top men were to meet face to face, they could straighten out the international tangle unhindered by the distortions of regular diplomacy.

The British and French governments are for a big four meeting, not because they expect anything substantial from it in the way of ending cold-war tensions, but because they know how popular it is among their peoples, and because they need that popularity to ensure the continuation of their regimes. The Stalinists are for it, because they are convinced that they can utilize any big four meeting for worldwide propaganda purposes, without having to yield anything of substance in them. The American government is opposed, and

is only willing to be dragged into such a meeting reluctantly, with all kinds of reservations, to help out its friends in France and England.

The opposition of the American government does not at all stem from a reluctance to play on popular illusions. It is the product of conviction, based on sad experience, that the foreign policy of this government precludes it from deriving any political or propaganda advantage from such a meeting. In fact, it simply exposes this government to another political rout, such as it experienced at the Berlin Conference last year.

As if to dispel any doubts the Eisenhower administration may have had on this score, the Stalinists have recently made two moves which have caused consternation in Washington, while raising their own political stock throughout the world. These are the Austrian peace treaty, and the proposals on disarmament submitted to the United Nations Disarmament Commission in London on May 10.

In the Austrian treaty, the Russians have made all the "concessions" at which they have balked in the past. These concessions have cost Russia very little indeed, while they have thrown a king-sized monkey wrench into the process of German rearmament (for an analysis of the politics of the Austrian treaty, see LABOR ACTION for April 25—G.H.). And in a broader field, they have once more reinforced the idea that the bureaucrats who now rule Russia are "reasonable," can be dealt with, and hence should be granted concessions, in turn, by the American war bloc in the interest of peace.

OLD STALINIST THEME

The Russian disarmament proposal is of the same nature. It lays heavy emphasis on the old Stalinist theme of a prohibition of the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons, an objective passionately desired by the vast majority of humanity. In addition, however, it proposes mutual withdrawal of major military forces from Germany, and the abandonment of military bases in foreign countries by the great powers: proposals which are absolutely unacceptable to the United States.

To give weight to these proposals, the Stalinists connect them with a proposal for a drastic reduction of the armed forces of all the great powers. This is a political masterstroke, for it counters the chief American argument for the necessity of nuclear weapons. This argument has been that the only way in which the American bloc can hope to balance the vast armed manpower of the Stalinist countries is by the employment of superior weapons—namely nuclear ones. Now the Russians appear to be willing to reduce their own armed forces to levels substantially equal to those of the American bloc.

Of course, there are all kinds of "jokers" in these proposals. But they are

(Turn to last page)

CIO PAMPHLET: "GOVERNMENT BY MINORITY"

Does the Majority Rule in America?

H. W. BENSON

How democratic is our system of representation? The title of the CIO pamphlet "Government by Minority" gives its reply. "Our system of representative government is being sapped at its roots," we are told. And it refers bluntly to "the minority stranglehold over our legislative bodies."

To get matters straight, let us make clear that the CIO is not analyzing the class structure of capitalism which permits a tiny minority to dominate government despite democracy. The pamphlet does no theorizing and passes no judgment on our social system; it merely gives the plain arithmetical facts of life, including graphs and charts, proving conclusively that the majority of our

population receives only minority representation in government. In this respect, the little 15-page booklet is a handy reference work. As our population grows and millions shift from farm to city, the ballots of millions of city dwellers become less and less equal to the votes of the rural people. The apportionment of representatives in the U. S. Congress and in the state legislatures makes our system of representation less democratic as the years pass.

THE SENATE

First, consider the Senate. Each state gets two votes regardless of size. The 15,000,000 citizens of New York State get two votes, no more than the 160,000 residents of Nevada. The vote of 92 New Yorkers equals the vote of 1 Nevadan. The 13 least populated states of the union have together less than half the to-

tal population of New York. Yet; they get 26 votes compared to the 2 votes from New York. Is it any wonder that the liberal majority of the country, concentrated in the highly populated industrial centers, finds it so difficult to win full representation in the Senate? Presumably each state merits equal representation in the Senate because the 13 original founders of the union surrendered their sovereignty, and in return were represented in the Senate as equal powers. But this theory leaves the privileged status of the 35 latecomers unexplained. Moreover, when the Senate was originally created, the difference between the largest state, Virginia and the smallest, Delaware, was only 14 to 1. The difference now, is 92 to 1. It is difficult to explain why our nation must suf-

(Turn to last page)

LONDON LETTER

Apathy Vanishes in Labor Party As: Hot Fight Shapes Up in British Elections

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, May 5—There is never a scarcity of political crystal gazers in Britain. The columns of the newspapers, both local and national, abound with prophets who—equipped with all the powers of the supernatural—earn their living by forecasting the political future. Now, with the general election three weeks away, the prophets have come into their own as editors offer the hospitality of their columns to anyone who is prepared to make an attempt at forecasting the result of the election; always providing, of course, that such forecasts are in line with editorial desires of the newspaper.

Just before the prime minister announced the date of the elections a Gallup Poll was taken on party support to be expected in an election. The results of this poll were published in the *News Chronicle* after the election date had been announced. It caused much rejoicing in the Tory camp—for it gave them a four point lead over the Labor Party. This lead, were it an accurate reflection of what is going to happen on May 26, would give the Tories a resounding victory. The jubilation of the Tories was short lived; a further poll, taken after the election date had been announced, cut this four point Tory lead down to a mere half-a-point lead. Smiles gave way to gloom on Tory faces and the sunshine suddenly seemed to break into all the dark corners of the Labor camp.

How much one may, or may not, rely upon the public opinion polls to reflect the actual outcome of an election is a debatable point—but one thing now seems to be quite certain. This general election fight is going to be a very tight thing one way or the other. A runaway victory for the Tories does not seem so certain now as it did a couple of months ago and the issue is likely to be settled by the reaction of the electorate in the marginal seats. These are seats which are held by a very slender majority and which turn over from one party to another in response to even a small shift of opinion among the electorate.

THE MARGINAL SEATS

There are about 80 seats which are held by a majority of less than 2,500 votes. A swing of a mere 2 per cent from one party to another will be sufficient for these seats to change hands. They are split roughly half each between the Labor and Tory parties. From these few mechanical details of the electoral process it can be seen that, with a neck and neck race for support anything might happen at the last moment.

Turning from the mechanics to the politics of the campaign brings one to the Labor election manifesto which was issued six days ago. As anticipated it contains no startling changes—although the language in which it is written displays the handiwork of the two Bevanites, Tom Driberg and Dick Crossman, who were delegated by the Party National Executive Committee to assist the secretary, Morgan Phillips, in preparing the final draft.

The manifesto, strangely enough, opens up by referring to the menace of the H-bomb "which looms over all mankind." From this one would imagine that Labor had some startling new pronouncement to make—but this is not so and the line advanced is that until world disarmament can be achieved "weapons of mass destruction in the hands of Britain and her allies in NATO form the most effective deterrent against aggression by a potential disturber of the peace." It is worth noting that the Labor line on the H-bomb is not contained in the main election manifesto but in a separate document. The manifesto proper emphasizes the need for a world plan for disarmament with effective international control and states that as a first step toward this Labor believes that Britain should propose "the immediate cessation of H-bomb tests." This proposal of ending the H-bomb tests has rather upset the anti-Labor forces in Britain. In the absence of complete opposition to the H-bomb by either of the big parties it may prove to be an effective vote catcher.

FOREIGN POLICY

Other points of foreign policy in the Labor manifesto include the necessity for high-level talks, which the manifesto states is of top priority and therefore is at one with the line advanced by the Bevanite weekly *Tribune*: The re-unifi-

cation of Germany by free elections; the admission of China to the UN and the neutralization of Formosa.

On home affairs the policy is varied. Proposals are advanced to re-nationalize iron and steel and the road haulage industries and to bring into public ownership the water supplies and sections of the chemical and machine tool industries. A further statement says, rather vaguely, "Where necessary we shall start new public enterprises." Exactly what this means is anybody's guess. The housing policy is also a measure of further public control, for it advocates that local municipalities should gradually take over all rented private houses.

Industrial democracy, something long neglected by the Labor Party, also finds a mention when the manifesto states that a Labor Government would "encourage schemes of industrial democracy." This, while mentioning the subject, really says nothing of importance. It is a great omission, for the whole question of industrial democracy, particularly in the industries being nationalized, is of the utmost importance and merits much greater consideration than it has received by the Labor Party. This goes for the left as well as the right.

The remainder of the program is given over to measures of welfare and social services. Most of them merely restore the position to where it was before the re-armament program interfered but others represent some advance—particularly in education policies.

The peroration reads: "In 1945, Britain started out along the path of social justice. Now is the time to go forward with Labor." Time alone will tell whether this means that the "consolidators" have been vanquished and that Labor is going to regain some of the dynamic with which it captured the imagination of the workers when it swept the Tories out of power in 1945 and welcomed the new Labor prime minister by singing "The Red Flag" in the sacred precincts of Parliament.

One of the most striking features of the Labor Party during the past few weeks is the suddenness with which the air of apathy seems to have vanished. A few months ago it was impossible to believe that the party could shake off its apparent stupor and spring into life. But

actualities consistently confound the prophets and they have done so on this occasion. Looking on the Labor Party now it is hard to imagine that a few short weeks ago it was a confused mixture of seething internal convulsions and frustrated apathy. It is now alive and ready to fight—the glint of battle is seen in every eye.

This peculiarity seems to be one of the inherent characteristics of the British Labor Party. It is rather like a family which consistently quarrels with itself and yet displays considerable agility in turning in a uniform fashion upon its natural enemy outside the family.

This, however, does not mean that the inner party conflicts of recent weeks have been forgotten. They have merely been placed in cold storage until the time is opportune for a resumption.

Bevan is still outside of the Parliamentary Labor Party because of the H-bomb row; but he has applied to the chief whip for re-admission and this will probably be granted within the next few days. Bevan is far too good a propagandist to be ignored during a general election campaign and the NEC will doubtless employ his talent to the utmost. Even though some of his statements will cause them some embarrassment and awaken bitter memories of the recent past.

BEVAN IS NEEDED

While Bevan will have no difficulty in securing re-admission to the Parliamentary Party there are several right wingers who find themselves in rather a difficult position and are hurriedly scrambling around in a most undignified fashion. Because of the recent carve-up of electoral boundaries some Labor MPs have found that their particular constituencies have been merged with others. Thus there are two MPs and only one vacant seat, which means that the local party has a chance of doing a little shifting around.

One of the victims of this situation is Dr. Edith Summerskill, present chairman of the NEC and a consistent right-winger. Her seat in Fulham—a London constituency — was merged with the neighboring one which was held by Michael Stewart—an MP who is slightly left of center and who was fairly vocal in his opposition to German rearmament. The local party decided to have Stewart—and Dr. Edith was left high and dry to fend for herself. This happened some weeks ago and it is only now, after much very hard work, that she has at last succeeded in finding a seat. [In Britain, unlike the United States, a candidate need not be a resident of the district he represents.—Ed.]

RIGHTWINGERS SUFFER

Another MP who has suffered at the hands of the local party is Bessie Brad-

dock, Member for Liverpool Exchange. Some months ago a campaign began in Liverpool to oust Mrs. Braddock because of her consistent right wing attitude and antagonism to the Bevanites. When news of this first leaked out Mrs. Braddock issued a statement saying that it was a conspiracy organized by Bevanites, Trotskyists and Communists. The NEC, no doubt horrified by the thoughts of such an unholy alliance, ordered an investigation. But, investigation or no, the Liverpool party pursued its point and has consistently refused to re-adopt Mrs. Braddock. Time is running short and she still has no seat. Incidentally, mention must be made of the fact that Mrs. Braddock was herself once a member of the Communist Party—thus must be aware of the unlikelihood of an alliance of the character she mentioned ever arising.

A third MP to have troubles is Woodrow Wyatt—another right-winger—who has several times been rejected by various Birmingham constituencies. The first occasion was when he was defeated by Victor Yates—a pacifist MP and one of those who was expelled from the Parliamentary Party for voting against German rearmament. It is now reported that Wyatt is to move away from the Birmingham area altogether in an endeavor to find a seat which will accept a right wing candidate; it is also reported that he is very annoyed with the people at Birmingham. This leaves them quite unmoved. Birmingham, a very large industrial center, has long traditions of pacifism which probably arises from the Quaker connections with the city. More recently it has been developing a growing left wing—and one which contains a vocal and extremely active Third Camp Socialist element.

These instances of MPs in trouble are a pointer to the fact that while there is an apparent cessation of internal party disputes the right wing is not being allowed to gain the advantage and the left forces are continually applying pressure.

I found a clear example of this when I attended a meeting of a constituency party which had been called to re-adopt its MP, who is a definite left winger. In welcoming his re-adoption as candidate in the election many delegates at the meeting used the occasion to have a crack at the right wing. Practically every speaker mentioned the fact that his or her organization congratulated the MP on the way he had opposed the manufacture of a British H-bomb. When one right wing delegate tried to toss a bomb into the meeting by asking if the MP did not agree that the "antics of the Bevan crowd" had lost the Labor Party a considerable number of votes, he was countered by a Bevanite delegate who

(Turn to last page)

POLAND

While the Puppet Leaders Grovel — — Economic Boom Serves Russian Masters

By A. RUDZIENSKI

At the recent Plenum of the Central Committee of the Stalinist Party of Poland (PZPR) the policy of the government was subjected to very sharp "self-criticism."

In the sphere of economic development, "failures" were recorded in both industry and agriculture. In the most important single industry in Poland, coal, 91 million tons were produced instead of the planned 100 million. Steel production attained a level of 3,900,000 tons instead of 4,500,000. In agriculture production reached "only" 98 per cent. But the production of the state farms, PGR (sovkhozes), was specially weak, fulfilling only 88 per cent of the plan.

In spite of all these "failures," Poland's industrial production is today the most important among the satellite countries, exceeds the production of Italy, and has caught up with France in the production of steel. Poland is the most important producer of coal on the European continent, and is exceeded in production only by Great Britain. But the productivity of the Polish mineworker has dropped to 1200 kilograms instead of the planned 17,000 kg., because of a lack of mechanization and the very low miners' wages. Nine out of ten tons of

coal are loaded by hand rather than mechanically. Here is the reason for the failure to fulfill the plan for 100 million tons of coal.

In agriculture, the small farms are producing more, and fulfilling the plan better than the state PGRs, as a result of the regime's pressure on the peasantry. The peasants still resist collectivization. In 1953 3170 kolkhozes had been created, but in 1954 there were only 1848.

Despite all of these "failures," the Polish economy is developing with a stormy tempo. But the problem is that this production is destined not for Polish consumption, but for "export" to Russia. Both coal and steel are used for armament production. The standard of living of the Polish workers and peasants is lower now than in Russia, and the prices of commodities are higher. The Polish economy pays a very heavy colonial tribute to Russia. But the Warsaw puppets are engaging in a preventive "self-criticism" for imaginary "failures," because they want to safeguard themselves from surprises for "any eventuality."

The self-criticism is even harsher in the field of ideological and organizational problems. The poor puppets "confess" to a lack of collective direction and collective collaboration, to "bureaucratic domineering" and the "cult of the individual" instead of "Leninist democracy," collec-

tive direction and comradely cooperation. They confess that because of these shortcomings, the party has failed to penetrate the worker and peasant masses and the youth, and that it is organizing primarily bureaucratic, careerist elements to whom the party card is only a means to the good life and bureaucratic careers.

Thus the puppets confess their bankruptcy, their inability to gain the support of the Polish people after ten years of rule. They are isolated from the Polish nation, from the workers as well as from the peasants. They live apart from the nation, and the people speak of the government as "them," that is, as strangers to the nation. The Stalinist dignitaries live in luxury, while the workers and peasants, as well as the middle layers of the "intelligentsia" live in misery. The former fear contact with the people, and appear publicly only on official occasions, guarded by their security agents. They have not won popularity with the people, despite the indubitable industrial successes, and the economic reconstruction of the country. This is so because the Polish people know very well that the steel and coal belongs not to them, but to the Russian masters, and that the reconstructed Polish industry is not the source of their welfare, but rather is used as the chains of their national slavery and the whip which drives them to forced labor.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Indian Socialist Dissents

To the Editor:

Apropos an article by Philip Coben in the LABOR ACTION of April 25, may I say that there is no truth whatsoever in the rumors that one section of the Indian Praja Socialist Party wants to return back to Nehru's Congress Party. All sections of the P.S.P. stand unequivocally committed to its 1954 Policy Resolution which declares both Nehru's Congress and the Communist Party to be equally irrelevant to socialism.

It must, however, also be said that merger with the Congress or the so-called militant opposition are not the only alternatives available to P.S.P. If militant socialists in the United States can find it possible to cooperate with some factions of ADA on the question of civil-liberties (while the ADA continues to maintain its bourgeois-capitalistic outlook) can it not be possible for PSP to cooperate with such economic programs of the Nehru government which have a socialist outlook? I think such cooperation does not mean acquiescence.

I do not think that PSP can ever enter in an alliance with Nehru's Congress until the 13-point program advanced by PSP in May 1953 is accepted (which was then rejected) by Nehru.

Indian socialism stands for militancy and social reconstruction at the same time. A genuine socialist movement can not be built by merely articulating the frustrations of the people. That way of activity belongs to the fascists and the communists, who on coming to power can suppress frustrations by military dictatorship. A socialist movement should be built on faith of the people: this is why the socialists should be able to justify in advance their future governmental role by doing constructive and positive acts during the period of militant opposition. This is where Asoka Mehta stands. If Phillip Coben could not see this, I am sure, Asoka will be ready to confess that it must have been his fault.

Every genuine party has its factions. One faction raises the questions, another tries to find the answers. Militancy is good, but is not self-contained. While militant people should continue to be busy winning arguments, statesmen like Asoka Mehta should try to convert people, and transform them to socialist ranks. A movement cannot live until it is both extensive and intensive in character. Asoka is not moving toward Nehru, but does that mean that if the Nehru government moves, at any time, toward the PSP, the PSP should step back just in order to maintain the "militant opposition?"

Brijen K. GUPTA

Wallingford, Pa., May 9.

Reply

In reply to Comrade Gupta, we would like to point out the following:

(1) Philip Coben's article did not say

Correction

An editorial mistake reversed the sense of the third paragraph in a letter by Jack Walker and Jim Thompson on Stalinism in Asia which appeared in the May 2 issue of LABOR ACTION (p. 4).

The sentence in question should, of course, have read: "There can be no socialist support to China's efforts to obtain the offshore islands by war or threat of war. . . ."

The "no" was omitted. Apologies.—Ed.

Patience!

Due to the special issue of LABOR ACTION last week, a number of letters to the editor have accumulated for which we have no space in this issue. We ask our correspondents to be patient.—Ed.

The standard biography
KARL MARX
by
Franz Mehring
\$3.50
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, New York City

that a section of the Praja Socialist Party wants to return to the Congress Party. Although such rumors have appeared (as facts) in the American press, LABOR ACTION has ignored them in the absence of confirmation from India. We know how "reliable" the American press is when it comes to reporting developments in the socialist movement of any country!

(2) Socialists often can and must cooperate with non-socialists when the latter adopt a progressive program and engage in struggle for it on any specific issue. This applies to those ADAers who want to fight for a consistently civil libertarian program.

(3) This does not mean, however, that socialists should naively assume that every time a political organization adopts a progressive plank in its platform, this should be hailed as a great step forward. The political record of an organization is far more important than its formal program. Both Democrats and Republicans in this country say they are for peace, justice, freedom, the welfare of all citizens, against imperialism, etc., etc. Why should socialists take them seriously, when their acts, both in power and in opposition, proclaim what they really stand for? Has the Congress Party changed its character recently, or has it merely adopted a verbal platform with which it hopes to catch votes? And if the latter be the case, why should socialists take any attitude but that of exposing such political demagoguery before the people?

(4) We confess that we are baffled by the different roles assigned by Comrade Gupta to "militant people" and "statesmen" in the socialist movement. In our understanding, militancy relates much less to argumentation than to bold, aggressive action in leading the masses to struggle for their immediate just demands, and for the reconstruction of society. We had also thought that for a mass movement, the best way to "convert people" and transform them into socialists is to prove to them in action that socialists really fight for and represent their interests in the most thorough, radical and uncompromising manner possible consistent with the given social realities.

In the American socialist movement, the term "labor statesman" has always been applied to conservative, compromising labor leaders who were more concerned that the respectable government and bourgeois circles consider them "responsible statesmen" than that they win substantial gains for their memberships, when such gains require militant struggle. From the discussion which has appeared in *Janata*, it seems to us that Asoka Mehta's policy is indeed "statesmanlike" in this sense.—Ed.

BRAZIL Election Crisis Grows As a Political Deal Boomerangs

By BRASILEIRO

RIO DE JANEIRO, May 9—The electoral struggle for the presidency of Brazil, that is, for the succession to Vargas, continues to be indecisive. The liberal, pro-capitalist camp is incapable of winning political control of the country, and on the other hand, the masses, dissatisfied with the policies of the suicide, Vargas, are searching for a new political expression.

In spite of a very favorable situation for his candidacy, Janio Quadros, governor of the state of San Paulo, and the most characteristic political figure of the new generation in Brazil, has decided to remain a governor and has withdrawn from the race for the presidency.

A POLITICAL DEAL

This happened as a result of a political deal between Quadros on the one hand, and President Cafe Filho and General Juarez Tavora on the other. According to them, Quadros backed out of his candidacy in favor of General Tavora in exchange for three federal ministries and the presidency of the Bank of Brazil "for San Paulo."

This means that Janio Quadros has followed the example of the biblical Esau, who sold his birthright for a dish of lentils. There was great disappointment among his adherents, and certainly among the masses who expected that his candidacy would be announced to the last moment. The PTB (Vargas party) offered its support to Quadros, and this, added to his own forces, made it probable that he could win the election. The political situation will never be as favorable for Quadros as it was this time. In spite of this, he backed out. Why?

Of course, his situation, caught between the capitalist-liberal camp and the populist movement, was very difficult. He could not run as a candidate of the right, for it did not trust him. He did not have the courage to become the candidate of the Getulist party (PTB—Labor Party of Brazil) against the right, and primarily against the army. For in Brazil, in a sharpened political fight, and in the face of political atomization, the army plays the role of an "arbiter," or to put it more accurately, of an official "state-over-party" of Brazilian capitalism.

A NEW POPULISM

The army finished off the Vargas dictatorship, as it became anachronistic and obsolete after the defeat of Hitler and Mussolini. The army also deposed Var-

gas from the presidency, won in a legal election, as popular discontent created the possibility of this deposition. The army regarded Quadros' candidacy askance, because he represented a new form of populism.

If Quadros wanted to win the presidency, he could do it only against the capitalist right and against the army. At this he quailed and backed out, thus revealing himself as a little provincial politician, incapable of taking the risk of defying the reactionary traditionalist camp in a political fight. He proved that he is not a great popular leader, not even in the petty-bourgeois sense, capable of fighting for his program, of leading the masses and challenging his adversaries.

QUADROS SOLD BIRTHRIGHT

Janio Quadros sold his political birthright in a "bargain" for three ministries. In an attempt to gain the confidence of the army, he promised to back the candidacy of General Juarez Tavora. But after this agreement, the general refused to carry out his side of the deal, and announced that he knew nothing of the "bargain" and had no intention of carrying it out.

After Quadros declared that Tavora was very well aware of the conditions of the "bargain," the proud general refused to continue his candidacy for the presidency, resigned as chief of president Cafe's military household, and "deprived the nation" of the "right" to elect him president.

KUBITSCHKEK vs. LINS

Thus, the bourgeois anti-Getulist camp remains without a representative leader capable of defeating the other candidate, Kubitschek. On the other side, the PTB has decided to back Kubitschek after Quadros' withdrawal. The rightist camp has nominated Eteveno Lins, ex-governor of Pernambuco to oppose Kubitschek, but he does not have the attractive power among the masses which Vargas used to have, and which Quadros could have now.

Thus, the candidate of the PSD, Kubitschek, backed by the Getulist PTB is most likely to win the election one year after Vargas' deposition, if the "democratic" camp proves incapable of opposing a popular candidate to him, or if the army does not organize a new coup d'etat.

Brazilian capitalism is sufficiently strong to weather this crisis. In Brazil, as in the United States, government policy is only the servant of business. It does not lead the nation, but is led by businessmen who are deciding the destiny of the country.

ISL FUND DRIVE Semi-final Report Fund Drive Reaches 90 per cent of Goal

By ALBERT GATES Fund Drive Director

This is in the nature of a semi-final report on the campaign, because all last minute returns have not yet come in at the time this is written.

The figures at this point show that the drive has reached \$9,087.65 or 90.4 per cent of the goal. Only \$963 needs yet to be raised to reach 100 per cent of our total quota and this sum is expected from several areas.

Thus, while we cannot say now that the drive has been completed, we are fairly certain that when all reports are collected we will be able to say exactly that. In any case, that has been our experience in recent drives.

The big surprise of the campaign has been Detroit which has topped the drive by more than doubling its quota. Detroit ended its drive with a whopping 232 per cent which pushed it ahead of St. Louis and all other areas.

But, as you can see from the box score, Chicago, which increased its own quota, is only \$33 from com-

pleting its goal of \$2000. New York, too, is doing fine and is now in a mopping up campaign.

The Bay Area has asked for an extension of time and it has been granted so that it can make the large quota for its section. As you can see, it is only 6 plus per cent away from its goal. The bad runners have been Newark, Seattle and Buffalo.

It has been a pretty tough campaign this year, and all things con-

sidered, we have a right to be proud of the ISL and its friends. In many respects, we have done better relatively than in other years. We feel that we have really made a good job of it that will help us along for another period.

The National Office of the ISL thanks all members, sympathizers and friends for their valiant efforts.

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE			
Branch	Quota	Paid	%
Total	\$10,050	\$9087.65	90.4
Detroit	200	465	232.5
St. Louis	25	56.25	221
Cleveland	150	180	120
Los Angeles	450	496	110
Streator	25	25	100
Oregon	50	50	100
Pittsburgh	125	125	100
Reading	50	50	100
Chicago	2,000	1967	98.3
Bay Area	500	469	93.8
N. Y. City	3,800	3464.40	91.1
Philadelphia	250	175	86
Nat'l Office	1,500	1190	79.3
Newark	400	255	63.7
Seattle	150	60	40
Akron	50	20	40
Buffalo	250	40	16
Indiana	75	0	0

A Basic Pamphlet—
SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY
by
Max Shachtman
Read it! 10 cents
Independent Socialist Press—
114 West 14 Street, New York City

ON THE JIM CROW FRONT

A Socialist Housing Program and The Spread of the Jim Crow Ghetto

By SCOTT ARDEN

Though for the most part this column is concerned primarily with "news items," occasionally we face the problem of reporting developments so far-reaching in their implications as to be worthy of special treatment. These are cases where questions of socialist theory and approach are directly involved.

A case at hand affords the opportunity to discuss such general conceptions concretely, in the context of a specific situation.

The situation in question has arisen in the Hyde Park area on Chicago's South Side. This community has been influenced by the presence of the University of Chicago. A sizable percentage of the area's residents are students, faculty members or administrative personnel of the university.

The University's presence has influenced the character of the neighborhood even more broadly; many families and individuals not directly connected with the University choose to live in the area because of the "intellectual oasis" it provides in the form of a community where cultural standards and interests are appreciably higher than in any other concentrated area in the city.

The composition of the neighborhood has traditionally, therefore, been predominantly "middle-class," with distinctive intellectual and liberal overtones.

For decades the community has been in flux class-wise (though only in recent years have Negroes been able to break through). A sizable section has remained high-rental luxury dwelling in nature, but many blocks have altered, through the years, and an increasingly working class character has been grafted onto a previously "middle-class" intellectual preserve.

The presence, however, of the University has made Hyde Park an exception to the normal pattern (i.e., as lower income groups move in, the upper income groups retreat toward the suburban areas) and the class composition of the neighborhood has altered in an "integrated" fashion, though not without some conflict—sporadic attacks on students by juvenile gangs, etc.

EXPANDING GHETTO

But this is history. The present factor is the proximity of Chicago's expanding Negro ghetto. Pushed by its rapidly growing population (the number of new arrivals from the South each month runs into four figures) and the already intolerable conditions that accompany overcrowding, the ghetto's expansion is both natural and necessary.

Building by building, block by block, resistance has broken down, rents have

doubled (Chicago has no rent control) and the ghetto has grown.

Hyde Park is now, therefore, specifically racially speaking a community in flux. Some sections are already all Negro, others are mixed and still others remain all white—depending, in almost every case on the section's proximity to the ghetto. The over-all tendency is definitely in the direction of the whole neighborhood becoming predominantly Negro in composition.

Nothing deters the area's landlords from doubling and even tripling the already high rents since Negroes have no choice but to pay them—even though this means "doubling up" (two families in a one family apartment) to meet the fantastically exorbitant rents. "Doubling," though unpleasant, is better than "tripling," which is not infrequently necessary in the heart of the ghetto.

Other landlords are cutting up (subdividing, legally and otherwise) larger dwelling units. Dividing a six-room apartment which previously rented for \$75 into two three-room apartments, each renting for \$75, is not uncommon.

HOW SLUMS GROW

This means that as more Negroes are forced to move into Hyde Park (one of the few areas outside of the "ghetto-proper" where they are allowed to live) the total population of the neighborhood will swell drastically and the community will tend to develop the characteristics common to overcrowded low income areas (slums), and will eventually become an undisputed part of the ghetto.

Attempts are being energetically pushed to "preserve" Hyde Park. Unlike similar movements in "unenlightened" communities, the groups in this case are for the most part composed of educated liberals who are not Jim Crow (they want the neighborhood to be interracial) but who want to halt the expansion of the ghetto because, if they do not, the neighborhood would then, by their standards, be unlivable for them.

To achieve this they have formed block committees whose main unifying aim is the enforcement of zoning ordinances and the blocking of illegal conversions. Many of these block committees are interracial, since it is not uncommon for the Negro who has managed to move out of the ghetto to vigorously resist the ghetto when it follows him.

Many Negroes, of course, also prefer to live in an interracial neighborhood, rather than in the ghetto. The attraction of the advantages (superior schools, better housing, less crowded, etc.) is irresistible.

The other method by which Hyde Park's liberals hope to "maintain the area's character" is the "slum prevention redevelopment project" of the South East Chicago Commission (SECC), composed primarily of the higher income bracket liberals and heavily backed by the University.

This project, financed by federal, city and private funds, will raze approximately 1,700 dwelling units, average rent \$60 to \$80 per month, and replace them with about 700 units which will rent in the vicinity of from \$90 to \$165 per month, with small houses for sale at about 18 to 20 thousand dollars.

SOCIALIST POSITION

Now the socialist position on this is clear. No matter how much attention the SECC will pay to "relocation" (and because of its liberal character it will un-

DISCUSSION ARTICLE

deniably pay more than is normal) many of the working class families now living in the area slated for "redevelopment" will have to move out of the neighborhood. These families, mostly white, will simply be unable to pay the rents (or sale prices) demanded for the "redeveloped" section.

The Negro families cannot leave the neighborhood without moving back to the "ghetto-proper" and this they will resist. As a result the "non-redeveloped" sections of Hyde Park will be put under even greater pressure. Competition for living space will force rents still higher and conversion and "doubling" will increase.

Thus Hyde Park's well-to-do liberals will acquire a choice "oasis" (near the lake front, university, parks and the better transportation lines) at the expense of Hyde Park's working class families, both Negro and white.

The fact that the well-heeled liberals assure us that well-heeled Negroes will not be discriminated against in the rentals and sales of these semi-luxury dwelling units does not alter the nature of the move.

BLOCK COMMITTEES

More thorny is the question of the block committees. They argue that their aims are in the interest of the Negroes. They just want to stop the conversion of the rest of Hyde Park into a racial slum. Are socialists, we are asked, in favor of ghettos? Their aim is an interracial community. Isn't this what socialists want? Won't this interracial community serve as an example to the "more backward" areas of the city, demonstrating that it is possible for Negroes to move in without the ghetto following them?

Because of this maze of confusion and rationalization the socialist position should be defined in the clearest possible way.

Socialists oppose the ghetto system, as well as the social system that fattens on it. But the problem of the ghetto, which is a problem common to most industrial cities in the U. S., can be resolved only in the context of a struggle for an overall solution to the housing problem.

Until serious, large-scale measures to solve that problem have been put into effect, any attempt to resist the expansion of the ghetto (if successful) can only result in an intensification of the misery of the majority of the city's Negro population, and is thus unsupportable.

MORE HOUSING

Our answer to the housing question is clear. Strict rent control and a real program of low cost public housing, open to all on the basis of need alone. *This is the struggle the block committees should be engaged in.*

When Negroes can live wherever they wish and pay reasonable rents for decent places, then the framework for the death of the ghetto will have been laid. Problems will remain but the pressures will be against the perpetuation of the ghetto. But this simply cannot be until a massive attack has been made on the housing problem as such. A major section of the city's population, the lower income group, Negro and white, is badly housed, crowded, and rent-gouged. Though the Negroes are hardest pressed in this area, as in most others, their special problem (that of the ghetto) cannot be dealt with without instituting a program that will affect the housing conditions of the city's lower income group as a whole.

Though most of the members of the block committees are probably also for rent control and public housing, these are not the things they are fighting for. And however well-meaning and liberal-minded they may be as individuals, the present emphasis of their struggle is one that socialists can in no way support. Enforcing zoning ordinances against illegal conversions without first providing a solution to the real problems the ghetto poses can

only have the effect of propping up the wall around the ghetto.

NO EXCEPTION

Fortunately, the block committees will eventually be forced to the realization that their neighborhood cannot be an exception and that as long as the ghetto exists it will continue to expand. When they reach that level of understanding they will either run (move out of Hyde Park—if they cannot afford the "oasis" rents), or stay and fight the real battle that must be fought.

The role of socialists in Hyde Park is to press them toward this understanding and toward the latter course—while at the same time explicitly refusing to in any way support their present misdirected efforts.

Because of their direct community-level nature and their social composition, and because even now their stated enemies are the real estate interests, the block committees have the potential of playing a socially meaningful and progressive role. But only if they address themselves to the problems that actually exist.

A New Edition of L. Trotsky's Works

Readers will be interested in a project, being pushed ahead in France, to issue a French-language edition of the complete works of Leon Trotsky for 1928-40. A series of volumes will collect all of his articles in periodicals, pamphlets, etc., to the exclusion only of seven major works already in print in French.

The publishers announce that the project is being conducted under the patronage of a group of well-known literary and political figures: Claude Bourdet, Jean Cassou, Maurice Dommanget, Daniel Guerin, Jean Maillot, Maurice Nadeau, and Alfred Rosmer. The work has also been given a hearty greeting by Natalia Trotsky.

The period to be covered begins with Trotsky's exile from Russia, and extends to his death. The seven works which will not be included are: *Lenin, The Third International After Lenin, The Permanent Revolution, The Revolution Betrayed, My Life, History of the Russian Revolution, and Les Crimes de Staline* (the last-named not in English in this form).

The first volume, now in preparation, will cover the period to the beginning of 1933, i.e., up to Hitler's seizure of power. This is the period of the First Five Year Plan, agricultural collectivization, consolidation of Stalin's power in Russia; of the rise of fascism in Germany; of the beginning of the Spanish revolution; of the work of the Left Opposition in the international field. However, because of its complete scope, also included are Trotsky's brilliant articles on such subjects as art, literature and pen portraits of prominent figures.

Announced as among the contents of the first volume are the following articles, hitherto available (or rather, inaccessible) only in back files of periodicals in various languages:

CONTENTS

How It Happened (six articles written after expulsion from Russia). *Letter to the Soviet Workers. A Lesson in Democracy That I Did Not Receive. Radek and the Opposition. The Sino-Russian Conflict and the Opposition. Letter to the Editor of "Vérité." Disarmament and the United States of Europe. Defense of the USSR and the Left Opposition. For the 12th Anniversary of October. What Is Happening in China? The Third Period of Mistakes of the CI. Maiakovsky's Suicide. The Five Year Plan and World Unemployment. Pure and Crystal-Clear. Stalin as Theoretician. The Turn in the CI and the Situation in Germany. Lessons of the Saboteurs' Trial. Ten Commandments of the Spanish Communist. The Case of Riazanov. The Spanish Revolution and the Tasks of the Communists. A French Novel on the Chinese Revolution. The Problem of Trade-Union Unity. Another Slander Against Riazanov. Hands Off Rosa Luxemburg. Lessons of the Red Plebiscite. The New Zigzag and the New Dangers. The British Elections. On the Disarmament Conference. Hitler's Victory Would Mean War Against the USSR. Letter to a German Communist Worker. About the Expulsion of Zinoviev and Kamenev. What is the October Revolution? Open Letter to Vandervelde. Max Eastman and Marxism. Lunacharsky.*—And many others, including a number of titles well known because they have appeared in English as pamphlets, not listed above.

The first volume is at present promised for about June.



LABOR ACTION

May 16, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 20

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

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Calif. Student Conference a Success New State-Wide Civil Liberties Organization to be Formed

By JACK WALKER

LOS ANGELES, May 2—About 115 students from northern and southern California colleges, plus representatives of southern high schools, attended a successful Statewide Student Civil Liberties Conference in Los Angeles on April 23-24, at the Mt. Hollywood Congregational Church. Students came from the University of California at Berkeley, UCLA, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Los Angeles City College, Pomona, Whittier, Occidental, Los Angeles High, San Diego State, Santa Monica City College, and Westridge High, making the base for continued civil liberties work among students much broader in California than it had been in the recent past.

The conference established its main ends by selecting a statewide Continuations Committee (northern and southern branches), adopting an excellent statement of principles, accepting a program, and determining a structure for a proposed statewide organization. In addition to these necessary goals the conference had the bonus of excellent audio-visual coverage of its sessions by the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic, which will soon release these for TV and private showings. This record can demonstrate to newly interested students some of the means whereby civil liberties can be advanced in their own areas.

The conference opened on Saturday, April 23, with a series of panels and discussion groups, and it continued Sunday afternoon with specific proposals and implementations for post-conference activity. Some of Saturday's activities were: an opening address on "The Campus Scene," by Martin McReynolds, former UCLA Bruin editor and current member of *The Observer's* editorial board. His speech comprised a penetrating review of past defeats and present activity, neither so broad that it became meaningless nor so narrow as to lose sight of the general picture. Next there was a symposium with Hallock Hoffman (Ford Foundation), Fred Okrand (a lawyer), and Dave McReynolds (Socialist Party-Fellowship of Reconciliation).

The speakers gave presentations on Anti-Civil Liberties Legislation, the Bill of Rights, and the Suppression of Student Liberties. All speakers pressed for greater resistance by students both on the campus and in the community, with the most general directive of all being to "Speak Up and Fight!" They upheld the rights of Stalinists, in particular, as being the acid test in the battle against the suppression of civil liberties. In this regard, the totalitarian quality of the Communist Party does not exclude its members from civil liberties open to others. The meaning of the Fifth Amendment—which was held subordinate to the First—was clarified as "Prove it!" The question period brought out the pernicious effect of unwarrantedly singling out non-sensitive government employees for special political screening, as opposed to a narrower use of political tests where political beliefs are an actual qualification for the job . . . i.e., top State Department officials.

After lunch, the conference reconvened for two sets of discussion groups separated by another panel. The first or theoretical set of discussion groups comprised: "Civil Liberties in the Social Process," "The University in a Free Society," "Civil Liberties and War," and "Mass Communications and Civil Liberties." The second series of discussion groups were labelled "Action Committees" and considered proposals for action in the following areas: "Large State Schools," "Small Colleges," "Democratic Processes" (a discussion of democratic means to strengthen civil liberties), and "Continuations." The intervening panel centered on "How to Undertake Responsible, Constructive Action in the College Community."

The experiences, problems and thoughts of the various participants were brought together in these various

meetings and there was a conscious attempt made to pool information and generalize from individual lessons. If no clear-cut snap solutions emerged from these brief sessions, certainly major lines of action and some theoretical clarification did emerge, and in today's atmosphere such exchanges are mandatory to stiffen the spine of any widespread movement in resisting encroachments on civil liberties.

Attendance at the first day's sessions covered all shades of the political spectrum with conservatives (one believed to be Dean Hahn's representative from UCLA), reactionaries (one member of Students for America), Stalinists (Labor Youth League members), liberals, pacifists and socialists all present. And each tendency met the general reception that could have been predicted at a conference with a principled civil-libertarian majority. The conservative's question on the problems of "freedom versus security" was answered by denying their contradictory character. The SFAers' question on why ROTC oaths should be opposed was answered with the fact that they intimidated students.

The Stalinists' contention that the international situation was only a bogey devised to mask the anti-civil-libertarian drive in the U. S. today, was answered with the fact that Russia was an aggressive totalitarian power, although recognition of this fact did not preclude a continuous fight for civil liberties at home. The liberals, socialists and pacifists agreed that civil liberties for all dissenters must be their watchword, but that it was not necessary to gloss over the aims of those who demand civil liberties only for themselves—i.e., pretend that they are all democrats—in order to fight for the liberties of everyone.

STALINISTS PRESENT

It had become apparent to the conference on the first day that a LYL core was present in mild force at the conference; this was seen in the various panel discussions. It was also determined that they were a distinct minority, possibly fifteen, who might take individuals with them on issues but who lacked the size to dominate the conference as a whole. This restricted participation of Stalinists vindicated the February Planning Session's belief that a fairly large conference turnout would limit Stalinist influence. It had also been recognized that the current "popular front" line which the Stalinists follow would tend to preclude their smashing all organizations which successfully stood in competition to them.

In order to forestall an expected move by the Stalinists on the second day, which would be devoted to the organizational consequences of this conference, two caucus meetings were held among the anti-Stalinists at which various proposals and partial slate recommendations were drawn up and discussed, so that a minimum agreement might be reached should the LYL attempt to take over the conference by packing the Sunday meeting. One additional important precaution was to agree on limiting the right of voting to

those conference participants who had attended the first day's sessions, since these were the only people who had participated in the conference's deliberations and could intelligently vote without simply following a "line."

At 2 p.m. on Sunday the conference reconvened and began its agenda by approving the idea of a continuations committee being constituted by this conference. In an atmosphere of slight confusion, a program and statement of principles were deferred in favor of a discussion on the structure of any conference-based group. It soon became apparent that alongside of a genuine concern for resolving this question in the limited time allowed to Sunday's meeting—a concern which expressed itself in various amendments and questions—there was also a campaign of stalling and obstructionism coming from locally known LYLers. It was not certain just what the latter's aims were; whether to destroy the effect of the conference or to attempt to take it over when most people became tired and went home. In any event, these people counseled others to prolong and rephrase their questions, while they put forward seemingly legitimate questions of their own, the effect of which was to prove by 4:30 p.m. that the remaining three-quarters of the first point, plus the remaining three major points were not likely to be concluded by 6 p.m. when the meeting had to adjourn.

LEGITIMATE CHAOS

On the surface everything was legitimate, although chaotic. This seeming blandness is part of the current professionally cultivated attitude that the LYL has managed to instill in its leaders. (We call it the "Gee Whiz Approach," in which you keep waiting for the other political shoe to drop when you talk with a known LYLer, and where he criticizes

the socialists and pacifists from the right.)

However, during a ten-minute recess requested at this time, liberals, socialists and pacifists met on the sidewalk in a hasty caucus and after agreeing on what was taking place, they decided to limit their own discussion in order to get on with the conference. A motion to limit debate on amendments was agreed upon and floor leaders were selected to call for a vote on questions where they felt discussion was overly prolonged. Although this decision was reached in an open manner, with outsiders listening to the caucus, and with a speech being made on the conference floor which described the situation quite specifically, it was, of course, a weakening of the conference's aim of permitting the broadest discussion, but it was necessary to assure its usefulness and survival.

In the reconvened meeting, the four essential points were covered with several valid amendments being adopted, including those proposed by persons outside of the LYL core. The Stalinists then decided to behave themselves when a determined opposition to their spotlighted activity was made.

ACLU RELATIONS

The "Student Assembly for Civil Liberties" (SACL), as the conference later named itself (and not for "Civil Rights" as the Peoples World reporter "erroneously" put it), declared itself to be at the moment composed of individuals. However, it looked forward to a similar conference next Spring where affiliated groups based on some relationship to the American Civil Liberties Union (such as the Student Civil Liberties Union at Berkeley) could then send delegates, as prescribed by the Continuations Committee. Naturally the presumption of such

(Continued on page 6)

YSL FUND DRIVE

The Fund Drive Must Speed Up!

By MAX MARTIN

The 1955 Fund Drive of the Young Socialist League is one week past its midpoint at the time this is being written, and the slowdown of payments we reported two weeks ago has continued. A total of \$128 has come in since then; the figure should have been upwards of \$230 for the drive to be on schedule. Unless this trend is drastically reversed during the next few weeks, the success of the drive will be in danger.

To date we have collected \$782.50 or 48.9 per cent of our \$1600 goal. To be on schedule, we should have had over \$920 or 57 per cent. Only "At Large" and National Office, Los Angeles, and Chicago, have been keeping up the necessary pace. All other YSL units are behind.

Our friends "at large" have been contributing quite generously; their efforts enabled this category to surpass Los Angeles and ensconce itself in first place for the only change in position since the last report. Chicago came through with a contribution and maintains its hold on third place. New York, which is fourth, lags behind the 50

per cent mark and is holding up the drive as a whole. Pittsburgh and Berkeley, who made their initial payments during the first two weeks, have not been heard from again. And Seattle has not yet responded at all.

The next few weeks will be decisive for the drive. The units which have been doing well must keep up their records and those which are behind have to make a real spurt. We trust that the laggards will have a considerable improvement in their positions two weeks from now.

Challenge readers and friends of the YSL are urged to pitch in. Make your checks and money orders payable to Max Martin and send them to YSL, 3rd Floor, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

WHAT'S THE SCORE?

	Quota	Paid	%
TOTAL	\$1600	\$782.50	48.9
At Large & N.O.	150	119	79.3
Los Angeles	100	69	69.0
Chicago	400	238	59.5
New York	700	318	45.4
Cleveland Area	50	16.50	33.3
Pittsburgh	75	10	13.3
Berkeley	100	12	12.0
Seattle	25	0	0.0

WHAT'S YOUR LINE?

(The following article by Martin McReynolds, former editor of the UCLA Daily Bruin and currently of the Editorial Board of the Observer, an off-campus student newspaper published by UCLA students, is taken from the March 23, 1955 issue of the Observer, and represents the personal views of Mr. McReynolds. Readers of Challenge will find it of interest, for it sums up so adequately, the drift towards conformity with the American Party Line on the part of students.—Editor.)

By MARTIN McREYNOLDS

"... Particularly in view of the recent changes in the Soviet Union, which quite easily may result in changes in the Communist Party Line and many of the supporters of this issue may find themselves on the other side of the fence."

—Appointed Rep. Charlie Decker (Daily Bruin, Feb. 21, 1955)

When Charlie Decker wrote the above warning, he may not have realized how funny it would seem in the light of subsequent events.

At the time, little more than a month ago, Decker was explaining why students should vote against an initiative asking the administration to invite a group of Russian editors to visit UCLA.

He was intimating that the supporters of the proposal were inspired not by their own reasoning, but by a "line" which originated in Moscow.

Now, the U. S. State Department has granted visas to the Russians in question, and most of our Student Legislative Council members have scrambled to get on the right side of the fence.

It wasn't hard for some of them, who were sitting on it, anyway.

Students are wondering what difference there is—in terms of being able to reason independently—between following the line of the Cominform and that of the U. S. State Department.

STATE DEPARTMENT SANCTION

Of course, the circumstances have been altered greatly. State Department sanction is an important factor in the situation.

But I am interested in our student leaders' thinking processes. Decker's February 21 article took 15½ column inches to give his reasons for a no vote. It didn't mention State Department disapproval as a reason.

ASUCLA President Skip Byrne took 22½ inches in the DB last December 1 to expound his views on the subject. Byrne didn't mention the State Department at that time, although he had room to say the following:

"This 'goodwill' gesture is being proposed by a country that . . . is opposed to anything that differs from its own belief and is dedicated to the overthrow of other governments.

"Similar 'visits' by Russian editors in other countries have shown the hollowness of their declarations for 'peace' and 'understanding,' that they are agents of their government and not sincere students, and that they have not truly represented the countries they visited to fellow Russians upon their return home."

Lately, however, we've been hearing that "the general feeling of SLC is that it would be very educational to have the Russian students visit if permission can be obtained from the University" (Byrne—DB, March 16).

Are these the same Russian editors? From that same Russian country (Russia)?

Could it be that our student leaders are much more adept at being followers? Is this really the Silent Generation which wants to do whatever is practical, safe and approved by all authorities?

Will our student "leaders" go on waiting to hear the State Department's edicts in order to find out what their reasoning is?

As I was saying, students are wondering. . . .

A Major Victory for Civil Liberties on the Campus Govt. Withdraws ROTC Loyalty Oath

We reproduce below in full a press release from the American Civil Liberties Union dated May 9. From the release it appears that a real victory has been won in the fight against the "subversive" list-based loyalty oath which has been required from lower-division ROTC enrollees.

At the moment there is no information on the manner or extent to which the Defense Department's new policy has actually been implemented on college campuses. Such information will be carried in Challenge as it is received from the field. (For the background on this issue and the struggle around it, see Challenge for September 27; October 4, 11, 25; Nov. 1 and 29, all in 1954.)

The government's retreat on the ROTC loyalty oath underlines the old truism that it pays to fight. Congratulations to all defenders of civil liberties and academic freedom who raised their voices on this issue! Congratulations, above all, to those courageous students who gave real substance to the issue by refusing to sign the oath, despite pressure, intimidation and risk to their future careers!

A major victory in the campaign against government-imposed loyalty oaths was reported last week by the American Civil Liberties Union.

The Union released a letter from the Department of Defense stating that the department had rescinded an oath for college students enrolled in basic training courses of the Reserve Officers Training Corps. The oath required the ROTC enrollee to certify that he is not a member of any organization listed by the attorney general as "subversive," that he did not attend any meeting or social activity sponsored by these organizations, or distribute the groups' literature, or give them any other form of aid.

The Union protested the oath in a letter to Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson on March 25, asserting that under the regulations a student listing the proscribed associations could not be formally enrolled in the ROTC program but could only participate on an informal basis, without being permitted to march in uniform or to borrow the necessary textbooks and drill equipment.

Pointing out that in many states universities and colleges which receive federal land grants must require students to take the basic two-year ROTC course, the ACLU letter had stated that the loyalty oath forces the student "to choose his associations, the speakers he wishes to listen to, the literature he wishes to distribute, at the penalty of being expelled from the university if his choices do not meet with the approval of the Defense Department." The oath presented a danger both to education and to democracy, the ACLU had said, by giving the government control of "education and ideas and associations without that control having any reasonable relationship to national security."

DEFENSE DEPT. REPLY

The Defense Department's reply, made public by ACLU executive director Patrick Murphy Malin, came from Rear Admiral J. M. Will, director of personnel policy, on April 5. Admiral Will wrote that the department had just completed a "thorough re-evaluation of our policies" on the loyalty oath subject, "and have concluded that we could greatly improve our method of administering the

law by adopting a positive loyalty oath for basic students in lieu of the present certificate. We have issued instructions to the military departments to implement these findings." In its March 25 letter, the ACLU had stated that the purpose of Public Law 458, which covers candidates for ROTC training, could be met by a simple affirmative oath.

The new oath for basic ROTC students reads as follows: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; so help me God."

Admiral Will stated that the original oath, embracing organizational membership and association, would be continued for the advanced ROTC students "of the Army and Air Force and to Naval ROTC students, as candidates for commissions in the Armed Forces."

In a letter sent to Admiral Will expressing the Union's gratitude for the elimination of the broad oath for the basic ROTC students, Malin said:

"The retention of form DD98, which is the basic loyalty oath required for all members of the Armed Forces, as applied to the advanced ROTC students, is now under study by our organization, in line with its review of general problems affecting civil liberties growing out of the Armed Forces security program."

Calif. Conference — —

(Continued from page 5)

statewide affiliated organizations rested upon the Northern and Southern California ACLU's decision to support such groups, provided that they remain free of partisan stripe (Democrat, Socialist, or Pacifist—let alone Stalinist). The ACLU, it is hoped, will be in close liaison with the present Continuations Committee, and will lend its community prestige to help sustain the new SCLU's, providing that they in fact adhere to ACLU's program. In this connection, it was held by most conference participants, ACLU restrictions—such as those forbidding co-sponsoring of meetings with outside groups—were well worth the important support of the ACLU if any student groups were to survive in this field at present. In addition, of course, the actual ACLU program was upheld by most participants at the conference.

An excellent Statement of Principles was adopted which took a comprehensive and militant position on civil liberties, and at the same time disassociated SACL's efforts from cooperation with Stalinist, Fascist or other totalitarian organizations, whose rights it would defend. Aimed specifically and avowedly against the LYL, it stirred a reply from an official LYL spokesman present, and led to a brief discussion on the role of the LYL in the civil liberties field. Unfortunately this interesting and heated discussion had to be very short, because, as the LYLers were told, of their disruptive activities in the early afternoon. It is hoped that a public debate may be held on this vital issue in the near future and on a platform near UCLA. The vote carrying this measure (anti-Stalinist plank) passed substantially (31-18, at this late hour), although several pacifists and persons formerly close to the LYL opposed the majority, despite their agreement on the anti-civil-libertarian character of the LYL and its Stalinist politics.

The major part of the program resolution affirmed the need of the Continuations Committee (whose authority is largely "moral" at this time) to "help mobilize students to defend and extend their areas of civil liberties both on the various campuses and in the community as a whole." Some of its suggested activities are: formation of local campus civil liberties groups, encouragement to students' interest organizations (discussion and action organizations which enable students to participate in running their own affairs and thereby finding out what civil liberties they have); enacting an educational program; coordinating campaigns on vital issues like the proposed extension of Rule #17 at UCLA and the ROTC loyalty oath; calling regional and statewide conferences and workshops where useful; publishing a newsletter; investigating the feasibility of putting out a magazine; and selling an immediate pamphlet reporting and evaluating this conference, with a list of its sponsors attached. Along with all these specific measures there was a general spirit of desiring to publicize this conference further and encourage students in other areas to assemble in conferences and organizations to meet some of the problems of civil liberties today.

CONTINUATIONS

The Continuations Committee formed consisted of eighteen persons, and left room for co-opting seven additional persons as new schools become represented (i.e., in northern California in particular). Three members were elected from U.C. and UCLA (the large state schools

and natural "centers"), six members were selected to represent the smaller colleges and high schools (the latter equally considered with colleges), and two of five allotted "members at large" (no more than one per college) were elected to strengthen the larger campuses. Beyond the co-option of more members, plus replacements for resignations (should both of these be required in time), new elections will be held at the next conference. In discussion outside of the conference it was felt that an active student organization could best preserve a representative leadership by meeting in an annual convention, as opposed to ballot referenda where a face-to-face meeting—and possibly defeat, should that occur—would be precluded, and the vitality of the conference itself undermined.

Other aspects of the conference worthy of note included a dispute over presence of a literature table, with the California SP-YPSL accepting the majority decision of the Steering Committee to allow an "unrestricted" table containing specifically civil-liberties literature and implying no support of such literature by the Conference. (There was also a conference exhibit of literature.) Thus the conference issue of Challenge, Cold War on the Campus, and Anvil were displayed along with various other groups' literature such as FOR, SP, Quakers, ACLU, Nation, etc. There was also a momentary dispute over the presence of the LYL monthly's "Youth Recorder" reporter and photographer, but the conference upheld the right of any newspaper's presence with only one dissenting vote.

IMPORTANT LESSON

Perhaps a final note should also refer to the possible alienation of a few people at the conference because of the necessary bloc-voting. Although the greatest percent of new people at the conference aligned themselves with the formation of the majority bloc—and thereby learned an important lesson in dealing with Stalinist infiltration—there were a few people who questioned the seemingly arbitrary or "bureaucratic" behavior that was necessitated. Where possible such people were later, and even during the conference, advised of the issues involved, and it is hoped that remaining reservations they may hold will be settled by the future of the committee. (There was even one fear that the "principles" might be revised by the committee that had fought for them). In any event it was necessary for the worth of the conference, and even the potential success of its continuations activity, that Stalinist domination be avoided.

Now, in the post conference "glow," California students are faced with the problems of building a statewide youth movement for civil liberties in the various localities. There is already a special UCLA committee for SACL, and it hopes to form a Student Civil Liberties Union-type organization at UCLA. Likewise in the pooled efforts of the Los Angeles Area smaller colleges such as LACC, etc. Flying committees will have to be formed to speak throughout the state, and coordinating conferences must be held. In the little time remaining this semester and the depleted summer sessions, a beginning must be made. In the Fall semester the problems of organization will meet their real test, with the continued vitality of SACL at stake. In view of the earnestness of the participants and the overwhelming needs of the times, there is no reason why this enterprise should fail!

LOS ANGELES YSL CLASS:

"THE 1905
RUSSIAN REVOLUTION"

FRIDAY, MAY 27th, 8:30 P.M.

YSL Headquarters

Room 9, 8939½ Santa Monica Blvd.

BOOKS AND IDEAS

Ruark's "Something of Value"

A Slick, Racist Job of Lying About Kenya

By PRISCILLA CADY

Robert Ruark, golden boy columnist of the Scripps-Howard chain, has written a book eminently worthy of that strong, silent type who fled from New York, crowded city of perverts and degenerates (according to him), to live in peace in Spain. It is a book worthy of the man who, not long ago, advocated the death penalty for rape. It is an atrocious book.

Something of Value, an outsize novel which takes place partly in Kenya and partly in Ruark's not particularly pretty fantasy life, has received a curious set of reviews. From the *Lady's Home Journal* ("It is a terrific book. It is violent, gory, brutal. But it tells the truth about Africa so that you can never forget it. It seizes you and hurls you out of your complacent safety") to *Time* magazine, with its scathing denunciation of the hero's snarled desire to get the head of his Mau Mau opponent and erstwhile boyhood companion as a trophy to hang over his fireplace, almost everyone feels impelled to mention the extraordinarily bloodthirsty taste of its author, either in apology or in disgust.

The *New York Post* reviewer criticized him for overdoing the effect, saying that to a reader in his quiet room, one pistol shot sounds louder than two hundred. Orville Prescott, in a week-day edition of the *New York Times*, expressed his loathing for what he considers this pandering to people's more perverse interests, as low an act as the writing of the worst crime and horror comics. John Barkham, whose review hit the front page of the *Sunday Times Book Review Supplement*, was less sensitive to this aspect, but could not ignore it, saying: "Inevitably, there will be much debate as to whether Mr. Ruark has not carried his realism too far." The review in the *Reporter* concluded, "... what raises your hackles ... is the licentious violence and the obvious relish with which the author unearths and lays bare nature's obscene rites and sacrifices and those of man ... the image of the blood bath has in itself enough impact for most of us today. Mr. Ruark has plunged his hands in it, and all the perfumes of Arabia could never sweeten them for this reader again." What is of parenthetical interest here is the open secret in the publishing trade that the original manuscript was far worse, and the editors of Doubleday had quite a time doing a bowl-derizing job.

With the possible exception of the *Time* reviewer, who implies the distorted view Ruark gives of the struggle between the Mau Mau and the settlers, and the definite exception of the *New Leader's* reviewer, who attacks the content of the book, *Something of Value* is accepted documentarily on its own grounds. Orville Prescott characterized it as objective, the *New York Post* considers it thoughtful and rewarding, with its author being fair to both black and white. Virgilia Peterson, in the *Reporter*, says: "It should go without saying that the rest of the world must know and understand the terror that came to every Kenya farm when the Mau Mau moved against the British; the inefficacy (!) of the Home Office in countering that terror; the psychology of the blacks, whose fancied and real grievances made them rise; the psychology of the whites who torture in self defense. It is fitting for a writer to work upon these facts." She also stumbles into the trap that Ruark set for liberals by his title, taken from a Bantu proverb that says, in effect, that when one set of values is done away, it is necessary that there be something else of value to take its place, and writes about: "... Mr. Ruark's veiled message, which if rightly understood, implies that something of value belonging to the African blacks has been destroyed by the African whites." John Barkham calls the book "an account of a nightmare that suddenly engulfed a land of casual charm" and adds, "It has been said that on many African questions the interest of Americans exceeds their knowledge. No such charge can be brought against Robert Ruark."

HARMLESS PECADILLO

No one, by the way, mentions Ruark's current love of and residence in Spain, which is apparently considered as harmless a peccadillo as a taste for Paris in the springtime.

This attitude of acceptance and naiveté toward the book's *raison d'être* (Ruark says in his preface "this is not a political book," meaning, perhaps, that it is not about a party election) could only have been taken by people who have no knowledge of the subject themselves, except for the neatly turned out news dispatches that are printed in our willing "anti-colonial"

press (which persists in depicting the whole civil war in Kenya as a savage uprising of primitive barbarians) and who are not concerned at reading a racist point of view. For Ruark does as fancy and slick a job as any racist could want in distorting, misrepresenting, and lying about the facts of Kenya.

Two interesting examples can be noted of Ruark's "objectivity" and "knowledge" (he did his research on the scene and in the library, according to the *Post* reviewer, who could profitably spend some time there himself). The author describes in his own piquant fashion no less than eighteen assassinations of whites before the emergency, declared in October of 1952. According to news stories in both the *Times* and the *Post*, four whites were killed before that date. He then goes on to exaggerate the numbers of assassinations afterwards proportionately. The second example occurs in Ruark's tortured and crude representation of the Mau Mau in general and of Jomo Kenyatta in particular as knowing allies and/or agents of Russia. Apparently feeling the necessity for throwing in everything at hand (although why he didn't mention the verifiable fact that Kenyatta once shared an apartment with Paul Robeson in London is not clear—maybe he didn't know about it) Ruark refers to "that Russian" who wrote the introduction to *Facing Mount Kenya* by Kenyatta. "That Russian" is Malinovsky, world-famous anthropologist, now at the University of London, who wrote in his preface: "A great deal will depend upon whether they [the educated minority of Africans] will be made to keep a balanced and moderate view of economic, social and political issues, or whether by ignoring them and treating them with contempt, we drive them into the open arms of world-wide Bolshevism."

Ruark, through the mouths of his "good guys," the settlers, who are as unappetizing a lot of narrow-minded, low-principled, hard-drinking egocentrics as one can find, expresses such ideas as "the natives have only been down out of the trees for fifty years" (this being the approximate length of time since the British seized land in Kenya and, presumably, started their altruistic pulling-down-from-the-trees operations); and "you have to hit a Wog to keep him in his place. ('Wog,' the epithet considered the most degrading of all by the Africans and Indians to whom it refers, is used consistently by Ruark throughout the book—through the mouths of his white characters).

LOYAL DOGS

He describes two kinds of Kikuyu: the agricultural workers and the Kenyattas, the former being ignorant, superstitious and cruel, although capable of desisting and receiving a white man's affection if he behaves himself, "like a loyal hunting dog," and the latter being those just down from trees with heads stuffed full of ideas they don't know what to do with. (Thus can Ruark carelessly describe his intellectual and moral superiors.)

Here is the meaning of the title of the book and the use of the Bantu proverb—the author's attitude is not one of sympathy for the Africans and their struggles but one of sympathy for the reactionary idea that it is going to take centuries to civilize these erstwhile tree-dwellers, and the British gave them too much too soon. Consequently, according to the settler gospel as set down by Ruark, they went berserk. Not only does he describe the civil war as a Russian plot but as a conspiracy among criminals. Actually, we can say from the incomplete evidence available on the subject, that the Mau Mau was a carefully conceived and executed last-ditch fight on issues that the Kenya African Union hoped to solve parliamentarily: land, political representation, etc.,

it has proved remarkably successful in one objective, that of discouraging new settlers from coming to Kenya, and after two and a half years of fighting at a cost to the British of a million pounds a week, may yet prove successful in the main objective—national independence.

There has recently been another book published on Kenya, which is not going to get selected by the Book-of-the-Month Club or bring in fantastic sums of money for its author. It is a little book, unprecedented by ballyhoo and whoopla, and unwelcomed by a review in every organ. It is called *The People of Kenya Speak for Themselves*, written by Mbiyu Koinange (Kenya Publication Fund, 25¢, 115 pp.) and it presents a great deal of interesting evidence, including source material, on the actual state of affairs that existed in Kenya before the emergency.

Koinange discusses the impossibility then of gaining any "civilized" advantages from the government, and the consequent birth and development of co-ops, banking system, school system, and Teachers College, run by Africans, for Africans. KAU, the political organization, and the large and effective labor movement in Kenya are also discussed. All of these pertinent and vital facts about the peoples of Kenya Ruark consistently ignores, distorts or belittles in *Something of Value*, which by the way,

we are soon to have the pleasure of beholding in gorgeous, super-colossal technicolor and probably cinemascreen to boot. We can't wait to see how the Kikuyu people will be depicted by Hollywood—dancing around a missionary in an enormous cooking pot, no doubt.

FAVORITE FANTASY

We have a favorite fantasy these days; we see ourselves creeping into that bastion of culture, Doubleday, some night with armloads of Koinange's book and slip-sheeting copies of it (it is only a very little book) into *Something of Value* (a very big book). It is problematical if even that would do any good, however, even for Mr. Orville Prescott and his colleagues in the *Post* and the *Reporter*, whose aesthetic sensibilities were so much aroused by the undoubted sadism and horror so gleefully depicted by Ruark.

But Ruark, who is possessed of quite a bit of low cunning, can laugh at them well, for he has won. What matters in this book is not the shades of the Marquis de Sade, but the shades of Franco, Hitler, Gerald L. K. Smith and Governor Byrd. The hullabaloo about the horror will get the book well read, and Ruark's "objective" representation of the situation will be imbibed freely. Ruark's sins against truth are far more heinous than his sins against common decency. And our liberals fell for it.

BOLIVIA

Paz Regime in Blind Alley; Rightist Offensive Grows

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO—The recent arrests in La Paz, Bolivia, reveal a new, acute crisis in the regime of President Paz Estenssoro. The conspiracy against the government is alleged to have been organized by two different groups: one by the rightist opposition, and the other by the totalitarian (Francoist) Falange Socialists Boliviana.

But the new crisis has more profound reasons. The economic situation in the country has deteriorated sharply, so that the dollar exchange-rate has reached 4000 pesos. The nationalized mines are working at a deficit because of the fall of tin prices. The government is covering this deficit by printing pesos, and inflation is running rampant through the country.

WORKERS PAYING COST

According to Central Obrera Boliviana (Bolivian Trade Union Federation) figures the cost of living has risen by 520 per cent between 1952 and 1954. Wages, however, have gone up by only 120 per cent during the same period. It is clear that the workers of Bolivia are paying the cost of nationalizing the mines, as well as of the inflation and the enrichment of the new nationalist bourgeoisie.

The workers have demanded wage increases to meet the new price levels, and under their pressure the COB demanded a 100 per cent increase in wages. But the government decree provided for only a 50 per cent rise. The discontent of the workers is so great that they declared strikes in some mines, and only the intervention of Minister of Mines Torres, supported by President Paz, who threatened to resign, induced the workers to go back to work.

The situation is so difficult that Juan Lechin, now no longer a minister, and "only" the general secretary of the COB, has presented his resignation as a protest against the government's decree and as proof of his own solidarity with the workers' demands.

The truth is that the workers are very discontented, and the government as well as the COB is having great difficulty in containing their dissatisfaction. But it is also true that the workers continue to support the COB and the government, despite their discontent, as demonstrated by the fact that they yielded to the pressure applied by President Paz and Juan Lechin and called off their strikes.

A political struggle is sharpening up in the government party. The right wing is dissatisfied with the present situation, and asserts that the country is no longer

governed by the MNR, but only by the "new association of thieves and hangers-on." (The latter term refers to the collaboration of the ex-Stalinists in the government, who are considered responsible for Villaroel's death). This slogan of the nationalist opposition to Paz is backed by the Falange Socialists as well as by the old rightist opposition.

RIGHT WING COMBATIVE

On the other hand, the Stalinists and the "Trotskyist" POR are also "conspiring" to strengthen their positions in the hope that they may win the succession in the event Paz falls from power. Of course, they are backing the regime against the rightist offensive. According to my information, Lechin's role is to back the government by canalizing the discontent of the workers with futile gestures. He does not hope to come to power against Paz, but only in agreement with the MNR and Paz, as the last reserve of nationalism. The right wing of the nationalist party, dissatisfied with the strength of the workers' movement, is more active, more combative, and more determined to come to power, expressing in this way the reactionary tendency of the pro-capitalist restoration.

This time, the Paz regime was saved by the new arrests and repressions. But it is difficult to say for how long. It cannot be saved in the long run if the economic situation in the country does not improve, if the nationalized mines cannot work profitably, thus insuring the workers wages which will satisfy their most elementary needs.

The situation of the nationalist government of Paz Estenssoro is made very difficult not so much because of the dissatisfaction of the workers, but as a result of the growing offensive of the right, including the nationalist right. If Lechin and the "left" parties remain passive, this could be the only political force capable of overthrowing the Paz government, and of "finding a way out" of the present situation.

Orwell's personal account of the Spanish Civil War

HOMAGE TO CATALONIA

by George Orwell

\$3.50

Order from:

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

London Letter — —

(Continued from page 2)

asked if the MP did not agree that if the party had adopted *One Way Only* as its election program it would win hands down. This caused a minor demonstration of support, for *One Way Only* is the first Bevanite pamphlet which *Tribune* issued after Bevan resigned from the cabinet.

STRUGGLE FOR FUTURE

Scenes similar to this are to be found all over the country as local parties fix their MP and subject him to a prolonged quiz—more designed to air the views of local members than to seek information from the MP. Identical too, are the scenes of activity which follow such a meeting—the establishment of committee rooms throughout the area, the gathering of workers to address envelopes,

stick on labels and perform the hundred and one other routine tasks called for in an election. Every night for many weeks the party workers will be out on the job around the houses, canvassing support for their candidate.

Each night after the canvass is finished they will return to the committee room to collate the results of the work. It is here, in the committee rooms, over innumerable cups of tea and cigarettes, that talk will flow freely. Until the small hours of the morning the air will grow thick with tobacco smoke and the heat of discussion, and the battle of words between right and left will continue pending the resumption of normal party activities. It is here, in the heart of the battle against the Tories, that the struggle for the future of the Labor Party will be carried out for the next few weeks.

Minority Government —

(Continued from page 1)

fer in perpetuity because there were once 13 independent states.

But then look at the House of Representatives, where states are theoretically represented according to population and, from a formal standpoint, are so represented. But the states decide how to apportion their own Congressional representation and within the states, systems of apportionment are deliberately devised to cut down the representation of the cities and over-represent the countryside. Except for 6 states which elect representatives at large, Congressional Districts are established . . . one representative chosen in each . . . to give millions of voters in industrial cities no more representation than thousands of farm voters. Nineteen states have not redistricted their congressional representation in over 20 years; yet the concentration of the population in cities continues.

Results? Look at these examples:

(There are about 152 million people in the United States. On this basis, each of the 435 members of the House should ideally represent about 345,000 people . . . but.)

The second district of South Dakota includes 159,000 persons; the eighth district of Texas, 807,000. And within these two states: the first South Dakota district has a population of 490,000 compared to the 159,000 of the second. In Texas, the 17th district numbers only 226,000 compared to the huge eighth district with its 807,000.

IN MICHIGAN

In Michigan, only 178,000 people live in the 12th district but 525,000 live in its 16th district.

In Georgia, the ninth district represents 246,000 people but one large district includes 618,000.

In most cases, the large underrepresented districts are in the big cities: Michigan's big district includes Detroit.

Texas' big district represents Houston. Georgia's giant district is the Atlanta area.

If the situation is bad in the U. S. Congress, it is even worse in the state legislatures. In 1947, 59 per cent of all Americans who live in urban centers elected only 25 per cent of the state legislators. Today, the proportion of city dwellers has risen to 64 per cent but their representation in the states has hardly increased at

all. "Take a roll call of the 48 legislatures," says the CIO pamphlet, "and you will find minority rule almost everywhere." Here are some of the facts compiled for us:

In New Jersey, most heavily industrialized state, 8 state senators represent 80 per cent of the population but their 8 votes are outnumbered by the 13 senators who represent only 20 per cent.

In Connecticut: 177,000 people in Hartford get two votes in the lower state House. But the town of Colebrook with a total population of 592 also gets two!

In agricultural Iowa: 226,000 people in Polk County including the city of Des Moines get one senator in the upper House. But Mahaska County with only 24,600 also gets one.

In California, Los Angeles County with 40 per cent of the state's population gets only 2½ per cent of the state senators.

IN GEORGIA

In Georgia: 393,000 people who reside in Fulton County which takes in Atlanta get three representatives in the lower House (1947); Echols County, with a population of only 3,000, gets one.

In Iowa, it must be added, five urban counties with a combined population of 635,000 elect 5 state senators; 20 rural counties with a population of 627,000 get 20.

"In California and Connecticut," we learn, "the vote of a resident of the smallest legislative district is worth 300 times the vote of a citizen who lives in the largest."

Conclusion: "Certainly it appears to many, if not yet to the U. S. Supreme Court itself, that the Constitution of this land is being trampled upon when the vote of any citizen counts for but one-three-hundredth of the vote of another when electing the government that passes laws affecting both."

And who is responsible: "The answer is not to be found by identifying only one of the two major parties as the sinner. Rotten borough districts exist alike in Republican Michigan and South Dakota and Democratic Texas and Georgia."

What to do? "Public opinion when sufficiently aroused can ultimately become an overwhelming force."

When sufficiently aroused? But who is to arouse it "sufficiently."

Our mild suggestion: a Labor Party.

Four Power Meet — —

(Continued from page 1)

not primarily in the nature of cleverly concealed technical items which would make it possible for the Stalinists to evade disarmament. They are based, rather, on the differences in the geographical-strategic and political positions of the two war blocs.

The Stalinist empire consists of a solid geographical area. Its possible routes of expansion lie outward from this area. Its possible means of expansion are as much political as military, if not more so. Even a relatively small military establishment would give the Stalinists all they need in the way of force to back up successful Stalinist movements in adjoining countries.

The American bloc is spread all over the world. Its military bases are everywhere. In many cases, they play a political role which is at least as important as their military role. That is, the presence of these bases gives the governments in these countries concrete, visible assurance that the Americans will back them politically and economically against the danger of political and social revolution (whether it be Stalinist, nationalist or socialist in character), as well as against any Stalinist attempt to conquer them from abroad.

BASES AND POLITICS

Thus the Stalinists can be assured that the American government cannot and will not agree to abandoning its bases on foreign soil. This protects them against any danger that their bluff on the reduction of their own armed forces

will be called. They also know that the presence of American bases is deeply resented by the peoples in many of the countries in which they are located. Hence, their proposal has a double advantage: it incurs no real risk, and it makes political capital for them abroad.

It is such facts (and many more like them) which make the American government so reluctant to meet with the Stalinists in a top-level conference. The outcome of any such meeting can really be foretold with a good deal of proposals they have made in the past. In return, the Americans can only demand their version of inspection of nuclear facilities; that the Russians get out of Germany while leaving the American army in the country, and the like. But now that U. S. military power has been concentrated in the nuclear field, even the old "inspection" policy cannot be advocated with any conviction. And on the other issues, America's refusal to withdraw from its imperial post-war positions vitiates any argument it might make that the Russians withdraw from theirs.

A four power conference may be held. A disarmament conference may be held also. Illusions on the outcome of either of them as means to real peace will be . . . illusions. The Czar did little or worse for the Russian peasants until they, with their worker allies, formed a political movement which was able to force concessions from him, and eventually to remove his power over them for good. The peoples of the world who hope for some real moves toward peace from the rulers of the big four would do well to ponder this example.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

Right next door we have an example of how the program *could* have worked if the concern were with human welfare rather than with profit. In Canada, 500,000 children have been inoculated with government-produced vaccine without a single case of polio appearing among them.

Civil Liberties Time Bomb

The McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950 is coming up for a major legal test. The Supreme Court will have to decide in the near future whether to confirm the registration order against the Communist Party by the Subversive Activities Control Board.

If the court either refuses to review the order, or upholds it, the Communist Party and all its members will have been placed, for all practical purposes, in a status of illegality. To comply with the law, the Stalinists would have to turn over the names of all members and financial contributors to the government. Any member whose name had not been turned in would be violating the law and exposing himself to dangerous penalties if he does not turn in his own name.

This illegalization of the CP is only part of the damage to civil liberties which will be brought about if the Supreme Court upholds the law and the registration of the CP under it. Section 5 of the law makes it a crime for a Communist to "engage in any employment in any defense facility." It directs the Secretary of Defense to "designate and proclaim, and from time to time to revise" a list of defense facilities. These are described as "any plant, factory or other manufacturing, producing or service establishment, airport facility, vessel, pier, waterfront facility, mine, railroad, public utility, laboratory, station, or other establishment. . . ." The secretary of defense need only find that "the security of the United States" requires that

such a facility be given this special protection.

But that is not all. In 1954 Congress repealed Section 5 (c) of the McCarran Act which defines membership in the CP, and amended it in the Humphrey-Morse-Douglas Communist Control Act. All the government now has to do to "prove" membership is to show that a person had "indicated by word, action, conduct, writing or in any other way a willingness to carry out in any manner and to any degree the plans, designs, objectives, or purposes of the [Communist] organization."

The Defense Department has indicated that it has prepared a list of "defense facilities" to be issued immediately if the Supreme Court finds against the Communist Party. It is quite clear that under the loose definition of the Humphrey bill thousands of union militants could be blacklisted from most of American industry. They need never have belonged to the CP or any of its front organizations. All they need have done is at some time have supported a campaign against discrimination, or for public housing in which the CP was actively engaged.

McCarthy may be lying low, but McCarthyism still has some kicks left in it.

Labor Action is indebted to I. F. Stone's Weekly of May 9 for the facts contained in the above item.

"SONGS OF THE WOBLIES"

The new LABOR ARTS recording of famous IWW songs, sung by Joe Glazer and Bill Friedland. On 33-1/3 LPs, unbreakable.

\$4.00

Now available on 33-1/3 LPs—

"BALLADS FOR SECTARIANS"

Song satires on the twists and turns of the American Stalinist movement

\$4.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

Mail orders will receive prompt attention. All orders must be accompanied by payment.

SUBSCRIBERS — ATTENTION!

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

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

19-20

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

RENEW NOW!