

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 25, 1955

FIVE CENTS

Max Shachtman on: OUR 'CRIME'

Why Washington Persecutes Socialists

... page 6

BRITISH LABORITES FACE A CHALLENGE

... page 2

EDUCATION BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

... page 5

THE GENTLEMEN OF THE HOD CARRIERS

... page 2

ISL Hearing Under Way; First of Kind

The first hearing ever pried out of the Department of Justice on a "subversive listing" started formally on Monday, July 18, in Washington, as the case of the Independent Socialist League came under review.

Although the Executive Order issued by Eisenhower early in his administration called for the attorney general to hold hearings for listed organizations as well as those proposed for listing, not a single hearing had ever been allowed by Brownell up to this week. The ISL's breakthrough against this stall came as a consequence of the Shachtman passport case, which gave front-page national publicity to the government's tactics.

The proceedings this past Monday, however, were only a preliminary skirmish, dealing with procedural and related questions. According to present schedule, the real hearing starts Monday, July 25, when the attorney general's office will present its case; it states it will take three days to do so, with witnesses. It is not known as yet whether cross-examination will be permitted. The government agency has also refused to announce its witnesses in advance, as requested by Joseph L. Rauh Jr., the ISL's attorney.

The ISL case, buttressed by documents, witnesses and expert testimony, will be presented to the hearing the following week, it is expected.

This hearing, while a necessary step in the process called "exhausting administrative remedies," is in effect a trial conducted by the prosecution, before a "judge" appointed by the prosecution, under rules arbitrarily laid down by the prosecution—i.e., by the attorney general's office.

The trial examiner is Edward M. Morrissey, borrowed for the occasion by the department from the Subversive Activities Control Board. If he reaffirms the

(Continued on page 3)

Appeals Court Again Sideswipes 'List' Procedure in Guild Case

The court decision in the case of the National Lawyers Guild against the attorney general's "subversive" listing provides an interesting, but not decisive, preliminary to the attack on the same list that is now being made by the ISL. Its chief interest, perhaps, is its passing but quite clear swipes at the subversive-listing procedure.

In 1953 Attorney General Brownell publicly announced in a speech that the Guild was "Communist-dominated" and otherwise subversive and that he was taking steps to put it on the list. This scandalous action was greeted with widespread attack as prejudgment of the hearing to which the group was entitled, and as a highly publicized broadcasting of a blacklist action before the action itself was even taken.

The Guild brought suit in the courts for an injunction against the government's listing and also asked for a judgment declaring unconstitutional the presidential Executive Orders (Tru-

BEHIND THE DEADLOCK ON GERMAN UNITY—

Geneva Confab Preparing for New Forms of Cold-War Conflict

By GORDON HASKELL

The Geneva conference of the Big Four imperialist powers appears to have run into a deadlock in the first two days of its deliberations. Unless a startling reversal takes place in the following sessions, there is every reason to believe that this conference, rather than opening up a period of relaxation in the tempo of the cold war, may signalize the development of the conflict along new lines.

The issue over which the conference deadlocked in its first days is the key European problem of the cold war: the unification of Germany and the role this most powerful country in Europe is to play in the capitalist-Stalinist struggle for world domination.

Although it is not excluded that in the course of the conference some deals may be worked out on East-West trade or other secondary issues, both sides have made it clear that at present no agreement can be reached on German unification. In the absence of such an agreement, it is quite unlikely that anything will come of the apparent narrowing of differences on the question of a limitation of the arms race.

The deadlock on Germany could have been and was anticipated by everyone who realizes the stake Stalinist Russia and the United States have in the continued division of the country. The way in which this deadlock was reached, however, has the widest implications for the future of the cold war in Europe. That, if anything, is the

"new" development revealed by the conference.

It may be recalled that in the months preceding Geneva, the Stalinist side had appeared to offer a new approach to the question of German unification. After the negotiation of the Austrian peace treaty, a number of "unofficial" (which in a totalitarian country like Russia means "official but not formal") hints appeared in the Russian press to the effect that the "Austrian formula" could be applied to Germany. This would have meant: unification of East and West Germany; the right of such

a unified Germany to arm itself; an international guarantee of the "neutrality" of Germany.

These suggestions aroused widespread interest and hopes both in Germany and throughout Europe that the Stalinists might be willing to give up East Germany in exchange for a separation of the united country from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The American government and its allies flatly rejected any such possibility. "NATO will not be on the bargain counter at Geneva" was one way in which this rejection was voiced. In view of this firm attitude on the part of the United States and its allies, it was thought possible that the Stalinists would push their proposal to the limit, in the hope of winning widespread German and European support to their position, and placing the blame for the continued division of

(Turn to last page)

Ridgway Throws a Bomb At Bomb-Based U.S. Policy

By A. STEIN

Among the more illustrious myths of American democracy (Fourth of July variety) two take pride of place and precedence. They are that the military are strictly subordinate to the civil authorities and that soldiers do not mix in politics—America is not Germany, etc.

But leaving these pleasant superstitions aside, the fact is that American generals have been known to defy the civil authorities (MacArthur in Korea), and more important, they do mix in politics and help shape foreign policy.

The militarization of politics and policy-making is not altogether the fault of the ambitious generals and admirals. What has been going on for the last ten years has been a reciprocal process of osmosis: the State Department and the Executive Branch resort more and more to military solutions for the complexities of foreign policy while the Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are thereby impelled to think more and more of the political consequences of military doctrine and practice.

The conflict between Army General Matthew B. Ridgway the military spokesman of the Administration, Admiral Radford, chairman of

the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is a case in point.

General Ridgway's differences with Admiral Radford and President Eisenhower have long been known. As befits an army officer, he has attempted to defend the interests of the army and resisted all attempts to reduce its size and minimize its strategic role.

His latest and final act of insubordination came on February 1, of

(Continued on page 7)

WASHINGTON'S ROLE IN THE MOROCCO STRUGGLE

A vital and little understood part of the background of the infamous French repression against the independence movement in North Africa—next week.

LONDON LETTER

Laborites, Right and Left, Trying to Face Challenge of Developing a Program

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, July 14—Since the defeat of the Labor Party at the general election hundreds of thousands of words have been written and spoken by Labor propagandists and journalists advancing their own particular theory of the causes which led to the defeat. Amidst this torrent of words one thing stands out in remarkable clarity—unanimity on one specific point. In a political party which contains such a wide variety of opinion this is rather surprising, especially in view of the many major fields of disagreement which exist at the present moment of time.

The monthly journal *Socialist Commentary*, which leads the field against Bevan as a person and is not far behind the leaders in attacking Bevanism as a political current, had this to say in the editorial of its July issue: "First, Labor can no longer win elections by playing on fears of the past; it must be forward-looking and appeal, rather, to the hopes of the future. The pre-war epoch with its unemployment and mass poverty is dead and gone with." It is precisely this view which has been advanced by practically everyone in the Labor Party who has attempted to analyze the election result.

Aneurin Bevan expressed the view in a masterly display of his command of the English language. Writing in *Tribune*, on June 2, he said: "A generation has grown up in Britain that has not experienced the frustration and privation of unemployment. The old keen edge of attack on capitalist society was therefore blunted. Youth does not build its case on the memory of the old. It has its own emotional attitude to contemporary society and this is not compounded of the elements that make up the mental climate of past generations." Bevan makes the point that the Labor Party is the custodian of the old memories of the past and these "were not sufficient in themselves to form the basis of a mass appeal." In other words Bevan said, on this particular issue, exactly the same as did the *Socialist Commentary*.

ASSORTMENT

Margaret Cole, the wife of Professor G. D. H., expressed similar views when writing in the July issue of the *Fabian Journal*, a magazine which is reputed to be read by the intellectuals of the party. Said Mrs. Cole: "Economic oppression of the old direct kind is gone so long as full employment lasts, and those who voted for Freedom from Want and for that alone have got what they wanted. They have a Health Service which they take for granted and grumble at as they grumble at the weather; a good many of them have Council houses, university awards and maintenance for their children; the workhouse is no more." Because of this Mrs. Cole, in common with other sources already quoted, is of the opinion that to attempt to win elections on the basis of evoking memories of the past will not pay dividends. Such practice, she says, "is nowadays a wasting asset."

In company with this rather strange assortment comes Hugh Gaitskell, one time Chancellor of the Exchequer and consistent right-winger. Says Gaitskell: "I have not the slightest doubt myself that the single most important factor behind the relatively greater decline in the Labor vote was the lack of fear of the Tories derived from the maintenance of full employment, the end of rationing and the general feeling that 'things were better.'"

BEVAN'S EMPHASIS

All of these statements, derived from widely differing sources, indicate how much in common is held the opinion within the Labor Party that merely to appeal to the memories of the past will not win elections in Britain at this moment of time. Having arrived at this amazing degree of unanimity at the start it is hardly surprising to find that they all end by drawing practically the same conclusions.

Says the *Socialist Commentary*: "the question for socialists is not simply how to win elections, but how to win them for further socialist advance." And this sentiment is echoed by all others participating in the debate.

But, of course, the real important thing is what is said in-between these two statements on which there is a fair degree of unanimity—for it is only by looking at this in-between section that it

is possible to get any idea of what exactly "socialism" constitutes in the minds of those using the term.

Bevan places most of his emphasis on the field of foreign affairs with, of course, attention focused onto the question of German rearmament and relationships with the Chinese Peiping government. He argues that Labor's own policy has become so entangled with the Tories in the field of foreign affairs that the difference between them is slight. It is worthy of note that he dismisses home policies in a single sentence which merely notes "the absence of any domestic issue" which was comparable in importance to the differences which existed in the years gone by when capitalism was typified by its mass unemployment and economic depressions. Symptoms which, at this moment of time, are absent in Britain.

CHALLENGE

In direct contrast to Bevan's approach, the *Socialist Commentary* concentrates on domestic issues—and issues of considerable import. On the question of the nationalized industries, for instance, it has this to say: "Nationalization, by itself, is not enough to solve the problem of workers' status in industry. It is true that the transfer to the state of the ownership of enterprise gives society control over the appointment of managers and makes them accountable to the public. But this does not get us

very far unless the purposes of industry are changed. If all that is to count are efficiency and productivity, then the position of the workers will continue to be treated as of subsidiary importance. Nationalization needs to be combined with industrial democracy, and so far socialists have significantly failed in showing how this is to be done."

For a journal which has the reputation of being right-wing this is indeed a statement to raise the eyebrows over. This is even more true when one realizes that this is one of the most important issues facing the Labor Party in home affairs today and one which the Bevanites have consistently ignored. This statement represents a direct challenge to the Bevanites and one cannot help feeling some dismay at the fact that they have failed to take it up.

TASK FOR BEVANITES

In other ways *Socialist Commentary* advances views which seem a little out of place in a journal with its reputation. It makes a direct attack on private ownership of property and talks of the profits accruing from it which "support extravagant luxury and privilege." It states that "The workers are given only as much respect as trade unions may be able to enforce or as expediency may require. Professor Tawney's description—'autocracy tempered by insurgence'—still sums up the system which prevails within the greater part of industry."

As a sweeping solution it then advocates the "transfer of all the large accumulations of property into public ownership" by means of a levy on capital. It must be emphasized that this is the policy advanced in the editorial of an anti-Bevanite magazine which carried in the same issue contributions from both Hugh Gaitskell and Herbert Morrison.

On the evidence so far it would seem that the initiative in the drive for a

"rethinking" of the party policy in relation to home affairs has passed from the hands of the Bevanites. If this is true it raises matters of considerable importance. It means, as so many have often stated, that the Bevanite leadership of the left wing of the party is beginning to reap the results of its failure—which extend back for a number of years—to get down to the real job of a left-wing leadership. That is the job of framing, presenting and consistently pursuing a coherent policy which has been framed as the result of careful, calculated and positive discussion involving the whole of the left forces in the party.

FOR A COHERENT POLICY

The position has now been reached in the party when mere rebellion against something will no longer do in place of a coherent policy. If Bevan, and his lieutenants, do not quickly recognize this fact and go about meeting it they will be responsible for throwing the whole of the left wing forces in the Labor Party into confusion. The matter is further complicated by the fact that, at this moment of time, there appears to be no one on the party left wing with the personal standing, political background and political understanding to win the support of the rank-and-file left wing. This applies not to individuals as such but groups of individuals pursuing a common and specific policy.

It can be seen that a task of some magnitude confronts the left-wing forces in Britain—particularly those who have adopted a role of critical support for Bevan in the years since he first left the Labor cabinet on the question of the Health Services and the rearmament program. For it is primarily with these critical supporters of Bevanism that the answer rests.

If the left forces in Britain are to develop and play the role which the situation demands of them it is imperative that the inadequacies of the Bevanite policy are clearly exposed. To allow the left wing to continue blindly following the Bevanite line without being aware of its deficiencies and without attempting to rectify these faults would be criminal folly and a sure way of committing political suicide.

LABOR'S SCOPE

The Gentlemen of the Hod Carriers Contract for a History

By BEN HALL

For thirty years, 1911-1941, the AFL Hod Carriers and Common Laborers Union went without a convention. The Executive Board elected in 1911 filled all vacancies in its own ranks as they occurred and chose the top union officers. Joseph V. Moreschi, now president, got the job in 1926 when he was chosen by the Executive Board upon the death of the previous president.

We stumble across this fact in *The Laborer's Story*, by Arch A. Mercey (whoever he may be), a book of almost 300 pages which purports to be the history of the first 50 years of the Hod Carriers Union. But this is one of the rare pieces of information about the union which we can extract from it.

The author faced a most disagreeable job: He was commissioned by the union to write a book in commemoration of its first 50 years, its Golden Jubilee Anniversary. What to write? Was he to describe the origins of its graft-ridden machine? To explain its reputation as one of the most unsavory groups that is officially classed as part of the American labor movement? That might prove somewhat disturbing, even offensive, to his employers.

He solved his dilemma neatly: The union provides only a title. Most of the wasted 300 pages give a running account of history and current events for the last 50 years, occasionally and incidentally mentioning the union where possible. Above all, he strains to mention the names of all living officials who are still officials.

DON'T IGNORE BOVE

In the first few pages is a handy chronology entitled "Memorable Milestones," 1903-1953. Following is the full entry for the period December 19, 1941 through 1945 quoted in full: "1941-1945—Union strongly supports war effort and seeks to keep jurisdictional friction at a minimum. Membership peak for pe-

riod is reached in 1942 when average membership is 430,187."

Not a single other memorable milestone. Apparently a rather dull few years. But wait!

In the appendix we find the name of every illustrious individual who has ever served as an officer. We discover the following entries about one James Bove: In March 1936 the Executive Board "elected" him to fill a vacancy in one of the vice-presidencies. In 1941 he became the fourth vice-president. He took a leave of absence in May 1943 and resigned on November 28, 1944.

Apart from these bare facts listed in the ledger, we read not a word about Mr. Bove in all the 300 pages of text. Yet he was, if not as illustrious as his colleagues, at least as well known. Let us take the opportunity to record a few facts for inclusion in the next edition of this book.

Bove was indicted in New York City for extortion in May 1943. At that time, he was not only a vice-president of the union but also secretary and treasurer of Local 60. This local shared jurisdiction with Local 17 over the construction of the Delaware River Water Supply system of the New York City watershed, a \$300,000,000 project.

Bove was determined to get his share. Many witnesses who testified against him in private were afraid to appear in open court for fear of reprisals against their companies. He was found guilty of extracting \$420,000 from construction companies beginning in 1936, and sentenced to 8½-16 years in prison.

The president of one construction company testified that Bove demanded a payment of \$125,000. The victim was curious enough to ask why. "We are going to give you very good men up there," answered Bove, "you will have no troubles, disputes or strikes."

Later it was discovered that \$250,000 had disappeared from his local's treasury and in May 1945, after being found guilty of 74 counts of grand larceny, he was sentenced to another 10-20 years.

In *Crime on the Labor Front*, Malcolm

Johnson relates: "As an aftermath to Bove's convictions, damage suits totaling \$3,140,000 were filed against the international union, of which Bove was a vice-president. Workers in a sandhog local charged that they were hounded, persecuted and deprived of jobs as a result of their refusal to 'knuckle under to the dictatorship.' A hod carriers local charged that its workers had been forced to work for low wages and under dangerous conditions as a result of agreements between Bove and four construction companies. There were other accusations and charges, too many to enumerate. They were all unanimous in describing Bove—a union official who had worked up through the ranks—as a vicious and unscrupulous criminal."

UNBROKEN DESCENT

On the other side of the Hudson River, Local 17 of the Hod Carriers Union enjoyed jurisdiction over the same water-supply project. From a special grand jury of Orange County, whose report was submitted on January 19, 1944, we learn:

In the fall of 1941, a group of Local 17 members petitioned Governor Herbert Lehman for an investigation of the affairs of their union. They charged that no elections had been held since 1937 and that no accounting had ever been made of more than \$600,000 that had gone through the local's treasury. They complained of dangerous working conditions and reported that critics of local officials were blacklisted and expelled.

The "Daily record of the union," reported the grand jury, "was a story of extravagance, waste and theft." For two years, 1937-1939, no local meetings were held. The local's business agent, Samuel Nuzzo, was convicted on 32 counts of forgery and larceny and sentenced to 10-20 years. The jury reported that he had paid large sums to a known gangster.

"Larceny and racketeering," explains the report, "are by-products of a greater

(Continued on page 3)

DISCUSSION

Pattern of the Argentine Revolt: An Interpretation

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, July 1—The liquidation of Peron's dictatorship in Argentina seems to be approaching. Coming after the downfall of the Vargas regime in Brazil, it would seem that there has come an end to the period of semi-totalitarianism in the two greatest countries of South America.

The revolt against Peron, which is not yet finished as this is written, was so violent that it seriously shook the Peron dictatorship. The crisis began with the Catholic demonstrations against Peronism, which Peron answered with anti-clerical moves against the Catholic opposition.

The law on divorce and the proposed law on separation of church and state are of secondary importance. What was manifested, in the religious form that the struggle took, was a political crisis and the political opposition of a big section of the Argentine people, in a Catholic country where Catholicism represents a majority. In Argentina the Radical Party, the Democrats and Socialists being practically outlawed, had no possibility to carry on an open political fight, and so the oppositionists used the opportunity of the religious celebrations to show their feelings about the dictatorship.

Thus the religious movement was in reality a political, anti-Peronist, spontaneous action of the Argentine opposition. The police attacked the religious ceremonies because they were a danger to the regime. But the movement was so deep that the political repression did not put it down; on the contrary, it was strengthened, taking on the character of a "national fight" against the tyrant, a fight which penetrated the ranks of the navy, army and air force.

Thus the second step of the Argentine revolt was the armed fight of the army, navy and air force against the Peronist police. The fight was transferred from the street to the garrisons. Instead of bishops, it was the generals who spoke now; instead of crosses, bullets.

This time the Peronist pretorians were unable to appease the revolt; and the police proved incapable of defending the regime. Also the Peronist "workers" militia remained relatively passive, in spite of Peron's threat that the *descamisados* would settle matters in short order with the opposition demonstrators. Neither the working class nor the civilian masses acted when the bombs and cannon thundered. The civilian religious revolt was passed over by the military civil war.

ARMY'S ROLE

In this situation, everything depended on the army's position, the same army which had participated in the anti-Peronist plot. But when the naval forces attacked the Casa Rosada, the soldiers who were supposed to support them began to shoot at the sailors instead. The army generals who had backed the uprising now betrayed it, ordering resistance to the naval and air forces.

Nobody knows much about what happened in the army circles: whether it was because of an internal fight among the generals, or because of General Lucero's indecisiveness, or loyalty to Peron, or hunger for power, or his ambition to take over the Peronist heritage. Politically the vacillating role of the army is to be explained by the general indecisiveness of the whole situation.

For the revolt began as an absolutely spontaneous action within religious forms, which soon passed over into a political opposition movement without any revolutionary character. It was the brutality of the police and of Peron himself that unloosed the political rebellion, transforming it into a military revolt. No part of the political opposition—neither the Radical Party, nor the socialists, nor the conservatives—participated in the military revolt or planned any common action with the military

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

chiefs; this fact was acknowledged by Peron himself, in his speech.

The scope and breadth of the revolt surprised not only Peron but also the leaders of the opposition. On the other hand, another surprise was the passivity of the Peronist "workers" militia, which was probably due to the neutrality of the working class in the struggle.

This neutrality, and the passivity of the civilian bourgeois opposition, is probably the root cause of the indecisiveness of the situation, of the army's "betrayal" of the revolt and its mediating role between the regime and the rebel camp. This peculiar situation is at the moment adequately symbolized by General Lucero, with his grayness of personality.

BEGINNING OF THE END

The organization of a new cabinet proves that the regime has not only been weakened but shaken and dislocated. Minister Borlenghi was dismissed and is now a refugee in Montevideo; for many long years he has been the strong man of the Peronist regime and the persecutor of the opposition. Also dismissed was the leader of the Peronist trade-union federation, Vuletich, on the ground of "anti-Catholic excesses" and instigation of anti-clerical action. The government's anti-Catholic moves were revoked and most likely the banished bishops will be allowed to return to Argentina. Peron is begging the pope's pardon and offering the church amends.

Of course, this will shake his position among the "radicals" of his own party and among the workers and *descamisados* who support him. But the stakes now are the life or death of the regime. In spite of Peron's slyness and cunning, the Argentine situation has decisively changed and the dictatorship has been so severely shaken by the latest events that the future of the government is very problematical.

It is difficult to foresee the further evolution of the situation in Argentina, but in any case the strongest dictatorship in South America has been shaken and is approaching its liquidation. The experience of the Argentine armed revolt, preceded as it was by the religious demonstrations, which overcame the political anti-Peronist movement, is very interesting as a pattern for possible liquidation of a totalitarian dictatorship. In view of the lack of an organized political opposition, the mass opposition expressed itself in the first available possible manner, in religious form, and then in a political fight which penetrated the armed forces and took on the character of civil war.

PATTERN FOR FUTURE?

It is true that the action against Peron had a rightist, Catholic and religious character, and also that the armed revolt did not have a progressive revolutionary program, that its program was limited only to "fight tyranny," "for legality and democracy," and that this was insufficient to mobilize the masses, especially the workers' masses, in our time. If the Stalinists and their followers appraise the Argentine revolt as a reactionary restoration and support the Peronist "social dictatorship," yet the revolutionary socialist does not have any ground to second this line.

For the Argentine civil war, in the view of this writer, is a very significant form of a spontaneous political and anti-totalitarian revolution against a dictatorship. Its indecisiveness is due to the absence of an armed workers' revolt. A totalitarian dictatorship can be destroyed in a progressive, democratic and modern fashion, in a fashion more-over which opens the way to the victory of socialist democracy, only by a combination and conjunction of an armed workers' upsurge with a political and social program and the armed revolt of soldiers, sailors and airmen against the totalitarian police regime of tyranny. The Argentine experience may be very important for future development in the world.

FERMENT IN AFRICA

Slander on the Screen . . . British Guinea-Pigs . . . Passport Victim

By PRISCILLA CADY

With titillating Ruarkian advertising (*See the primitive savages go berserk—Hear them utter cries in their strange, barbaric tongue—See women hacked to pieces*) a theatre in New York is offering an hour-long film called "Mau-Mau."

It opens with the thud of a torch and slow portentous music. Then a sincere-type fellow tells the audience that unrest is everywhere, caused by the impact of civilization on primitive cultures, and that a case in point is the Mau Mau terror in Kenya. Then follow all the ingredients which make up a typical American product: self-righteousness, pseudo-understanding and condescension, spiced with deliberate horror and topped with an unctuous note of hope, sunrise shot and all. It is not a very competent job from a technical point of view.

The film does not live up to its advertising, although the camera has a fondness for lingering on shots of corpses; and the Lari Massacre scenes, obviously staged, are overly repeated scenes of man-attacks-near-naked-woman-with-panga.

The narrator tells us in shocked tones what he claims the Mau Mau has done, and then relates happily the counter-measures the British have taken. When we see real horrors—scores of people imprisoned behind barbed wire, families turned out of their homes, and women carrying three or four heavy logs as prized possessions—the narrator sounds pleased with these "necessary and effective measures."

We are given scenes of Mau Mau oath-taking and the narrator recites to us in sepulchral tones the seven parts of the oath—that is, his version of the oath (we have seen at least ten to date and they have all been different). We are presented with glib factual inaccuracies, such as the statement that Jomo Kenyatta was the moving spirit and head of the Teachers College, whereas that honor belongs to Mbiyu Koinange. But that's nothing: everything is laid at Kenyatta's door—he is, traditionally now, the clever, educated villain who provided leadership to a bunch of savages and used them for his own end, which was sheer, naked power.

Lip-service is given to the color-bar and land question; everything about the land dealings was due to misunderstandings, we are told, because the English and Kikuyu didn't know each other's language. (Note on primitive savages: the Kikuyu language is so difficult that only a handful of Europeans have learned it to this day.)

The end of the picture shows a group of men slogging away with picks, and we are told that (as a sensible and wise precaution, of course) those considered to be

ISL Hearing —

(Continued from page 1)

listing, the ISL and Rauh are fully prepared to take the whole matter into the courts. Such a court case would for the first time be in a position to basically test the subversive-list system judicially in a precedent-making manner.

The attorney general's office has already informed Rauh that it will rely on only two (of the three) designations under which the ISL is listed, these being "communist" and "advocating overthrow, etc., by unconstitutional means." The third designation, which the government will not seek to justify at the hearing, is "subversive." It states that if the ISL refutes the first two (to its satisfaction), the third will fall also.

In the preliminaries this past Monday, attorney Rauh most especially made an attempt to get the government prosecution to define, or give some specific meaning to, the key terms—What does it mean by "communist" in connection with the ISL? What does it mean by "adhering to the doctrines of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky"? which doctrines? . . . and so on, through much of the government's Interrogatories addressed to the ISL.

No satisfaction could be obtained on this score. The government, for the most part, refused to specify or define; and Rauh's requests, as well as motions to strike vague and meaningless charges, were rejected by the trial examiner.

All this, of course, becomes part of the record that will be presented to the court in the eventuality mentioned.

good prospects for the Mau Mau have been placed in internment camps for rehabilitation through labor; camp chaplains have been instructed to turn their dark and savage hearts to Christian love. Indeed.

What is particularly sickening about this picture is the syrupy frosting of unctuousness and righteousness that the Americans have placed over the inedible dough of British imperialism.

GUINEA-PIGS

Colonies are convenient. It is helpful to have large numbers of people at one's disposal. If a government isn't sure how something will work on its own people—white people, that is; people whose lives are valuable, you understand—why then, try it out on . . . Africans.

The British government announced last week that it considers the Salk vaccine to be so dangerous that it will not even try it out on English volunteers. It will experiment on the population of Gambia, West Africa.

It was stated that the incidence of polio is high in that area but the rate of paralysis low, which indicates that the virus is milder and therefore the experiment less dangerous. Now we are not scientists, and this may be quite correct as far as it goes, but the fact remains that the Africans are to be "experimented" on rather than English volunteers. The point is not to eliminate polio in Africa as the end in view. The people of Gambia are being used as convenient guinea pigs for British imperialism.

PASSPORT VICTIM

A South African Negro high school student was recently awarded a scholarship to study at the Kent School in Connecticut. All arrangements have been made; the school is ready to receive him, and he is ready to go. The South African government is taking a hand in the affair, however, by simply not issuing him a passport. He has received no reply, no denial, and no passport. (We seem to be reminded here of another government, with different characteristics, but similar techniques.)

Member of Parliament Mrs. Margaret Ballinger, who made inquiries on his behalf, had considerable trouble herself in leaving the country on a trip to Nigeria and the Gold Coast, but she finally made it. The student, Stephen Ramosodi, is still waiting.

FIGHT FOR EDUCATION

Protestant Episcopal churches in and around New York staged a rally last Saturday to raise funds for Trevor Huddleston, well-known anti-Malan minister who runs a church-connected school in South Africa. Under the Bantu education act, the government withdrew its subsidies to all church-run schools unless they agreed to teach according to the government program, which is designed to educate Africans only to the point where they will be capable servants.

Not a few of these religious institutions, notably the Catholic and Episcopal ones, are endeavoring to continue, on their limited funds, in opposition to this racist program.

LABORSCOPE — —

(Continued from page 2)

evil—the complete denial of democratic rights to union members by their own officials."

In one unbroken line of evolution, in a descent of over 40 years, the present leadership of the Hod Carriers Union perpetuates its power. It now enters the coming united labor movement as part of its ultra-right wing, combining into a formal alliance with the Teamsters, Carpenters, and Operating Engineers.

If the Reuther-Meany-Dubinsky forces in a new federation hope to clean up the labor movement, they can hardly ignore these gentlemen.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

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

A sub is only \$2 a year!

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Possibilities Before The Geneva Conference

To the Editor:

I would like to comment on Comrade Gordon Haskell's generally excellent article on disarmament carried in the July 18 issue. First of all, permit me to point out a typographical error which makes nonsense of an important political point being made by Comrade Haskell. The text, as LABOR ACTION prints it, says, "But the American demand for inspection, justified though it be on technical grounds, would lose much of its political effectiveness if the United States makes it clear, under Russian pressure and prodding, that even if the American inspection provisions were met, the United States would still be willing to withdraw from its world-wide bases as part of a scheme of general disarmament." Obviously Comrade Haskell wrote "unwilling" or "still not be willing." As the body of the article makes plain, the United States is not going to dismantle the vast network of air bases with which it has encircled the Stalinist empire.

Now let me turn to what I consider a mistaken judgment on the part of Comrade Haskell, based on his misunderstanding of the new positions taken both by the United States and Russia on the question of disarmament.

I agree with Comrade Haskell when he declares that the discussion at Geneva and whatever comes after will have nothing to do with genuine disarmament and is fraudulent on both sides. But when he states that the "Stalinists do not expect the United States or the governments most closely allied or most dependent on it to accept this proposal [on disarmament]," I am afraid I must disagree. What Washington and Moscow are both groping toward is, of course, not "disarmament," but an agreement to call a halt to the arms race, a limited degree of reduction in conventional armed forces and an "alarm" system of inspection and control of nuclear weapons and their production. Eisenhower's statement, it is true, is "an evasion of the popular demand for disarmament in the atomic field." But it is something else as well. It is a tentative American response to the Russian proposals of May 10. Just as the Russians have abandoned their old intransigence on these questions, so too the United States is moving away from its old position. What is taking place is a process of mutual concession and accommodation. And while to categorically insist that an agreement will be consummated is absurd, it is just as wrong to say that no agreement is possible. Never have the United States and Russia been closer to a basis for agreement than they are now.

For the sake of clarity, permit me to indicate the main points on which both sides have made concessions. In the declaration of May 10, Moscow accepted the March 8 standstill proposal of Canada, France, Britain and the United States as the first step in "disarmament." This freezes armed forces and weapons at existing levels.

Secondly, Moscow executed a major turn-about when it accepted the notion of equality of conventional armed forces on both sides. Hitherto, the Russians had insisted on a flat one-third reduction in armed forces of all states. This, of course, would have given it a tremen-

dous superiority in armed manpower. Now the Russians propose the following ceilings: U. S., USSR and China: 1 million to 1.5 million men; Britain and France: 650,000 men. The first step in reducing the armed forces of these states is to be taken within one year after an agreement is negotiated to the extent of 50 per cent of the difference between the above ceilings and the levels existing on December 31, 1954.

With regard to nuclear weapons and their control, as a token of good faith, the Russians propose the immediate banning of tests of such weapons. Until now, they have resisted any such agreement.

Although the system of control of nuclear weapons proposed by the Russians in their note of May 10 remains sufficiently vague and ambiguous, the important thing to note is that Eisenhower's recent statements on this issue are a step in the direction of the Kremlin's plan. The first condition of such a move was the American abandonment of unlimited inspection by an international agency. Both Moscow and Washington are considering the feasibility of what has been called the "burglar alarm" system of checks, that is, international control bodies whose representatives would be stationed permanently at certain crucial points in each country.

Within the framework of this letter, I don't want to enter into a discussion of the political, economic and technical reasons which in my opinion make an agreement between Moscow and Washington for a limited reduction in armaments feasible. We must, as Comrade Haskell in his excellent article has done, expose the fraud of imperialist "disarmament" on both sides; but we must also be aware of the very real tendencies which are now operative on the international scene and lend strength to American and Russian propaganda that each is earnestly seeking to guarantee that a third and most terrible of world wars will never break out. To deny them can

only result in weakening the effectiveness of our correct analysis that these rival imperialist social systems can only resolve their differences in the long run by military means and that the only genuine road to peace lies through the creation of a socialist world.

A. STEIN

The Stalinist proposal which, I wrote, the United States will not accept is one which makes abandonment of American military bases all over the world a condition for any reduction of armaments.

I agree with Comrade Stein that it is not excluded that the two blocs in the cold war may reach some kind of agreement to limit the armaments race. There is no law of imperialism which postulates the constant and unlimited expansion of armaments. There is also no law which excludes a reduction in the tempo of the arms race by mutual agreement. Whether the pressures on both sides, or the possibility of a general imperialist political deal, make such a reduction feasible at the present time is a matter for conjecture. Though, as Comrade Stein points out, both sides have moved closer to each other in their "disarmament" proposals, as things stand now each attaches conditions to its "technical" proposals which appear unacceptable to the other. This may mean that the "accommodation" each appears to be willing to make to the other's approach is simply a means of putting the opponent on the spot in terms of political warfare. Or it may represent a real desire amounting to an intention to reach some kind of deal.

In any event, Comrade Stein is quite right when he points out that the socialist position on disarmament need not and should not base itself on the contention that no abatement in the arms race is possible. Such a position could only strengthen popular illusions if some kind of deal should actually be reached.

GORDON HASKELL

A Letter 'Militant' Didn't Print on Bolivian Policy

S. R. requests us to publish the following letter which he wrote to the Militant in May but which the Militant has refused to publish.—Ed.

To the Editor of the Militant:

In the May 16 issue you likened Paz Estenssoro, president of Bolivia, to Kerensky, who was overthrown by the Russian October revolution. I believe the comparison was not accurate. Kerensky was a "laborite," a labor lawyer who entered the government with the consent of the workers' soviet. Paz Estenssoro is not a laborite in any sense; he is a representative of the Bolivian bourgeoisie. The closest parallel to Estenssoro is not Kerensky but Miliukov, the leader of the capitalist "Cadet" party. The Bolivian parallel to Kerensky is Juan Lechin, head of the Bolivian Workers Federation.

I make this point because an accurate analogy with the Russian Revolution can help us to understand both the similarities and the differences between it and the Bolivian revolution. The first phase of the revolution in both countries resulted in coalition governments with a bourgeois head and a reformist laborite tail. In Russia, because of the opposition of the masses and of the Bolsheviks, the bourgeois ministers were pushed out and Kerensky came to head a pro-capitalist labor government. The coalition in Bolivia remains, though Lechin himself has been forced out of the government.

The Bolivian revolution has made no progress in three years comparable to that achieved in Russia in a few months. And this despite the fact that the Bolivian revolution began on a higher level than the Russian February. Whereas the February revolution left the army of millions and especially the Czarist officer corps intact, in Bolivia the army and police were completely disarmed and the workers' militias were left with all the arms in the country. Now, however, the army and police force have been rebuilt, with a very reactionary officer corps, and rearmed with the most modern weapons, while the workers' militias have been debilitated.

I think that the main reason for the different courses of these two revolutions can be mainly attributed to the different policies of the Bolshevik party and the Bolivian Trotskyists, the Revolutionary Workers Party (POR). Whereas Lenin regarded the Provisional Government as a capitalist tool, the enemy of the workers which would have to be replaced by a soviet government, the POR calls the

Bolivian government "petty-bourgeois." Whereas Lenin mercilessly criticized the reformist labor leaders for serving in a coalition government, the POR has never criticized Lechin for entering or remaining in the Estenssoro government. The POR has, in fact, asked Paz Estenssoro to appoint a government of the left wing of the MNR, the party of capitalism; a government which would, of course, be responsible to President Estenssoro, that is, to the Bolivian capitalists.

Two years ago the correspondent of LABOR ACTION reported that leaders of the POR had accepted posts in various government commissions. This report has never been publicly denied by the Militant or by the POR.

S. R.

Times Report on German TUs Was False

By A. S.

It is worth while calling attention, though belatedly, to a small though not unimportant piece of inaccurate reporting by that newspaper which "prints all the news that fits to print," the N. Y. Times.

On May 20 the Times carried a front-page story written by A. H. Raskin in Vienna, where he was covering the Fourth World Congress of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. Raskin's story carried the headline, "West German Unions Back Pledge to Support Arming." The story itself stated: "West German labor joined today in a pledge of action with the free unions of seventy-four other countries to build up the military strength of the Western world against the Soviet Union.

"This was a reversal of the previous stand taken by West German unions."

Had this report been true, it would have given a completely different complexion to the internal political scene in West Germany where, as Raskin himself noted, the trade unions and their "6 million members constitute the backbone of the Social-Democratic Party" and have been in the forefront of the fight against Adenauer's drive to rearm West Germany as an integral part of the American-led NATO military system.

The same Times carried a story on May 28 repudiating Raskin's sensation of May 20. Buried in the body of a news report from West Germany, written by Welles Hagen, was a statement by the

Gov't Drops Case Of Socialist C.O.

The case against socialist conscientious objector David McReynolds has been dismissed in court.

On January 11, McReynolds was arrested for refusing induction into the Armed Forces. After 24 hours in the county jail he was released on \$1000 bond. With J. B. Tietz as defense attorney, trial was set for April 26. On that date, the government, rather than risk losing a case, moved to dismiss and the court granted permission.

The government's case had been greatly weakened by recent court decisions that a defendant had a right to see the report of the Hearing Officer to the Attorney General and the recommendations of the Attorney General to the Appeal Board before the Appeal Board came to its decision. Since in McReynolds case, these reports and recommendations were not available to the defendant until after his arrest, he had been denied due process and the government's case was too weak to stand in court.

Although McReynolds may now be reprocessed by the draft board and stand trial at a later date, the dismissal is the first victory in the growing fight to have the right of socialist COs recognized. At the present time the draft law permits exemption from military service only to COs who believe in a Supreme Being. McReynolds, a religious pacifist as well as a member of the Socialist Party, refused to seek exemption on religious grounds, feeling that to do so would be "to cooperate with a grossly unfair, discriminatory and unconstitutional section of the draft law."

This was the fourth arrest within the last two years of socialist leaders who are opposed to war. Burt Rosen, former official of the Young People's Socialist League (Socialist Party), is now in prison. Vern Davidson, former national secretary of YPSL, has been sentenced to three years in prison and is currently appealing the case. Don Thomas, Socialist Party member, was arrested early in 1954 but has not yet been brought to trial.

In all four cases it was impossible to secure a CO classification because the defendants would not admit to a belief in a Supreme Being, basing their objections on political, philosophical, or humanitarian grounds. Full information on these cases and suggestions as to how one can help defend the rights of non-religious objectors to war is obtainable from Davidson Defense Committee, 2514 Shattuck Ave., Berkeley 4, Calif., or 167 West 60th Street, New York 23, N. Y.

—DDC News Release

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



LABOR ACTION

July 25, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 30

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

Our Noble Ally

SEOUL, Korea, July 15—President Syngman Rhee today warned farmers and laborers that they would be treated as "traitors" if they went on strike. He said "those who stage strikes hereafter will be considered as people serving in the Communist interest." He said that instead of striking, workers must appeal to him or the Government from now on.

—N.Y. Times, July 16.

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

July 25, 1955

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

EDUCATION BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

A Factual Analysis of Russian Educational Techniques, Before and After Stalinism

By GERTRUDE BLACK

Institutions provide for the historian a function supplementary to their indigenous interest. They can be studied as important barometers which reflect, perhaps only indirectly but reflect nevertheless, those social relations, attitudes and traditions which go to make up the social fabric.

Education is perhaps the most sensitive in this respect. For the nature of the human being which a society wishes to create must of necessity be directly related to its existing social system and values.

Education in a totalitarian state mirrors in an obvious fashion the standards of the society. The rigid discipline, dogma and emphasis on conformity of Catholic education point to its counterparts in the philosophy and structure of the church. The variegated pattern in American education, a pattern which includes the use of corporal punishment in the South and the existence of many advanced progressive schools in other areas, indirectly reflects the shadings in American ideology and politics.

It is with this in mind that we approach the development of Russian education since the revolution of October 1917. In a planned society such as exists in Russia, where education is completely a state function, its study as a social barometer will be particularly applicable. Here we can see directly the intentions of the rulers concerning its future generations of ruled.

The history of education since 1917 in Russia presents two distinct phases. We will begin with the first covering the period from 1918 to 1929.

The profound changes initiated in Russia by the 1917 revolution permeated and revolutionized education. Almost everything except the physical rudiments of the old school system was swept away. Against the backdrop of an illiterate and backward country, the most ad-

vanced theories of education became the norm. It was a period of experimentation, of daring and of creative initiative.

NEW EDUCATION

The men who took the leadership were advocates of progressive education. The lecture and discipline method was abandoned in favor of "learning through experience." The classroom unit was replaced by the study circle and laboratory. Subject material was not artificially administered to the child but was directly related to his own experience and thus coordinated with existing environment. The student became an investigator, not a passive recipient. Discipline was self-discipline, a natural outgrowth of the human being developing through his own experience. The instructor directed the independent analysis of the student by formulating series of questions and theses.

Official Russian State Document No. 3 on school reform, drawn up June 2, 1918, states:

"The school must offer the widest possible opportunity for the full play and development of the creative forces of the child. . . . Essential prerequisites hereof are:

- "(a) Self-activity of children in various fields of school life, their independence and initiative while at work and a spirit of self-reliance in matters of everyday routine;
- "(b) introduction of an educational system stimulating the creative forces of the child;
- "(c) artistic activity as the chief element in the child's esthetic development, guiding the emotional processes of its spiritual life;
- "(d) attention in the matter of child's education should chiefly aim to bring up a human being as a social creature and to produce an understanding of social labor. . . . Educational training is to be conducted in full conformity with the latest discoveries in psychology, physiology and pedagogy."¹

REVOLUTIONARY CHANGES

With the abandonment of the classroom unit and the lecture method go also the abandonment of discipline and regimentation. The maintenance of silence is no longer a prerogative for learning because the child now learns by doing, not only by listening. The quiet, passive and obedient student is not the "best child." Very often it is precisely this student who is the worst from a psychiatric viewpoint since fear and repression may be the basis for his inactivity.

No punishment of any kind was tolerated. The student was not encouraged to adopt an attitude of reverence toward his teacher. Real student self-government was initiated and encouraged.

"No punishment whatever is being allowed. Children's self-government is being introduced in all schools."²

Examinations were abolished. This single decree is enough to indicate that a revolution had taken place in Russia. Education was made available to the masses of the people. Coeducation was introduced. Experimental schools, always a good indication of freedom in a society, were encouraged. A call was sent out for educators to join with the government and participate in the educational drive. Teachers were given lati-

1. See Education and Art in Soviet Russia, introduction by Max Eastman.
2. Public Education in the USSR, 1926, introduction by Lunacharsky.

The Winter 1950 issue of Anvil contained an article on education in Stalinist Russia which is of great value for an understanding of this aspect of Russian society. Since most of our present readers undoubtedly did not see this study when it was originally published, we are reproducing it in Challenge. Part 1 appears below; the concluding part will appear next week. —ED.

tude in the preparation of syllabi and curriculums.

John Dewey writes in Impressions of Soviet Russia: "I have never seen anywhere in the world such a large proportion of intelligent, happy and intelligently occupied children." (Published in 1929.)

At a time when most schools in the world were run along the lines of conservative education, when school meant unhappiness, discipline and punishment for students, it was in a backward country, ruled over for centuries by an autocracy, that the most modern and progressive ideas were state policy.

TRAINING FOR DEMOCRACY

For the first time perhaps in history, patriotism disappeared from education. In the sense that children were brought up as members of the world community, socialist education in this brief period represented the application of the highest ideal of social development: the ideal of international brotherhood and solidarity. The Declaration of Principles of a Socialist School could say with justification, "Only the socialist school has the right to say that it does not turn a human being out a skilled laborer, but creates a man."

Pedagogy of this nature leaves no room for deification of leaders. Exaltation of leading figures has as its inevitable implication passive submission to their decisions. Emphasis on independence and self-activity in education are not isolated pedagogical methods but directly relate to the training of the democratic human being. Reverence of the teacher is preparation for reverence of the leader. Enforced discipline, punishment and coercion are preparation for submission to the state which rules from above only by coercion. The democratic perspectives of the revolutionary Russian state of 1917 are reflected most clearly in their educational methods.

This does not mean that all worked perfectly, that a paradise of progressive education sprang up overnight. The devastation of the Civil War, loss of manpower and materials, lack of trained per-

sonnel and funds created tremendous barriers. It was with the utmost heroism that teachers and educators carried on their work sometimes under conditions of near-starvation. They had almost for the first time freedom to experiment, to be creative. There were, as is inevitable in such a period, many extreme and untenable schemes offered—such as the abolition of all formal schools—"The party, the street and the shop will teach them"—or the proposal to nationalize all children.

On the whole, however, education was carried on by serious and cultured men who understood the nature of their responsibilities and who understood educational theory. They were men who, believing in socialism, believed in the development of free, creative human beings, human beings who could develop out of happy, unregimented and active children.

THE ROAD BACK

The closing of the period of progressive education in Russia coincided with social and economic changes which had been taking place since the twenties and began to achieve institutional status in the early thirties. The democracy of the first period gave way to open dictatorship. After a speech by Stalin denouncing "petty-bourgeois egalitarianism," the early concept that "a government official should receive no more than the average skilled worker" was eliminated. A privileged bureaucracy of officials, managers and technicians developed with wide discrepancies in income between itself and the working class and peasantry. The brutal, forced collectivizations of the peasantry in 1929 marked the advent of a regime of terror and the disappearance of those remnants of democracy which had persisted through the twenties.

The period of experimentation in education came to a close in 1931 with the abandonment of the Dalton method and the reinstatement of the classroom unit. Following this came the reintroduction of all the old values in education. Discipline, obedience and punishment replaced the standards of progressive education adopted in 1918. In 1932 student democracy disappeared and schools came again under the control of the director and his staff.

(Concluded next week)

YSR Is Out

The latest issue of the Young Socialist Review, YSL information and discussion bulletin, is off the press. Copies at 10¢ each may be ordered from the YSL national office, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y.

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

Perspective on History & Revolution

TUESDAYS at 8 p.m.

July 26—HAL DRAPER
The European Revolution and the Comintern, 1918-1929

Aug. 2—ABE STEIN
Germany, 1924-1934

Aug. 9—ANNE RUSSELL
The Spanish Revolution and Civil War

Aug. 16—GORDON HASKELL
Revolution in Asia—I

Aug. 23—GORDON HASKELL
Revolution in Asia—II

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

NEW YORK YSL

New Summer Class

THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF SOCIALISM

WEDNESDAY EVE'S at 8:15

(3) July 27
What Is Stalinism?

(4) Aug. 3
Why a Labor Party?

(5) Aug. 10
How Socialists Work for Peace

(6) Aug. 17
Democratic Socialism and the Future

All sessions will be held on consecutive Wednesday evenings at 273 Madison Street, Apt. 3A (Lower East Side), New York. Take D train to E. Broadway sta.

ATTEND THE YSL SUMMER CAMP—SEPT. 6-11

Socialist Education—Recreation—Comradeship

At Genoa City, Wisc. Fill out and send in the blank below.

YSL—c/o Meier
5426 S. Maryland
Chicago 15, Ill.

I would like to register now for the YSL camp.
 \$5 deposit enclosed. Please bill me for \$5 deposit.
 I may attend the camp; please send me brochure.
 (Make checks payable to D. Meier or Young Socialist League.)

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE..... STATE.....

Registration for one for couple

Shachtman Assails Gov't Witchhunt at ISL Meeting

Speaking last Thursday at the New York public meeting organized by the ISL and Young Socialist League on the passport case victory, Max Shachtman, national chairman of the ISL, tore into the reactionary civil-liberties policies of the Washington administration and underlined the importance of the fight that the Independent Socialists are making against the attorney general's "subversive list" system. Over a hundred attend-

"We have won an outstanding victory in the fight to preserve democratic rights in the U.S.," he began, "But," he added, "it is important to know also that the excellent decision of the Court of Appeals . . . was not the beginning of this fight, and is far from the end. It is a stage in a fight that began long ago and that still has a long way to go before we can celebrate the big victory."

Shachtman sketched the development of the case from three years ago and described the tactics of the Passport Division under its "malicious, spiteful, arrogant archetype of the insufferable petty bureaucratic tyrant," Mrs. Shipley, and then analyzed the content of the court decision which hit the State Department.

He continued:

"I said it was an outstanding victory, but not the big one."

"The fact is: I have no passport! . . . Meanwhile I am a prisoner in my own land. I am learning a lot during the term of my sentence:

"The power of bureaucracy is infinite, or almost. It can stall, procrastinate, sabotage. It can thwart democratic rights without direct violation of law and regulation. It can exhaust the patience of the ordinary person. It can in-

timidate the humble and timid person who shuns publicity. It can silence persons in sensitive situations."

In "many, many cases" the State Department met no resistance to its bureaucratic policy for these reasons. Hence all the greater importance of the fact that the ISL fought back, for all such victims.

Giving sweeping credit to the aid of the Workers Defense League and its indefatigable secretary Rowland Watts, to attorney Joseph L. Rauh, and to Norman Thomas, Shachtman pointed out that so many of those who are belatedly hailing the "victory for democracy" never stirred a finger to make it possible.

"We started the fight. We did it without a penny and at first with hardly a friend. We showed our courage and per-

severance, our refusal to be intimidated and silenced by picayune tyrants, or even big ones. We showed our doggedness and stamina, our refusal to be worn out by the long fight, and the longer one to come. We are headed now for the fight against the subversive listing."

He followed with an account of the latest developments on the last-mentioned fight (see story elsewhere in this issue), promising, "We're going through with the hearing, even if the procedure is preposterous, arbitrary and ectoplastic. And if we get no justice and satisfaction there, we will go further, as far as we can, and we will not let up until we win."

Then Shachtman discussed the political bases and context of the government's persecution, concluding with the section which is published below.

Our 'Crime': Why They Persecute Socialists

Conclusion of Speech By Max Shachtman On the Passport Victory

Let everybody know why it is that we are really being persecuted in this outrageous way.

Our "crime" is socialism—nothing else, absolutely nothing else.

All this talk about "force and violence" is fraudulent from start to finish. All this talk about our being a "Communist" organization is sly, malicious and underhanded—a vicious and cunning attribution to us of something which is horrendous in the mind of everybody decent. But we won't budge from our principles.

Our "crime" is nothing more than this: that we want a world where all can enjoy the plenty which is at hand, and not suffer from the waste that is criminally and intentionally and organizedly perpetrated against the needs of the people of the world, the people of the United States included.

Our crime is that we passionately desire a world of peace, in which we can enjoy all those wondrous things that the wondrous advances of modern science already assure us of, and that we hate and work against the cold-blooded devastation of the world that is being organized and planned instead.

It is that we have a passion that is unquenchable for equality and brotherhood, and a hatred for the system of master and slave, oppressor and oppressed, the one above and the one below.

Our crime is that we won't support either of the two big imperialist camps that have kept the world in a state of unendurable tension ever since the end of the Second World War. We won't support either imperialism, won't support their war preparations, won't support their war. We have said so—we have said so to their face—that is our crime.

Our crime is that we are not State Department socialists like some are; and we are not Kremlin State Department socialists either, like some are.

THE CRIME OF LOYALTY

Our crime is that we hold up to humanity, to everyone within the reach of our voice or our pen, the idea of the Third Camp, the third way, the way of the peoples who seek peace and freedom—freedom from Stalinist totalitarianism and freedom from this outworn, outlived, obsolete capitalist exploitation.

Our crime is not the disloyalty that they charge us with. Our crime is loyalty—our unshatterable loyalty to the people and their interests, their true interests as we see it; our loyalty to democracy which they trample on so cynically, so brutally—to freedom, to the great noble ideal of socialism, and not to capitalism, to which we have no loyalty, none whatsoever.

And all of these "crimes" of which we are so proud, we have proved them in our words and we have proved them in our deeds. What matters if they say you are totalitarian because you are in favor of this or you are in favor of that, when everything we do, everything we speak for, everything we fight for, everything we suffer for, everything we endure, is for a principle, the tenets of democracy, the rule of the people.

Everyone here knows how easy it is nowadays to conform, to conform to the prevailing hysteria, to conform to the prevailing fear, to conform to the prevailing directions and instructions from

the state, which seeks to dominate the lives of us all; to conform to the philosophy and practices of the reaction, to conform at best to the philosophy and practices of conservatism, of timid fearful conservatism, and timid fearful shame-faced liberalism. How easy it is to do that, how safe it is, how respectable—how easy it is to purchase comfort, even a tenuous and precarious comfort by selling your principles; and selling your conscience, and selling your duty to society, your social obligation, that is, your obligation to your fellow man. How easy it is to buy security for yourself as an individual, as an atom divorced from your social responsibility nowadays.

Our fight was not for a passport for Shachtman. Believe me, Shachtman and anybody else here can live, and a long time, without a passport and without traveling to Europe, even though it is an outrage. With such outrages one can live. There are far greater outrages, and far greater perils to the mind and body nowadays than that.

OUTRAGES

But we fought for what was involved there which was infinitely more than the passport and in that we fought for everybody, and everybody who now enjoys the right to a passport in part owes it to our fight. We demand the credit for that because in demanding the credit we demand recognition of our fight for democratic rights, nothing more. We demand recognition of where we stand in reality, not the malicious caricature of our position that is imputed to us.

The decision of the Court of Appeals is invaluable not only in the passport case; it is invaluable tomorrow in the fight against the same thing for civil service employees, and for teachers, who by the Pineberg Law in New York State are disqualified from working if only they are members of an organization listed by the attorney general—think of that outrage! How much greater is that outrage, how much greater in the light of the decision of the Appeals Court that we won.

We won by our persistency. Think of how that now affects the human beings—

that is what they are, the human beings, the men, the women, the husbands, the wives, the kids—who are coldly evicted from government housing because they don't take an oath, that shameful and degrading procedure, that they are not members of an organization listed by the attorney general seven years ago—a list against which there has never been any appeal, and on which there has never even been a hearing, not by a higher body but by the attorney general's office itself.

SOLDIERS' RIGHTS

In factories now: These absolutely shameless hypocrites, these Uriah Heeps, continue to contend that the subversive list, as the attorney general's office says, was only for screening government employees; "we know of nothing else" it claims. But the National Association of Manufacturers in its publications, the Chambers of Commerce in their publications, who are not hiring government employees at all but only hiring ordinary human beings who are not working for the government—they print the subversive list for the "guidance" of their members. What guidance? for what members? For regular factories that have nothing to do with government employees!

And everybody knows how people have suffered: we know them by the dozens in our tiny little organization. How many more are there!

And see how valuable this Appeals Court decision is for soldiers. For soldiers—here it is almost impossible to talk; I choke up with anger when I think of it. Here people are yanked away from society without asking them so much as by-your-leave, torn out of the society which isn't too grand for them to live in under the best of circumstances and into the barracks, into a world they never made and never want to live in; and are prepared for a war that they shrink in horror from; and sent into wars about which they have nothing to say. And socialists that they are, they conduct themselves like men, not like whimpering cowards, and they do their duty as they are supposed to—not one, but dozens.

I know many of our comrades—our own young comrades, splendid figures of

men, revolutionists to the core, fine people, the best there are, none better—and some martinet drags them out of the ranks—someone with the heart and shriveled soul of a stoolpigeon—and brings them up before a military court for a hearing, for a trial. Why? What have they done which is bad in the army? Did they spit in the eye of a colonel? Have they dirtied the barracks? Have they refused any military duty? Are they AWOL? Have they violated any law in the army? None; not charged with it.

They are charged with only one thing. They were — before they entered the service, before they entered the service —members of an organization listed by the attorney general as subversive.

We have one comrade—he's still our comrade even though he is not a member formally now—in Korea, who was in the fighting there, a hero by anybody's standards, including the army's, who was given a special medal, not for being a rifleman but for heroism above and beyond the call of duty in the battle. And he's up on charges—because before, he was pulled into the army he was a member of the Socialist Youth League.

How far can you go with this monstrosity? Nothing else charged against him! And he is only one of many who have to go through this incredible procedure.

THIS DIGNITY

That is what we are fighting against, and things like that. We are fighting for the very opposite of that, and we invite you to join our fight, and not to stand any longer on the sidelines, where you have no business being, where you have no right to be. All of us have in us—all of us—the power to realize human dignity, to walk the earth as men liberated from all fetters and all terrors, physical and intellectual as well. This dignity, this freedom: they are not the distant stars that only later generations can see or be guided by; they are for us, now, for us now. In this swamp in which we live, surrounded by all these horrors though we are, they are for us now, for each one of us, who knows that to live them is to have them.

When the ruling classes and their clerks usurp our natural rights—the rights that we have conquered—the rights that our forebears conquered—all over the world and in this country as well, and we sit by in silent acquiescent weakness, cowed, looking over our shoulders timidly at every noise we hear, it's not merely they that have taken our rights from us, but we who have cravenly surrendered them.

But if we act with manliness, because we are men, men who love all the precious things that a full life holds for all of us, then no ruling class can take from us what is ours and what should be ours.

So let us act in unison and in union, and under an open banner, our banner, our ISL banner, our YSL banner, the banner of Democratic, internationalist socialist liberty. Let's challenge the usurper, the witchhunters, the blacklisters, the warmongers, the careerists; and all of their apologists, who are more numerous than the others. Let's leave no infamy un denounced, and no violation of our rights unresisted.

It is in such a battle fought without fear, as we have tried to fight it, fought with pugnacious intensity, as we have tried to fight it, that we and all of us can find, not in the hazy future but today and tomorrow, the dignity and liberty that is our true goal.

Socialist Party Weekly Hails Victory

The Reading *Labor Advocate*, Socialist Party organ in Pennsylvania, editorialized on the Shachtman passport case in its July 15 issue:

"When the federal Court of Appeals ruled unanimously on June 23 against the government in the Shachtman passport case, and upheld the right to travel as a 'natural right' which can only be abridged by 'due process of law' and not by the decree of any bureaucrat, it made a far-reaching decision for freedom."

"Americans who may never have heard of Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, owe him and the Workers Defense League, who fought his case to its victorious conclusion, a vote of thanks for preserving a freedom they always assumed was unqualified."

"Shachtman was denied a passport because of his membership and activity in an organization listed by the attorney general as 'subversive.' No such charge was made against Shachtman personally, certainly not in a Court of Law. The directive denying his passport came from a bureau, nay, an individual in the State Department—purely a bureaucratic decision negating a long tradition of freedom-loving Americans."

"This, the most recent case, is only one in a long line of denials and revocations by the State Department. *Advocate* readers will remember the Bergman case of two years ago and a host of others."

"The implication that the Court of Appeals decision opens the path to an attack upon the subversive list itself is obvious even though the two matters are separate legal matters."

Ridgway Bombs U.S. Foreign Policy — —

(Continued from page 1)

this year when he stated to the House Armed Services Committee that a cut of 140,000 in armed manpower would "jeopardize" the nation's security. It was this open attack on administration military policy and practice which led to his forced "retirement" as army chief of staff and therefore as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on June 30.

If Ridgway's differences with the administration were merely the product of the parochial and particular self-interest of one branch of the military, nothing more would need be said. Rivalries between the different branches of the armed forces are nothing new.

But Ridgway's views transcend the provincial appetites of a general lusting after more troops for the sake of more prestige and power. Ridgway justifies his demand for a larger army on the grounds of a broad concept of "balanced forces" needed to meet the world challenge of Russian power. From this perspective of a general political and military analysis, he attacks with devastating logic the administration's doctrine of "limited atomic war", with its main reliance on the retaliatory power of air-nuclear weapons.

General Ridgway's views (and we can be sure they are shared by a considerable group of the military in the Pentagon, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Security Council) are stated in a farewell letter addressed to Defense Secretary Wilson. The full text of this document has not been published, but its chief points are embodied in a story appearing in the N.Y. Times of July 15 under the by-line of that paper's Washington correspondent, Anthony Leviero.

IN THE VACUUM

Two aspects of this "letter," which bears the solemn title "My View of the Role of A Military Adviser," are worth discussing before getting to Ridgway's views.

First of all, Ridgway defends his insubordination by claiming that the administration is illegitimately trying to defend its new military policy by presenting it to the American people as the unanimous judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Of course, basically Ridgway is engaging in a piece of sophistry, since it is the business of the civil authorities to make policy decisions. But without realizing it, Ridgway calls attention to an ominous fact about American political life.

The real discussions and decisions about American foreign policy and its military consequences are taking place behind closed doors.

The opposition party, the Democratic party, does not "oppose" the administration, but in fact is outdoing the Eisenhower regime in calling for more and more planes. This has indeed become the political trademark of Democratic Senator Stuart Symington, air-force secretary under President Truman.

Because of the political vacuum, because no public discussion on this life-and-death question for the American people is taking place, General Ridgway has been compelled to step forward and use the pages of the N.Y. Times in order to call public attention to the controversy raging between the ad-

ministration and one section of the military brass.

The "democratic process" in the United States is taking a strange form these days. The generals insist on a public discussion of policy while the politicians try to keep everybody quiet.

What are Ridgway's views?

The American military establishment and its European adjunct NATO are being reshaped to give top priority to air-nuclear power. This is the practical consequence of the doctrine of limited atomic war, the heir and offspring of "massive retaliation." This strategy, says General Ridgway, is stupid, unrealistic and self-defeating from both a military and political point of view.

AGAINST A-BOMB STRATEGY

In the first place, says General Ridgway, "As the point of time approaches, possibly between 1958 and 1962, when Soviet nuclear weapons and delivery developments will give the Communist bloc the capability of inflicting critical damage on the United States war-making potential, coupled with a concurrent improvement of Soviet air defense capability, the United States nuclear air superiority will have lost most of its present significance."

The military consequence of this, says the general, is that "In a situation of nuclear plenty, mutual cancellation of nuclear advantage can occur in terms of mutual devastation; or depending on the degree of parity, in terms of mutually limited use; or, finally, in common refusal to use nuclear weapons at all."

In the light of these developments what is Russian military and political strategy going to be? Ridgway makes the following observations:

(1) So long as the United States has superiority, the Russians will not initiate the use of nuclear

weapons when war breaks out but limit themselves to retaliation as a means of crippling American war-making potential.

(2) The Russians are not interested in winning as the prize of war "a vast ash heap of devastated animal life, or of a human race debilitated by the effects of radiation." This means, says Ridgway, that the Russian strategists "are even now giving consideration to a course of action which would put on the United States the onus of initiating the use of military nuclear power. . ."

From both a military and political point of view, concludes Ridgway, "It is at least debatable whether the United States really has the freedom to rely preponderantly on nuclear weapons to exert its military power."

POLITICS PRIMARY

Nothing need be added to General Ridgway's sober analysis of Russian intentions and American military strategy except one point which he is careful to avoid since it would have been a direct and scathing attack on the major premise of administration policy. That is, is it even possible to wage a "limited atomic war?" By implication, Ridgway says no, but nevertheless he allows for the possibility. However, let us adduce the example of Formosa to test this strategy.

If the United States had decided to defend the off-shore islands it would have had to use atom bombs against the Chinese mainland to cripple the Chinese Stalinist air force, shipping, artillery and troop concentrations and movement. But the Chinese Stalinists have already declared they would retaliate with atomic bombs, which they possess. Would Russia have stood aside in case of a successful atomic attack on its Chinese allies? A minor atomic war could have soon taken on major proportions.

Despite the flair for political

analysis revealed by General Ridgway (or his ghost writer) in his reading of Russian intentions, he demonstrates all the limitations of the bourgeois military mind when it comes to offering his own solution.

The Russians prefer to wage war with conventional arms and to exploit what Ridgway calls "political subversion." He cites the examples of China, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Malaya, Korea and Indonesia. But what this means, as these examples of civil war and colonial struggles for national independence show is that the struggle against Russian power is primarily a political struggle.

RIDGWAY'S ANSWER

And Ridgway's solution? A mobile, flexible, balanced military force of the "free world," ready to meet the Russian challenge at any given point when the need arises. To a political challenge, he gives a military answer.

Ridgway declares that "In view of the free world's appreciable manpower superiority over the Communist bloc, and of the economic potential of the United States, it is my view that the free world has ample resources to confront the Soviet bloc enemy in whatever form of aggression the Soviets choose." Let us grant American economic superiority, but what about the "free world's appreciable manpower superiority?"

The fifteen NATO nations have a much larger population than Russia and her European satellites. Nevertheless, NATO from the very beginning has been unable to find the manpower needed to fight a war without nuclear weapons. And here we come to the mystery of the Eisenhower predilection for the use of air-nuclear strategy.

NO SUBSTITUTE

It is not merely for technical military reasons generated by the existence of such new weapons, nor is it merely because such a strategy is cheaper, but because the United States and its allied governments have been unable to generate any enthusiasm among their peoples for a third world war.

The French workers and peasants saw no connection between dying in Indo-China yesterday and French North Africa today and defending democracy against Stalinist totalitarianism. The German workers and middle class see no reason why Germany should be denied her national unity and the country turned into a slaughter ground to defend the United States in the first stages of an H-bomb war.

Precisely because Stalinism can exploit national independence movements in Asia, and because the United States cannot win the political support of the West European masses, the world strategy of American imperialism has been driven in the direction of air-nuclear warfare.

General Ridgway sees the madness of this solution, but then, what can he replace it with? Large mobile armies that exist only in his own imagination. It is a poor substitute for politics.

The trouble, in fact, is that, unlike a deeper military thinker, Clausewitz, Ridgway does not understand that war is simply the continuation of politics by other means.

WDL Appeals for Funds

In the wake of the national publicity gained for its historic work in the Shachtman passport case, and in view of the start of the second phase of the ISL case against the attorney general's "subversive list," the Workers Defense League has sent out appeals for financial contributions to aid this important civil-liberties work, over the signatures of Rowland Watts, national secretary of the WDL, and Norman Thomas, member of the WDL's National Executive Board.

The letter now being circulated by the WDL follows.

Dear Friend:

I am sure you are as happy as we are over the tremendous victory achieved by the Workers Defense League in the Max Shachtman Passport Case. The Court of Appeals has finally and definitively repudiated the State Department's claim of arbitrary control over the right of all of us to travel. Whether Dulles appeals the decision to the Supreme Court or not it is hard to see how he can continue to assert this right.

The Passport Case, however, is only one half of the story. The other half is the attorney general's list itself. From the beginning we have challenged its validity and have tried to secure hearings for a few of the organizations which in our opinion are neither Communist nor subversive. The case which we have been most aggressively pushing has been that of the Independent Socialist League. After almost seven years of effort we have finally secured a hearing for this organization. In connection with this hearing, we need your help.

We regard this case as one of the most important in the fight for civil liberties and in accord with the many other cases the WDL is now handling in loyalty, security and immigration fields—all of them stemming from the evils of the attorney general's list.

The hearing granted to the ISL is the

first we know of by the attorney general and we have been fortunate in obtaining the services of Attorney Joseph L. Rauh of Washington. Mr. Rauh is chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action and Washington counsel of the United Automobile Workers. The total cost of research, legal preparations, and other work attendant upon such a case will run to \$5,000.

You know, of course, that the WDL is heavily engaged in all kinds of cases with little or no financial assistance, except that given to it voluntarily by its friends and people sympathetic with its fight for civil liberties and civil rights in this country.

We are now setting up a committee on the case of the ISL. This committee will publicize the case and raise funds to finance it. However, until this committee is fully organized and functioning, we need to appeal for funds now so that the work on the case may begin at once.

We are therefore calling upon you to make your contributions to the WDL direct or to the person presenting this appeal to you.

You will be fully advised on all developments of the case as they occur.

Fraternally yours,

ROWLAND WATTS, Secy.

NORMAN THOMAS, NEB, WDL

Geneva Conference — —

(Continued from page 1)

Germany on the American camp. Nothing of the sort has happened. Instead, it is the NATO powers which have seemed to be pushing for German unification as the key to the solution of the "disarmament" and other problems, while the Russians at the conference have taken an almost indifferent attitude toward the question of German unification. The NATO powers have shown such anxiety on the question that both Prime Minister Eden and Premier Faure have displeased their American allies by making proposals which appear to put the future of NATO in question.

OTHER FISH TO FRY

What accounts for the position the Stalinists have taken at the conference?

For one thing, it appears that the Russian rulers feel they have made enough gestures, for the time being, to appear in the eyes of the world as reasonable, peace-loving, amicable people. Now, their theme is, it is time for the American bloc to perform some "deeds" in exchange.

Another factor relating specifically to West Germany, however, may be far more important. This has been the evident increase, in significant and powerful form, of opposition inside the Adenauer bloc which rules Germany to the

inclusion of West Germany into NATO. As reported last week in LABOR ACTION, West Germany's leading conservative newspaper, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* has come out strongly against the NATO orientation. This, taken together with other developments, shows that the Social Democrats have now been joined by a powerful section of the German bourgeoisie in their opposition to the freezing of the German situation in its present mold.

It appears that the Stalinist leaders have concluded that it is to their interest to test the possibilities inherent in this development. Adenauer has agreed to open negotiations in Moscow some time this fall. Up till now his position has been based firmly on the NATO alliance. But if the solid bourgeois support which forms his base has begun to crumble significantly under him, he may not be as firm in the fall as he was in the spring and summer. And even if he should remain adamant, neither the man himself nor his power in Germany are indestructible.

CRACKS IN THE WEST

Other factors also enter into the equation on which the Stalinists seem to be working. Significant differences in approach have already been revealed between Britain and France on the one hand,

and the United States on the other at this conference. Up till now, these have been differences based on fundamental agreement that NATO and the inclusion of West-Germany therein are untouchable for the present. The British and French, however, have shown a greater readiness than the Americans to speculate on the possibility of some future revamping of NATO into a wider, all-European "security" system.

The Stalinists may well be thinking along the following lines: If direct negotiations between the Russian and West German governments for some kind of a deal should prove promising in the future, how much wider might these differences between the United States and her European allies become? Obviously, even the possibility that West Germany might slip out of the NATO alliance in exchange for a German-Russian unification deal would create a major crisis for all governments in the NATO bloc. Is it excluded that the French, for instance, might feel compelled to seek "security" in some other arrangement?

EXPECTATIONS DIM

If the Stalinist tactic of delay and indifference at this conference on the question of German unification is indeed based on such considerations (and it is difficult to imagine any other reason for their failure to seek to make propaganda-capital at Geneva on the German question), there would appear to be little reason to expect any significant approach to a reduction of the pace of the arms race to come from this conference.

The Stalinists continue to tie their proposals on arms reduction to a withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of Europe. In Bulganin's opening speech, he placed special emphasis on this condition. This is utterly unacceptable to the United States at the present time.

Further, it would appear that a development with respect to Germany along the lines sketched above would tend to intensify the arms race rather than to permit its slowing down. The United States, threatened with the loss of a firm, armed ally in West Germany, would be compelled to try to compensate for such loss with a vast increase in its own military establishment.

IN SPITE OF SMILES

It should be emphasized, at this point, that the above analysis of the Stalinist position on Germany at this conference, and of the political developments in Germany on which it may be based, has nothing fixed or final about it. Adenauer, with strong American support, may be able to retain his position for a long time to come. Any number of factors could arise to make a German-Russian deal impossible, chief among them being the price the Stalinists would no doubt demand for giving up East Germany if, indeed, there is any price big enough for them.

The only thing which appears fairly certain at the moment, however, is that the factors which have led to widespread hope that the time has been reached when some kind of an important and far-reaching "settlement" of the cold war is at hand have failed to counterbalance, even temporarily, the imperialist interests which divide the world and threaten it with nuclear devastation.

In the first two days at Geneva, both sides have appeared with smiles and polite phrases, rather than with mutual recriminations for the benefit of the galleries: the peoples of the world. Nothing which has yet happened seems to indicate that these are even the smiles of imperialist rivals who have managed to work out a deal among themselves at the expense of the weaker peoples of the world, even though such a deal is generally speaking entirely possible within the framework of the cold war.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Court on Guild Case — —

(Continued from page 1)

Miller and Danaher, "says the rules of procedure are fatally defective in a number of concrete respects. But the rules do provide the features of hearing, etc., we have described, and so we think they meet the basic tests which are sufficient premise for a requirement that the remedy be exhausted. Some features of the rules do give pause. Such, for example, are the provisions eliminating, in the discretion of the hearing officer, oral testimony, with its concomitant cross-examination, and accepting affidavits in lieu thereof; the provision that the hearing officer may dispense with the taking of evidence; and the provision that an 'evasive' reply to an interrogatory 'shall' be deemed an admission of the facts to which the interrogatory 'refers.' But we think answers to the problems posed by such provisions must await a case in which they have been applied..."

The case which is thus "awaited" is, one can predict quite certainly, going to be the precedent-making case of the Independent Socialist League, depending on the outcome of the hearing reported on page 1.

HITS INTERROGATORIES

Another passage dealt with the nature of the interrogatories submitted by Brownell to the Guild, for (judging by what is said) these interrogatories appear to be as fantastic in many respects as the interrogatories addressed to the ISL. The court wrote:

"The Guild also attacks the Interrogatories submitted to it. Some further revision of these questions is probably in order. For example, some of the amended questions appear to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, of answer. The Guild says it had at times some thirty chapters and several thousand members, many of whom no longer belong to it. A few of the interrogatories are: No. 60, 'To your knowledge has . . . any . . . chapter of the NLG ever permitted the use of its mailing list to any other organization?' No. 64, 'Has the NLG or any of the . . . chapters thereof, passed an anti-Communist or anti-Soviet Union resolution since 1946?' No. 49, ' . . . have you reason to believe that any of the . . . past members of any . . . chapter of the NLG . . . ever has been [a] . . . member of the CP. . . ?' 'If so, identify each of them. . . ' No. 50, ' . . . have you reason to believe that . . . any . . . chapter . . . ever furnished information to the *Daily Worker* . . . on any occasion when such

information was not likewise furnished to other newspapers or news services?' The foregoing are by way of example only. We do not intend a critical analysis. We think the proper place to test these Interrogatories in the first instance is before the administrative body. We cannot anticipate the administrative action, if such a step were taken, any more than we can anticipate the outcome of the proceeding itself. Some modifications have already been made, and we cannot now say that others will not be made if specific application is made."

WARNING

In the case of both passages, the court, it would seem, is going some distance out of its strictly necessary way in order to warn the attorney general against some grosser violations of sense and democracy in the administrative procedures which it has set up, and which at some time will be tested in the courts.

Attorneys for the Guild were Osmond K. Fraenkel and Joseph Forer.

The reason why the Guild argued that it did not have to go through the administrative procedures first are (as summarized by the court): "that the attorney general has prejudged the matter, no statute authorized the procedure, there is no constitutional basis for the executive action, irreparable injury would ensue from pursuing the remedy, the procedure violates the requirements of due process, and the Executive Order (No. 10450) is void for lack of definite standards."

Complete Story of ISL Hearing on 'Subversive List'

will be carried in next week's issue. Although LA comes off the press on Thursday, it will, thanks to special arrangements, present a detailed account of the government's case up to and including the Wednesday session.

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

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

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2. New
 - 6 months at \$1. Renewal
 - Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

ZONE STATE

CITY