

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

ISL's Washington Hearing:
**BURNHAM PHILOSOPHIZES
ON HOW TO SMEAR AND LIE**

... page 6

San Francisco Convention:
NAACP Plans for the Fight Ahead

... page 2

In Britain:
Hanging and the House of Lords

... page 3

JULY 23, 1956

FIVE CENTS

**SPOT-
LIGHT**

NEHRU-TITO-NASSER AT BRIONI: The 1½ Camp and the Third Camp

Old Stand

As the leaderships of the world Communist Parties, after making their gesture of "criticizing" Khrushchev, crawl back to Moscow's warm lap with statements approving the Central Committee statement—and "unreservedly" at that—our own *Daily Worker* also snaps back to its accustomed ways.

Its managing editor Alan Max, who was one of the first breast-beaters back in March when William Z. Foster was still dragging his feet instead of using them to jump on Stalin, had an article last Tuesday defending the democracy that is being demonstrated at the current session of the Supreme Soviet.

He had been hoping, of course, that the Russians would give them a break by staging something real democratic, like (say) a speech by a deputy from Novosibirsk violently objecting to the syntax of any of the decrees that had been prepared for automatic passage. There is really no inherent reason why, particularly under present circumstances, the Russians couldn't afford at least a phony gesture, if only in order to make it possible for Isaac Deutscher and his school to hail the breakneck tempo of democratization from above.

But nothing of the sort has happened. So Alan Max explains, in the July 17 DW.

It's simple: unlike Congress, the Supreme Soviet gets things done. Who says that democracy is measured by "the amount of talk"? Look at the "actual accomplishments"—

"Take Saturday's session of the Supreme Soviet, for example. The Council of Nationalities, the upper house, met for 35 minutes in the morning. The Council of the Union, the lower house, met for 40 minutes in the afternoon. In these few minutes, the pension bill was voted unanimously [etc., etc., etc.] . . ."

"Permit me to point out that here we have a mass of legislation to protect the working people. It is passed quickly, quietly and without debate. . . ."

No fuss, no muss, no feathers, no talk, no squawk. They're their old selves once more, and isn't it nice to be able to talk like gruff totalitarians again without all the bother of keeping the snarl from showing?

Egghead

We missed Max Ascoli's editorial in the June 28 *Reporter*, and want to make up for it now. It was called "The Second Act of God," is about Eisenhower's *Lead*, and explains why this liberal journal plumps for Stevenson.

The reason you should vote for Stevenson, says Ascoli, is because there's no difference between him and Eisenhower.

"There is profound similarity between Eisenhower's and Stevenson's basic beliefs, far more important than any differ-

(Continued on page 4)

By PHILIP COBEN

The big three of the One-and-a-Half Camp are scheduled to meet this week in Brioni, Yugoslavia.

Nehru of India likes to call it "non-alignment." Tito of Yugoslavia likes to call it "active coexistence." Nasser of Egypt likes to call it "third force." Others use the more common label "neutralism." In anticipation of their deliberations, we would like to state some opinions about this tendency.

Whatever the name, it is the politics of trying to stand *between* the two great war camps in order to reconcile them with each other and everyone else. That is why it is by no means a third camp or third force; its reason for existence is to try to stand between No. 1 and No. 2.

It is the very opposite of another policy which stands outside the two war camps, outside the one led by the Russians and outside the one led by the capitalist powers of the West: namely, the policy that urges unremitting opposition to both, as rival imperialisms seeking to dominate the rest of the world.

The neutralists typically present themselves as, and often act as, the friends of both war camps—and also as the whitewashers and apologists of both. (That is why Nehru, for example, is often mistaken for pro-Moscow, given the atmosphere in this country.)

They are not against both war blocs.

They work hard to avoid the impression that they wish ill to either. They want to be the bridge between them. They equate "peacemaking" with sowing illusions impartially about the intentions and nature of either type of imperialist.

That is why we do not recommend building any hopes on the Brioni trio.

WHAT IS PEACE?

There are some who may be willing to overlook the fact that Tito is himself a totalitarian despot in a national-Stalinist type of regime, because they like to think he is a "force for peace."

There are some who may prefer to ignore that Nasser is a military dictator who throttles labor and socialism at home, saber-rattles in his own region, and is against coexistence with his own neighbor Israel, because they would like to view him as a "force for peace."

There are some who would make excuses for the erstwhile disciple of Gandhi, Nehru, whose government has



NEHRU

shot down more unarmed demonstrators than any other in the world; because they believe him to be a "force for peace."

But even if we can forget these things when this bloc of not-very-democratic statesmen talk of being "against blocs," there is the crux of the matter which cannot be put aside. That is: what their idea of peace is.

If the rival imperialist colossi make a deal to coexist, that is peace, for them.

(Turn to last page)

THE POTS ARE STILL BOILING, BUT WE EXPECT:

CPs Won't Break with Moscow

By GORDON HASKELL

If ever additional proof were needed of the subservience to the Russian bureaucracy of the leadership of the Stalinist parties throughout the world, the last few weeks have rendered it full measure, beaten down, and running over.

For one month, really one foreshortened month, the leadership of one Stalinist party after another was permitted to strut its little stuff, preen itself on its independence, and shake a finger at big brother. For the first time in thirty years there was public criticism of the Russian government and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by leaders of the parties abroad. This period of "independent criticism" lasted from June 4, when the American government first released the text of Khrushchev's speech on Stalin, till June 30, when the Central Committee of the CPSU issued its "explanation" and warning to vassal parties all over the world.

The indecent haste with which the leadership of one party after another rushed to give assurances of its unshaken and

unshakable servility to Moscow bids fair to cancel out whatever public-relations value the original criticisms may have had.

The leadership of the British Communist Party, for instance, which on June 21 had demanded "a profound Marxist analysis of the causes of degeneration in the functioning of Soviet democracy and party democracy," on July 15 stated that "we warmly welcome the resolution of June 30 of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union on 'Overcoming the Cult of the Individual and its Consequences' . . . The injustices and crimes of that period caused great harm to the cause of socialism and to the interests of the Soviet

people, but it is not true, as the enemies of Communism allege, that they arose from the nature of the Soviet social system or that they fundamentally changed its character.

"Political power and the means of production were firmly in the hands of the working people. Socialism was established in the Soviet Union and proved itself superior to capitalism in peace and war."

The French, American and other Stalinist leaderships expressed themselves in the same vein. Palmirio Togliatti, leader of the powerful Italian CP, who had asked the most pointed and searching questions and who was rebuked by name in the resolution of the Moscow bureaucrats, hastened also to express his satisfaction with the reply, while protesting that his earlier statement had been misunderstood.

STILL FERMENT

Does all this mean that the voices raised by the various CP leaderships were merely part of some kind of plot, that they had no political significance worth

(Turn to last page)

The NAACP Plans For the Fight Ahead

By CHARLES WALKER

San Francisco, July 1

With its head in San Francisco and its heart in Montgomery, Alabama, the 47th Annual Convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People pursued its deliberations from June 26 to June 31 in the Civic Auditorium here.

This "Montgomery Convention," meeting at a fateful moment in the upsurge of the Negro community for full first-class citizenship, was attended by 532 full delegates and 479 alternates, observers and fraternal delegates representing some 300,000 members from 1392 units in 43 states and Alaska.

With an over-all tone of militancy in all speeches at evening mass meetings, afternoon workshops and in the resolutions adopted during the two days of business meetings, the convention can be looked upon as a qualified success. The NAACP is at a historical turning point, where it must decide how best to employ its burgeoning mass membership in community, political and legal activities to implement the May 1954 Supreme Court decision on school desegregation—equivalent to a Wagner Act for the efforts of the Negro community toward full integration.

The general position of the convention was to stress increased utilization of past techniques, ranging from more support to political "friends" and opposition to enemies (especially in 60 key congressional and senatorial areas), to increased legal pressure, and a hesitant but hopeful attitude toward such mass activities as the Montgomery and Tallahassee passive-resistance and economic boycott.

In this sense, the NAACP has taken a step forward, especially in Montgomery and Tallahassee, aligning itself with mass activities growing up outside of itself in today's more favorable civil-rights climate. Its vital support to Montgomery and its leadership in Tallahassee (through an NAACP branch president) are great contributions.

It is this new movement from below which placed its stamp on the NAACP convention this year, and which captured the imagination and heart of the Negro and white delegates in San Francisco.

POLITICS STRESSED

If Martin Luther King was the indisputable hero of the hour, there was also a strong response to other heroes like Mrs. Rosa Parks, Autherine Lucy Foster, Gus Courts, and E. L. Blackman, the NAACP president in Ellmore, S. C. who attended a Klan meeting in an open field at night, alone, to say that he wouldn't be driven out of town by the Klan for signing a petition for integration in the local schools.

The other "unique" feature of the convention was its political emphasis, to be expected in an election year, but perhaps with more far-reaching portents for the future. "If politics can be used for increasing corporation profits, there is nothing wrong with using politics to secure human rights," Roy Wilkins said in his concluding address to the convention. "Everyone else tries to use politics for his benefit; you use it for yours. Don't stammer and don't apologize. Use your vote in behalf of civil rights."

In watching the same old appeals for local pressure upon the Republican and Democratic Parties, both of which have an eye on the South, several speakers repeated the theme that both parties were derelict over civil rights. The historic victories won had been won by the Negro community itself, the hard way, and with NAACP backing. Yet it seems as if, election year or not, there will be no civil-rights legislation in this Congress, and that no forthright plank will be adopted at either convention that would read racist politicians out of either party.

Among the highlights of the conven-

tion were the speeches made at evening mass meetings, held prior to, in-between and after the business sessions. These drew between 5000 to 10,000 people, the highest figure on the last day and the concluding address by the Executive Secretary.

Other main addresses were by Thurgood Marshall as keynoter, Martin King (reporting on Alabama), A. Philip Randolph (on Negroes and the labor movement), plus the political spectacle of dual denunciation by Scott and Yates of their opponent's respective Democratic and Republican Parties.

KING'S PHILOSOPHY

King's speech—that of a 27-year-old new national figure in the NAACP—was very well received, as he explained his adherence to the "philosophy of non-violent resistance."

"It is the expression of a new and creative method which might be added to the several methods which we must use to make integration a reality." "Wherever segregation exists we must be willing to rise up in mass and protest courageously against it. I realize that this type of courage means suffering and sacrifice. It might mean going to jail. If such is the case we must honorably fill up the jail houses of the South. It might even lead to physical death. But if such physical death is the price that we must pay to free our children from a life of permanent psychological death, then nothing could be more honorable. This is really the meaning of the method of passive resistance. It confronts physical force, namely soul force."

The strong response to King by this audience reflected more than simply recognition of the effect of economic boycott as practiced in earlier struggles—such as the successful "Don't Spend Your Money Where You Can't Work" Chicago campaign of the 1920s. The positive content of this approach consists in the fact that it involves mass action, not merely court cases.

LABOR AND NEGROES

There is obvious resistance to this new philosophy within the NAACP national leadership, based partly upon the use of traditional legal-work methods, tempered by a more cautious but positive response to it as being one more instrument which was effective under some circumstances but which was not necessarily a general course. There are circumstances, Roy Wilkins said in an interview, where a counter-boycott might be disastrous to the Negro community. The convention itself referred the question back to the national leadership for further review.

A. Philip Randolph made a very strong speech emphasizing the economic basis for segregation in the South, calling upon the Negroes to tie in their lot with the labor movement, with which nine-tenths of all Negroes has a natural alliance in terms of occupation. He cited the AFL-CIO's national support to their cause—however imperfectly implemented—in comparison with the utter absence by any employers' organization of a pro-civil-rights stand.

"Verily, not only will the cause of labor's rights and Negroes' and other minorities' rights be fundamentally served by organized labor and the Negro recognizing their common and mutual interests, but it will help make and keep America strong and free."

Thurgood Marshall's keynote address was a synopsis of what had been done and the lines of future action. He emphasized the determination of the NAACP to go ahead in pressing legal cases in the eight Southern states that remained intransigently opposed to carrying out the

Supreme Court's decision, although negotiations for desegregation advances were possible in the other nine Southern states as a first resort.

He noted the increased support the Negroes were getting in the fight for equality as a result of their progress, but warned that "As this small minority of Southern politicians get smaller and smaller, they become more and more ruthless," and that remaining battles would not be easy.

It is necessary to report briefly also on some important organizational and ideological points raised here which continue to concern the NAACP as its fight goes on.

DEMOCRACY

First, there is the problem of internal democracy, which came upon the floor via an attempt to amend the Constitution so as to re-direct a percentage of funds going directly into the National Office back to the local branches, which generally deduct this amount on the way.

Apart from the relatively non-controversial point itself, it appeared that the convention did not have the authority to amend its Constitution—at least its "National" or "Blue Book" Constitution, as distinct from its "White Book" or branch constitution. Only the National Executive can alter this, if the convention wishes to recommend such a step. (This Board of Directors is selected by referendum vote from the slate named by a Nominating Committee selected by the convention—four votes—and by the Board of Directors—three votes.)

But as a result of the very real accomplishments of the NAACP as the organization of the Negro community in its long struggle for civil rights, and given a change in character of the organization as a result of mass participation and struggles, plus the hopes for an increase of membership to 400,000 by the 1957 Detroit convention, this membership will no doubt be increasingly dissatisfied with the present arrangement. The "top down" character of the NAACP—identical in many ways with other "good cause" liberal organizations—will continue to be a bone of contention, and a target for healthy rank-and-file opposition.

One of the reasons often cited for justifying bureaucratic methods has been the fear of Stalinist infiltration—admittedly a real danger. This was referred to

at length on the convention floor as well as from the platform, and an anti-Communist resolution was amended to provide for the exclusion of members of "Communist-front groups," as well as the CP, Kluxers, and White Citizens Council members. Although less jittery elements on the floor urged dissociation from such groups and careful ward against them, as against exclusion, this amendment was overwhelmingly supported by the delegates following its recommendation from Los Angeles.

A practical and more democratic solution to this problem, given the nature of the NAACP as a non-political mass organization of limited aims (similar to AVC), would be to oppose any positions of influence for Stalinist candidates (as officers, for instance) without excluding any members for beliefs or outside organizational attachments.

YOUTH WORK

Another point that should be mentioned was the convention's failure to adopt a position favoring civil liberties as well as civil rights. With the NAACP itself having to function through a "front group" in Alabama (the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights), because it has been outlawed there, the lesson would appear obvious on the link between the two issues.

Instead the NAACP selected only those narrow points on the civil-liberties front where Negroes are particularly affected, such as the disproportionate firing of janitorial personnel in the government loyalty and security program.

One of the more positive resolutions passed called for an increased emphasis on youth work for future NAACP success:

"Every active branch [is to] establish a youth council by the 48th annual convention of the Association" and "steps [are to] be taken looking forward to the establishment of state conferences of youth councils and college chapters in all states where they do not now exist"—these to have youth advisors on the state level as at the branch-council level.

If implemented, this would alter the present relationship of 251 youth councils and 61 college chapters to 1080 regular branches. In the whole Western states area, for example, there are only two college chapters (one at UCLA) and 23 youth councils, as compared with 75 branches.

The convention, in short, was one by a movement which was looking ahead to growth and accomplishment, though only through a hard and determined fight. It did not think in terms of relaxation, such as took place immediately after the 1954 Supreme Court decision, because the delegates knew that even achievement of the legal goals by 1963 would not be the final victory but only the signal to struggle for full implementation.

Formosa vs. Chiang Kai-shek

We think the following item—entitled "A Formosa Third Force?"—from the *London Economist* (March 17) will interest LABOR ACTION readers, in view of the fact that we stand for self-determination for Formosa (i.e., for the Formosan people, as against the Chiang Kai-shek regime occupying the island). But we do not know anything further about the interesting developments reported.—ED.

The one thing on which Mao Tse-tung and Chiang Kai-shek agree is that the people of Formosa should not be encouraged to ask for self-determination. The seven million Formosans can make out a claim to be distinguished from the mainland Chinese as good as that of, say, the people of Ceylon in relation to India, and have never taken a mainland government to their hearts. There is good reason to believe that, given a free choice, they would opt for independence; their island is more prosperous than the Chinese provinces across the strait; it is more viable than many a small Asian state. In 1947 they rose against the newly installed Nationalist garrison, and although the rising was brutally suppressed the hope of independence was not completely extinguished.

The sizeable community of Formosans in Japan has issued a declaration of independence and inaugurated a government in exile, which draws its "legiti-

macy" from a Formosan congress held in Tokyo last year by the "Democratic Independence Party" headed by the exiled Dr. Liao Tsu-yi. The embarrassed Japanese government explained that it had no power to forbid these activities, although it did prevent the Formosan youth corps from staging a march through Tokyo. Japan's embarrassment is natural, for both Nationalist and Communist Chinese reactions have been sharp. The mainland press has unanimously denounced Dr. Liao as a traitor and his movement as an American plot, and meetings have been held in Peking and Shanghai to warn all Formosans in China against him.

If the Peking government takes the new developments so seriously, it seems strange that they have attracted little attention from the various proponents of Formosan separatism, including the British Labor Party. When the Labor delegation headed by Mr. Attlee visited China in 1953, it took up with Chou En-lai the idea that Formosa might decide its own future, perhaps after a period of international trusteeship. Peking's response was to describe any such idea as "putrid." At the time, there certainly seemed to be no visible foundation on which an independent Formosan policy might be built, for the Nationalists had silenced all local opposition in the island. Do these events in Tokyo alter the prospect?

—Economist

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

LONDON LETTER

Death Penalty for the House of Lords?

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, July 12

The House of Lords, upper chamber of Parliament, is not normally densely populated. In its cathedral-like atmosphere of carved paneling, stained-glass windows and red benches, it is usually difficult to count a muster of 50 peers of the realm. The remainder of their lordships, some 750, are too busy attending to affairs of finance and business, country estates or socialite gatherings to exercise their constitutional right of dabbling in the affairs of state and government.

There are, however, odd occasions when the belted earls, noble lords, bishops and archbishops turn out in force. This happens when the House of Commons, the lower chamber composed of elected representatives, has passed a measure which comes into conflict with the finer feelings of the unelected members of the House of Lords. Then, with the blood of their illustrious ancestors pounding fiercely through their veins, the peers of the realm turn out by the hundreds in an endeavor to frustrate the will of the commoners.

Earlier this week the House of Lords gave a demonstration of its strength and determination on such occasions. Almost half their number attended for two days in order to toss overboard a bill that had survived three readings in the House of Commons and was therefore presented, in accordance with constitutional procedure, to the House of Lords before becoming law.

The bill was the Death Penalty (Abolition) Bill introduced into Parliament last November by Laborite MP Sydney Silverman.

The bill was a Private Member's Bill, which means that it was prepared and piloted through the House of Commons

by Silverman as an individual, to remove the death penalty from the statute book. The government, aware of the feelings on the matter, allowed free-votes in the House of Commons—which means that the government MPs, the Tories, were allowed to vote as their conscience dictated and not in accordance with the feelings of the government itself. Labor MPs also voted without instructions from the party whips.

Because of this free vote the bill got through all its readings in the House of Commons in spite of the fact that it was opposed by the government. Enough Tory MPs were sufficiently opposed to capital punishment to vote with Silverman, and most of the other Laborite members, to push the bill through. Then came the crucial time for it to attempt a passage through the House of Lords.

When observers saw the huge gathering of members in the House of Lords they felt certain that the bill would be defeated—and it was. By 238 votes to 95 the Lords tossed the bill out.

The majority was composed of a queer assortment of peers including the Lord Chief Justice, the Bishop of Rochester, Viscount Montgomery of Alamein (one-time Field Marshal Montgomery of desert warfare fame) and Earl Alexander of Tunis (another wartime army

chief), and an infinite variety of the relics of the old English feudal aristocracy coupled with the more recently created barons of industry.

Although the Lords were exercising a free vote, undirected by party affiliations, the situation that has arisen has once again thrown open the whole question of the role of the House of Lords and its future in British government.

Under the Parliament Act of 1949 a bill passed by the House of Commons but rejected by the Lords becomes law, without further reference to the Lords, if it once again passes through the House of Commons. The question now is: Will the government allow the time and the facilities for the bill to be re-passed through the House of Commons?

DILEMMA

The government is poised on the horns of a dilemma. It has clearly stated, through its spokesmen during the debates in both Houses, that it does not like the bill and advises its rejection. The House of Commons ignored the government's advice and passed the bill. The House of Lords followed the government's advice and rejected the bill. If the government follows the dictum that the wishes of the House of Commons, as an elected chamber, must prevail, it must allow the bill to go through the Commons once again so that it may become law without again going to the Lords. If, because of its dislike of the bill, it does not provide the opportunity for its passage through the Commons, it lays itself wide open to the charge that it is using the House of Lords to override the wishes of the elected chamber.

Sydney Silverman, himself a lawyer and master of the constitutional set-up of Parliament, put the issues clearly in a statement issued after he had seen his bill flattened by the Lords. He said that the government was left to choose between the Lords and the Commons:

"No government in our country has any right to govern without enjoying the confidence of the House of Commons. That is basic to our constitution. The government must therefore constitutionally prefer the Commons' decision to the Lords' decision where they are in conflict, and therefore afford all proper facilities and support under the Parliament Act to see that the House of Commons gets its way. Meanwhile, every execution from now on will take place, if it does take place, in defiance of the considered view of the House of Commons."

So far no word has been forthcoming from the government concerning its intentions. The day after the Lords' decision was known, a cabinet meeting was held at which it is believed the situation was discussed. But no statement has yet been issued.

TO THE SCAFFOLD

Meanwhile the straws in the wind, as indicated by press comment, point to the row that is likely to blow up over the position of the House of Lords. In an editorial comment the *Daily Herald*, Labor's official newspaper, had this to say:

"Bravely, and with touching dignity, the House of Lords marches to the scaffold. By rejecting the bill to abolish capital punishment and once again refusing to bow to the will of the elected Commons, the House of Lords puts its own coronet in the noose. Abolition of the peers' hereditary power of obstruction becomes a live political issue."

The *Herald* said that the constitutional issue was coming to a head and that it was time that the Labor Party worked out its policy:

"To put up with an hereditary House of Lords is obviously nonsensical. But when it is swept away, the arguments for and against the usefulness of a second, revising chamber will need more consideration than Labor has given them."

The current issue of the Bevanite weekly *Tribune* also carries a strong demand for the abolition of the House of Lords. Recalling that the House of Lords has a history which includes fighting for the retention of death by slow torture and strangulation, child labor in mines and factories, the slave

trade and—only a few years ago—flogging, *Tribune* says that its latest action should put *Paid* to all plans to prolong the life of the upper house.

"Labor," says *Tribune*, "must state clearly that the House of Lords has thrown away its last claim to survival. The next election program should include a proposal for its abolition."

Surveying the procession of "the halt, the lame, the deaf, the obscure, the senile and the forgotten—the hereditary peers of England" who gathered to defeat Silverman's bill, the weekly *New Statesman and Nation* says that the House of Lords may have delayed abolition of hanging "but it has hastened its own abolition."

LABOR DIVIDED

The Tory section of the British press, which has supported hanging in almost monolithic unity, is endeavoring to pooh-pooh the idea of any constitutional issues arising. Said Lord Kemsley's *Daily Telegraph*: "Some may be tempted to describe the Lord's refusal to abolish the death penalty for murder as a slap in the face for democracy. It would be foolish judgement, but in this emotional controversy all things are possible."

The *Daily Mail*, organ of another Tory press lord (Lord Rothermere), said: "Now we may expect a cry of Peers versus People. This would not only be false but would do harm to the community."

For some time now it has been known that Lord Salisbury, government leader in the Lords, has been touting the idea of some sort of reformed House of Lords behind the scenes. His plans are believed to include schemes for replacing some of the "backwoods" peers by "elder statesmen" in order to give the Lords the façade of a more democratic assembly.

The Labor Party itself is divided on the issue. Some are known to be in favor of reforming the House of Lords on the basis of part elected members by the House of Commons and part drawn from the existing peers. Others are thought to be in some degree supporting Lord Salisbury's plans. Yet another section is in favor of the complete abolition of the second chamber and is opposed to any ideas of reforming it on the grounds that this will only prolong its life unnecessarily.

All of the views are likely to be tested in debate now that the Lords has once again raised the question of its own existence.

To Debate CP?

Philadelphia, July 16

The Philadelphia branch of the Independent Socialist League has sent a challenge to the local Communist Party to debate the question "Is Russia a Socialist Society?" Because of recent conversations with several Communist Party followers there is some possibility that the CP will accept the challenge.

In issuing the invitation the local ISL clearly indicated that the debate would be held only on terms agreeable to both organizations.

Steel Strike Marks Time

By EMIL MODIC

Pittsburgh, July 16

What is a steel strike like? Certainly the present one is relatively calm and quiet.

Statements and counter-statements have been few. There is no well-dramatized issue. No special attempt has been made by the United Steelworkers to get the men "up" for the strike or to win the sympathy of the public.

It is true that McDonald has made a television appearance and that the companies have made several radio addresses and placed some full-page ads in dailies in steel towns. But all in all, things are quiet.

In that respect, a steel strike nowadays is rather like a coal strike.

Coal miners live usually in communities of their own, away from the rest of the population, away from bourgeois pressure of daily papers, white-collar neighbors, hostile merchants, and the like. Because their industry is extractive, it is almost never located in big cities. They live to themselves; the merchants who serve them are dependent on them and therefore "go along"; their solidarity is real and physical and contiguous. It is not as necessary to get them "up" for a strike as is the case with the electrical or auto or other unions.

To a great extent, steel is the same way.

Steel mills are almost always located on the edge of towns or in mill towns. They require huge water supplies and large acreages and good rail or water transportation. They are communities of their own.

Steel workers do not really live in Pittsburgh, for example; they live in Homestead or Braddock or Duquesne, little close-knit towns, off the main track, huddled on the flats of rivers or stacked up the hills along the Monogahela or Ohio valleys. Pressure is not so great on them. Merchants give credit during strikes; public utilities and rental agencies are lenient.

There is another similarity between a steel strike and a coal strike. It is obvious; the steel workers' union was organized by the United Mine Workers.

David McDonald used to be an office employee of the Mine Workers, and tries

to pattern himself after Lewis—"the titans of industry have labored and brought forth a louse."

It was notorious for years that all of the top officials of the Steelworkers were ex-miner leaders, and that situation still obtains to a considerable extent. Therefore, the steel workers, like the miners, are closer to "pure and simple" unionism than the UAW or the IUE. (The force of events has driven the Mine Workers, the Steelworkers, and any number of other unions away from "pure and simple" unionism, of course—witness the remarkable series of UMW hospitals, for example. But the evolution has been resisted.)

MUTED STRUGGLE

There is another aspect to the relative calm of the present strike. It is rooted in the deliberate philosophy and policy of class collaboration which Murray initiated and McDonald has carried to great lengths.

Psychologically, McDonald, the man in the Brooks Brothers suit, is very close to the steel titans. In effect, so far as negotiations are concerned, they have agreed to disagree. McDonald does not really distrust management, and they do not hate and fear him as GM does Reuther, for example.

They act on the assumption that six months from now, they will again be touring plants together on joint goodwill tours. The steel titans do not want to destroy McDonald, and he does not want to humble them. Both sides act accordingly; the feeling is transmitted to the staff and the ranks.

A month from now, things may not be that way, but that's the way they are now.

For the time being, the strike suits the companies. As the union has said in a letter to all members, steel inventories are so high that if there were no strike, steel workers would be laid off in the fall and would lose work, anyway.

The companies will use the strike to further jack up the price of steel. Already, steel wholesalers are raising prices to small manufacturers. When basic steel raises its prices, many customers will already be paying the higher prices.

A NEW PAMPHLET, JUST PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND

Russia from Stalin to Khrushchev

by

TONY CLIFF

22 pages 15 cents

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

NEW YORK

LABOR ACTION FORUM

THURSDAYS at 9 p.m.

July 26—Richard Parrish
reports on his recent trips through the South as

A NORTHERN NEGRO LOOKS AT THE SOUTH

Aug. 2—Julius Falk

AMERICAN STALINOIDS & THE 20th CONGRESS

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

OPINIONS AND DISCUSSION:

More on the Socialist Party Convention

The writer of the following letter was one of the leaders of the left-wing group at the Socialist Party convention recently reported in LA.

To the Editor:

I have just finished reading your reports on the Socialist Party convention, carried in the June 25 and July 2 issues of LABOR ACTION. You obviously attempted to report the convention in an objective and fraternal way. However even the best of reporters will make mistakes and certainly there are points where your reports are in error. It is to present a more complete view of the Socialist Party as reflected in its 30th National Convention that I am writing.

For one thing it is not true that the Socialist Party is still losing ground. In the past two years our paid membership has increased at least 15 per cent and our locals are definitely on a firmer footing than they were two years ago. This in no way minimizes our very real weakness—something which we share in common with the ISL—but it is simply to point out that the party is no longer in the process of disintegration. Our membership, incidentally, is considerably higher than your estimate in the June 25 LA.

Regarding the formation of the party's present left wing, it is certainly straining logic to assume that the split in YPSL that occurred in 1953 explains the subsequent rise within the party of a left opposition. (While it is true the shift to the right at the 1954 party convention spurred a stronger organization of left elements within the party, it is highly doubtful if the shift to the right can be attributed to the resignation of YPSL members in '53.) Actually I think a much stronger case can be made out for saying that the resignations of left elements from YPSL and the consequent disintegration of what remained of YPSL took out of the party some principle—if somewhat irresponsible—youth who could have been of tremendous value in building a stronger left opposition and building it sooner.

You also gave the impression that the Committee for a Socialist Program—the group around which the left opposition has solidified—is essentially a California group. It is true the CFSP was formed in California, but well over a year ago it had become the dominant force in several locals outside of California (not merely in Chicago), the majority of its members were outside of California, and two of the three CFSP floor leaders at the convention came from outside of California.

CONTINUE TO EXPLORE

On the question of unity I deeply regret that the party did not invite the ISL to participate in a discussion with various other socialist groups on the question of unity. However it is significant that the question was raised and given a full debate within the party. It is significant that those who opposed inviting the ISL did so in generally moderate language. It takes a long time for old wounds to heal, for old angers to die and be forgotten. The important thing to remember—for all of us in both the party and the ISL—is that both of our groups are part of the democratic socialist community.

There are of course those in both of our organizations who are either "ultra-left purists" or "ultra-right sectarians," but I firmly believe that politically responsible socialists must continue to explore areas of agreement between our organizations and with other organizations as well. There is every reason to believe such exploration will continue to take place.

It is for this reason that I am grateful for the tone with which LA reported the convention, for while you say that the ISL's "militant socialism has no sectarianism in it," this is, I think, a subjective belief not entirely borne out by past experience and events.

Turning now to the July 2 issue and your comments on Algeria, I think you should have greater confidence in the SP's membership than to feel it was your duty "forcibly to bring before the SP its socialist obligation in this matter." Without going into a long discussion of this here, I think two points must

be made. The first is to recognize our understandable and I think essentially healthy unwillingness to attack those we consider to be comrades—i.e., the French Socialist Party. Guy Mollet is a man with a courageous and honorable record and it is painful for us to face the present reality. It is, I suspect, easier to build a Democratic Socialist movement with people who are slow to believe bad reports of those they consider comrades, than with people who are so speedy as to seem almost eager to find points of disagreement. Those who are slow to anger may in the final analysis be most firm in their stand when they do take it.

The second point is that even without the "forcible" help of the ISL the matter would have come before the convention. Incredible as it may seem to some in the ISL who at times act as if their main function in life was to safeguard the morality of the Socialist Party, resolutions were being prepared even before the May 28 comment in LA about our socialist duty. The comrades in the ISL may rest assured that if the NEC should make the error of emasculating the resolution we passed it will doubtless go to referendum.

You implied in reporting on resolutions that things were steam-rolled through. To some extent this is true—we were badly pressed for time. But since both Jack Cypin and I had sat on the Resolutions Committee, the resolutions which Sam Friedman was rattling off so quickly were ones on which all of us on the Resolutions Committee had agreed. We had agreed in advance that controversial resolutions would come at the end of such virtually undebatable resolutions as those against Franco, juvenile delinquency, etc.

I think a better point—and one which you did not raise though I have heard it since from others in the ISL and appreciated its merit—is that the failure to distribute mimeographed copies of all resolutions to every delegate at the convention (and if possible some time in advance) made it difficult to debate the questions with any real political logic. This was certainly a mistake on our part and will be fully corrected at the next convention.

LEFT WING'S APPROACH

Just a point on electoral action. You said the left wing supported electoral action. No quite so. Two of the three CFSP floor leaders opposed it strongly and our group was clearly split on it. My own position was that it would be healthy for the party not to run a ticket and thus open up its mind to somewhat less of a parliamentary approach to democratic socialism (at least to the extent of recognizing the struggle for socialism is far deeper than simply a struggle for votes).

I have not attempted to write a second report of the convention but only to correct some mistakes which I found in your own report. These things, however, I would add:

Our left wing is, as you noted, loyal to the party. (This should be obvious, but it is still good for all involved to recognize that there are no splits about to occur.) The left wing controlled about one-third of the convention votes, and about one-half of the active party locals. We do not view our right-wing opposition as being people who should be thrown out of the party, but as comrades with whom we have every desire and intention of working. Both viewpoints together will build a militant and united Socialist Party. We have serious political disagreements with them, and those will be fought out within the party. This conflict of political positions will continue to take place in an organizational framework which our experience has taught us is basically democratic.

The errors and mistakes made at the convention were due to our inexperience and youth—not to any monolithic or undemocratic "old guard." Many things were not done that should have been done. But this convention represented a distinct gain for the left wing—not simply a gain that had to be taken "very relatively" as you state in LA. Certainly the fact that a Third Camp resolution came within two votes of having a majority is of extreme importance. The left wing and the party as a whole were strengthened by the convention.

The party's platform is moderate but it is basically good. We are able to support it actively. We hope every member of the ISL and every reader of LA will obtain a copy and that they will read it with a less jaundiced eye than usual—looking for those areas where we have common agreement. Our goal as the left wing of the party remains that of achieving the working unity of all Democratic Socialist forces. One step toward that goal might well be the ISL's support of the party's ticket in this coming election.

Fraternally,
DAVID McREYNOLDS

We're exceedingly glad to have Comrade McReynolds' views on the SP convention and on unity. And thanks to him for his correction on how the left-wingers voted on electoral action; on the other purely factual points he discusses, I would myself let stand what I wrote, though it is natural that there should honestly be different estimates on some of these points. Most important, we would like to urgently invite other Socialist Party comrades, not to speak of LABOR ACTION readers, to avail themselves of our space to discuss the questions that McReynolds has brought up. There are few things more important, in our own opinion, than exploring the possibilities of a sincere and healthy socialist unity.

HAL DRAPER

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

ence in literary style or in a few degrees right or left of center. . . . These two men . . . still appeal to the same broad, middle-of-the-road, fundamentally anti-radical bulk of the American people."

Humanity waited until 1956 to produce a leading intellectual organ which would advise the Thinking People of the nation to vote for a presidential candidate on the basis of his eminently superior digestive tract.

Two Cheers

As we've noted before, the space we have been devoting to the ISL's Washington hearing has crowded out comment on many current events. We have not, for example, adequately commented on a few good civil-liberties developments.

For one thing, we are happy that Carl Braden's infamous prison sentence was thrown out by the Kentucky Court of Appeals, on the basis of the Supreme Court's decision (in the Steve Nelson case) reserving exclusive federal jurisdiction over sedition laws.

For another: it was a good thing that the Social Security Administration was reversed on denying their pensions to a number of Communist Party leaders or their wives.

B. MULLIGAN

READERS TAKE THE FLOOR

Anybody Know Anything More About This?

To the Editor:

Readers of LABOR ACTION may be interested in learning about the latest developments which appear to be taking place in the Cochranite tendency organized around the *American Socialist*. This group it will be recalled, originated in a faction fight and split in the Cannonite Socialist Workers Party in 1953, in which the Cochranites took an even more pro-Stalinist line than the SWP does. Since then this tendency has continued in the direction of further ideological capitulation to Stalinism.

While the exact details of the current situation are not yet known to this writer, reliable reports indicate that a group has arisen inside the Cochranites that stands for entry into the CP. This group, which is headed by M. Bartell, appears to be further divided over the question of whether they should organizationally enter the ranks of Stalinism quietly as individuals, or whether they should enter as a group through formal negotiations with the Communist Party.

The current development seems to be an outgrowth of a dispute which took place in Cochranite ranks some six months ago. At that time a faction in this tendency criticized the leadership for its exclusive interest in publishing a magazine and its neglect of organizational work. Exactly what organizational activity this faction was proposing could not be learned. The Bartell group appears to be an outgrowth of this faction, it having decided that the organizational activity it desires is the obliteration of the last remaining lines between itself and reactionary Stalinism.

There is some confusion as to whether or not the Bartell group has already formally split from the Cochranites. One report reaching this writer claims that it has done so and is already pursuing its line of entry into the CP; another states that the split has not yet been consummated. The existence of the Bartell tendency on a line of entry into the CP, however, seems certain.

If true, this development constitutes tragic news. That a group of Trotskyists, or former Trotskyists, should draw these organizational conclusions from the political line of the Pablo wing of the Fourth International, which in itself is an extension of the Cannonite position, is further testimony to the pernicious falseness of that line and position. Nearly thirty years after the break with Stalinism by the American Trotskyists, a wing of that movement repudiates its history and, drawing logical organizational conclusions from its politics, returns to the CP. What a commentary on the politics of "orthodox-Trotskyism!" What a shambles the epigones of Trotsky have made of a movement that was organized on the basis of fighting against counter-revolutionary Stalinism.

B. MULLIGAN

At last available!

The **SECOND** volume
of
Leon Trotsky's
THE FIRST
FIVE YEARS
OF THE
COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL

384 pages.....Paper covers
\$3.00

All orders must be accompanied
by payment.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

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



LABOR
ACTION

July 23, 1956 Vol. 20, 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

THE FAILURES OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

Last week, *Challenge* reported the sell-out of both the Democrats and Republicans on the school bill. But Washington's refusal to act on the problem of education is not confined to this one major case; it also extends to a critical area of American life, that of higher education.

A decade or so ago, only 10 per cent of American youth enrolled in college. In the period since then, there has been a tremendous increase in the number of students who continue their education after high school. The GI Bill right after World War II accounted for a huge influx, and this continues in a severely modified form with the veterans program of today.

But the really basic factor has been a considerable increase in population coupled with some sixteen years of prosperity. Today, 31 per cent of America's youth attend college, and if the present trend continues (this is based, to a considerable extent, upon the development of the economy), American educators expect 40 or 45 per cent to be in college in 1975.

Czechs Clamp Down On Student Rebels

The Czech Communist Party has moved against those students who recently took the slogans of "democratization" seriously. The students, as reported in *Challenge* previously, took the opportunity to hold meetings, write resolutions condemning aspects of the regime's denial of academic freedom, and even won a minor point when they got the Russian flag removed from a building in Prague.

There have already been indications that the party was moving against these acts of criticism. In the June 21 issue of *France-Observateur*, some more information on this clamp-down was made available.

At the National Conference of the Czech Communist Party, Novotny, one of the official reporters, made a sharp attack on the Second Congress of Writers, charging them with an "immoral intervention" into their country's political life. (The "immoral intervention" was speaking up even if ever so softly.)

He then turned to the youth. He dwelled on the fact that "the majority of the students were not of working-class origin" and then went on to say that "reactionary elements had abused the right of criticism in order to transform the students into their instruments."

A little later, the "reactionary" character of the student activity was spelled out. Kopecky denounced the youth of Prague and Bratislava for having adopted resolutions "containing provocative points, hostile to the party and to the regime." The "working class," he said, would not allow the discussion of reactionary, idealistic thoughts "without control."

This is in line with the Stalinist repression throughout their empire, another example of he fear which grips the regime when it faces the slightest bit of free criticism. And the criticism in question, it must be noted, was not revolutionary; i.e., it did not propose the overthrow of either government or party; rather it demanded reforms within the structure of Czech Stalinism. (It is, of course, wrong to look at this as simply a reform movement, however; as the Stalinists recognize, any assertion of the right to criticize in a Stalinist country is indeed implicitly revolutionary.)

An additional point of interest: the students involved in the demonstrations seem to have been sparked by youth from the Institute of Pedagogy, that is, the future teachers of Czechoslovakia.

The social consequences of this change are great. Many jobs which once required a high school diploma now demand a degree. In certain fields, especially science and engineering, even the increase in the number of graduates has been unable to keep pace with the needs of an industry which has been growing and growing on the basis of a war economy and credit boom.

One result has been that business has entered the academic world and has used its financial power to ensure that the universities will be favorably disposed to filling their requirements.

But America's higher education system remains uneven. Selection is still on a class basis, even though college has been made possible for a wider grouping of students. And in the technical fields, the refusal of American society to see education as a social problem has led to a severe crisis.

This is usually recognized in Cold War terms—the Russians are producing more engineers, physicists, mathematicians, etc.—but its implications go far beyond that.

Earlier this year, President Eisenhower appointed a committee to go into this problem. In doing so, he was acting upon the recommendations of the 1955 sessions of the White House Conference on Education. Significantly enough, the Eisenhower group was heavily weighted with businessmen. Its head is Devereux C. Josephs.

NO PLANNING

But the Congress looked down upon even this modest effort. A subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee refused Josephs and his colleagues a grant of \$300,000 to carry out its job, and their work has continued only because of a \$75,000 handout from the president's contingency fund. The committee itself feels that it will require another \$800,000 in addition to the \$300,000 which it can't get, this to undertake a thorough investigation of the problem on the state level.

Josephs, the committee head, is the former chairman of the Carnegie Foundation and now the executive head of a large insurance company. This is how he defines the problem:

"There has been no real planning in higher education. We know that 30 per cent of the youth of college age go to college. But what about the 70 per cent who do not? Many of them go to technical schools, to proprietary institutes, to post-high-school institutions that cannot be classified as colleges. Shouldn't we examine this area of education?"

This emphasis upon planning is basic

to the committee's approach—a case where businessmen favor what the Right calls "creeping socialism" because they require it for their own good. Thus Josephs discussed the situation in terms of three basic problems: (1) the need of an expanding economy for more trained people; (2) the absence of any planning with regard to higher education, particularly in terms of handling the imminent stampede at the admissions office; (3) the total lack of a federal policy for higher education.

It is not, of course, an accident that this conception of the situation is dominated by a consciousness of the needs of business, but it is interesting that the failure of a capitalistically organized educational system to provide for the needs of capitalism brings the businessmen into the fray with a cry of . . . federal planning.

The root of this problem, as we have suggested before, is the fact that American education is still dominated by the class organization of American society. The inability to pay still bars millions and millions of youth from American colleges; the aspirations of those who have the ability to pay still determine the type of graduates who will preponderate every June.

This has forced American business into the field of education. On one level, it has meant a sharp competition between various firms for the graduates in technical fields. In some cases, businessmen have attempted to get a favorable recruiting position at various universities by making contributions, endowing chairs, etc.

JOSEPHS' CONCERN

But the Josephs committee is approaching the problem on a somewhat more systematic level. What it seeks is to have the society as a whole bear the cost of rationalizing the educational system along lines which meet the needs of business. The kind of "planning" which his remarks suggest is clearly dominated by this major consideration: to take the pressure off American business. It is not primarily motivated by a concern for the needs of American youth.

Even so, the Eisenhower Committee cannot help but take certain welcome steps. To begin with, the very fact that the federal government is forced to seek a policy and a plan is encouraging. And secondly, even though this interest in the American student would seem to be business-motivated, nevertheless it will have to move in the direction of making access to higher education easier.

In this particular period of capitalism, one of expansion and war economy, there is a temporary coincidence of the social value of making education available to all and the business value of staffing American companies with trained personnel.

Given this fact, Congress' inaction is but another example of that body's negligence of the problem of education. At the present writing (there is still hope that the Eisenhower committee will receive its appropriation), Congress is not even impressed by the demands of American business and the grave problem which issues from the fact that Russia's totalitarian planning in the field of education is providing an edge for Stalinism in the Cold War.

No one can feel complacent about the fact that the administration's interest in education, and that of the business community, is part of a larger trend in which the academic world is falling more and more under the sway of business. But even worse is Congress' procrastination in doing anything about the manifold problems of education in America whether it be primary or college-level.

LYL Says No

The Labor Youth League has refused the Young Socialist League's challenge to a debate on some topic which would raise the question of Russian society before American youth.

Indeed, it was only some month or so after the original letter had been sent to the LYL that it replied and negotiations began. During the negotiations, the LYL representative continually counterposed the notion of a "broad" symposium, including various points of view, and on some question (possibly Russia, but not necessarily) which would be of interest to a student audience.

The YSLers insisted that the topic should be Russia. They pointed out that every young person who begins to come toward socialism has to make a decision on what he thinks of Russian society at the very outset, and certainly when he chooses an organization. The direct confrontation of two sharply opposed groups such as the YSL and LYL would be of tremendous benefit in this situation.

Moreover, although the YSLers pointed out that they did not reject a symposium, they kept noting that a symposium was not the same thing as a debate, that it loses the clear statement of difference which a debate provides.

In all of this, there would seem to be more evidence of the LYL's recent attempt to broaden itself to the point of becoming amorphous, part of its popular-front line. The debate is seen as "sectarian," i.e. it confronts two political points of view claiming to speak in the name of socialism; but the symposium is of possible value, i.e., it brings in many speakers, it mutes conflicts, it gives a round-table air of cooperativeness.

This was also reflected in the fact that the LYL insisted throughout the negotiations that it has no "position" on Russia officially.

As pointed out before, the YSL is not opposed to a symposium. But it remains in favor of a debate, and the two are different matters.

We still believe that it is incredible that the LYLers turned down a chance to defend their point of view before a youth audience, that they ran away from their own politics. Incredible if certain echoes from the past did not remind us that this kind of approach—always a symposium rather than a debate, a folk song rather than internal discussion, etc.—is characteristic of the Popular Front.

All this aside, we still believe the LYL should defend its position. Their rejection shows us how things are.

CALIFORNIA YSL WEEKEND CAMP

PFEIFFER-BIG SUR STATE PARK (Big Sur, Calif.)

JULY 28-29

Educational Program:

- (1) Labor, the Negro People and the Democratic Party.
- (2) Poznan and the 20th Congress.
- (3) Current Trends in American Literature.

Socials, Hiking, Fishing, Swimming, Athletics, Sunshine

Registration: \$4.50

Transportation from Los Angeles: \$12

Write to—Los Angeles YSL:

8939 1/2 Santa Monica Blvd.

Berkeley YSL: 2161 Shattuck Ave.

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

WORLD POLITICS SINCE 1925

Wednesday evenings at 8

- (3) July 25—George Rawlings
Germany: the Rise of Nazism.
- (4) Aug. 1—Max Martin
France: the Popular Front.
- (5) Aug. 8—Anne Russell
Spain: the Civil War.
- (6) Aug. 15—Sam Taylor
The Second World War.

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

AT THE ISL'S WASHINGTON HEARING

BURNHAM PHILOSOPHIZES ON SMEARS AND LIES

By HAL DRAPER

Washington, July 12

"You lie as part of your duty to your country," yesterday explained James Burnham, the government's sole witness in this first hearing ever held on a "subversive list" labeling case, that of the Independent Socialist League.

The hearing came to an end Wednesday with the morning session, making a day and a half of continuous examination for the McCarthyite police agent whom the government attorneys had fished out of the bottom of the barrel at the last minute. [For the day before, the Tuesday session, see last week's *LA—Ed.*]

Burnham's philosophy of lying was expounded to the hearing after probing questioning by ISL attorney Joseph L. Rauh Jr. which succeeded brilliantly in exposing Burnham as an habitual smear-artist with little or no scruples about inventing "subversive" connections for political opponents.

Before this came up, however, two other points were disposed of: Burnham's relations with the FBI; and his political role as a McCarthyite.

It was Burnham who broached the FBI question again in his first words on the stand. He had changed his mind, he told hearing examiner Morrissey, about his refusal the day before to discuss his dealings with the FBI; he was ready to talk.

Asked by Rauh whether he "went to the FBI" in 1940 "when you left these organizations," he replied no; and gave the same answer for every year up to the present. But then he volunteered that on occasions "when seeing the FBI, I brought up the question of the political nature of . . . the Shachtman group; that is to say, the initiative in bringing it up was on my part." These occasions were in 1948, 1950 and the winter of 1953-54.

Q—"So the FBI approached you about this matter?"

A—"Yes."

Q—"Then you volunteered the information about the Shachtman group?"

A—"Yes, in discussing it with the representative."

He told the FBI men, he said, that the organization was "Communist and Leninist."

Q—"Why didn't you report it before [1948]?"

A—"I didn't say I didn't report it to the FBI before."

This was confusing, but in any case he now proceeded to testify that the FBI had approached him to testify in the then-imminent Minneapolis trial of Socialist Workers Party leaders, which he had declined to do.

Why then hadn't this patriot done his duty to his country by reporting the dangerous "subversives" if everything he now says is true? The answer (not stated by Burnham) seemed to be that

Heart Condition

• At one point in his examination where Burnham was reeling on the ropes in a vain attempt to invent "three dozen friends" of Schlesinger's in the IPR, government attorney Maddrix tried to come to the rescue by raising technical objections which would give his man a breathing-spell. Rauh indignantly pointed out to the examiner that he was interrupting simply because his witness was "obviously agitated." Maddrix challenged the description, for the record. "Well, replied Rauh, 'when a witness goes like this [business of hand to mouth, jaw working], he's obviously upset.' Maddrix's refutation was not exactly felicitous: 'There is nothing to show that Mr. Burnham is 'obviously upset.' He may be suffering with a heart condition. . . ." He did not explain what sort of heart condition gives one the shakes on witness stands.

it took him so many years to lose all sense of shame.

RIGHT-WING RECORD

Next Rauh took up the political viewpoint from which Burnham was testifying as an "expert" on Communism. This of course was at the heart of the matter, since in essence Burnham was presenting his own political opinions and views as the sole buttress of the government's shaky case.

On the very first day he had appeared, on June 27, Burnham had testified that, although he was not a member of any party, it was "the position of Senator Knowland" that he was closest to. When asked "Would you say the same of Sen. McCarthy, for instance?" he had answered, "I would say that I am an anti-McCarthyite."

On Tuesday Burnham was asked by Rauh, "would it be fair to say that you are a man who has come from the extreme left wing of American political life to the extreme right wing?" He demurred at the designation "right wing" as "a little overstated"; "By extreme right wing, people mean these fascist and anti-Semitic organizations with which my views have nothing whatever in common. I would call my point of view . . . conservative and American traditionalist."

Rauh pointed out that he was an editor of Buckley's *National Review* and asked what, in his opinion, was more right-wing than that. Burnham listed the *Freeman* (under its present editors), *Human Events*, and the *American Mercury* (under current editors). This mention of the *Mercury* started off the quiz, to be described below, on the last article Burnham had written for the *Mercury*, "The Case Against Adlai Stevenson" (October 1952).

Yesterday (Wednesday) Rauh took up Burnham's work on the *National Review*, via a consideration of the magazine's editorials. The witness solidified himself with the general line of most of these: bitter opposition to the Supreme Court desegregation decision, together with fierce reviling of the justices; a dim view of minimum-wage laws in general; a smear at Hutchins; an attack on the UN for questioning the sanctity of private property; criticism of the term "Bill of Rights" as "misleading"; sneers at "globalist fanatics"; support of Westinghouse's position against the strikers; a kind word for the McCarthyite movement; a blast at "object Eisenhowerism," etc.

His McCarthyite politics was laid on the record.

ANTI-DEMOCRAT

One of these editorials led into a related subject. In the Dec. 21, 1955 issue, an editorial had remarked "If there is a justification of universal suffrage (and we hope there is) . . ."

Rauh noted this, and asked:

Q—"Did you ever say that democracy wouldn't work?"

A—"Yes, democracy in the sense of some definitions of it."

Q—"What definitions . . .?"

A—"Well, democracy, what I call the Rousseauian sense, the expression of the general will. Democracy in the practical sense, as a system that involves suffrage, rights of opposition, and so on, I believe can work and obviously has worked."

Rauh quoted from Burnham's book *The Machiavellians* (p. 236): "Democracy" is usually defined in some such terms as 'self-government' or 'govern-

ment by the people.' Historical experience forces us to conclude that democracy, in this sense, is impossible."

Burnham said he agreed. Rauh quoted a little further along: "The theory of democracy as self-government must, therefore, be understood as a myth, formula, or derivation." Burnham again agreed, and also okayed a passage read from another book:

"... if we put the question in the popular form, 'Will democracy win?' there can be little doubt that the answer must be No. Democracy can never win. Democracy always loses, because the forces of democracy, in winning, cease to be democratic. Those who want democracy, therefore, must be willing to lose." (This was in 1941 when Burnham was predicting the world victory of Germany.)

"SMART-ALEC"

A fourth passage was read, from *The Machiavellians*: "The other error, typical of democratic theory, is that the masses, the majority, can rule themselves. . . ." Burnham agreed.

By the fifth, however, he was boggling. This came from his book *The Struggle for the World*, and was directed against "the abstract, empty, sentimental rhetoric of democratic idealism, established for us first by Thomas Jefferson. This is for speeches, conscience-soothing, and full-dress occasions . . . Jeffersonian rhetoric has no connection with reality . . ." etc.

BURNHAM: "I believe that it appears in one of my earlier works . . . I mention this because I would not altogether agree with that. . ."

Why wouldn't he agree with it? He did not criticize its idea: "I think it is rather smart-alec . . . it is rhetoric I find embarrassing now. . ."

Embarrassing indeed for a man who was busy acting as a police agent against socialists, presumably in defense of that "meaningless" democracy which he had snickered at in his so-enlightened books about the inevitability of oligarchy.

This was the only defender of democracy that the government could lure out of the woodwork to testify against the ISL.

PERSONAL SMEARS

As mentioned above, an important line of questioning opened up when Burnham mentioned his October 1952 article, "The Case Against Adlai Stevenson." This article, we must point out, was not one of Burnham's professorial efforts. In it, it was apparent, he had made a real effort to get way down into the gutter and roll; it was a notable landmark in the ex-managerial-revolutionist's descent to the status of a hack writer of McCarthyite smears. The bulk of the article consisted of innuendos purporting to link up Stevenson's associates with Communists, alleged Communists, Alger Hiss, the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR), collectivism, Yalta, and every other bugbear of the Right. A particular target was Arthur Schlesinger Jr., then Stevenson's research director.

Dictatorship

• In the June 6 *National Review*, an article by Burnham had referred to "the Northeastern dictatorship that has for so long ruled the nation" in the U. S. On the stand he explained what he meant by "dictatorship":

"Well, the word is used as a kind of metaphor. I don't think that there is anyone who read it except possibly yourself who would have interpreted it to mean dictatorship in the literal sense of a violation of the structure and forms of American democracy, but a dictatorship rather in the sense of a general social ascendancy and political ascendancy."

It would be interesting to have Burnham's version of the sense in which Marx used the term "dictatorship of the proletariat."

Rauh demonstrated that Burnham was willing to smear opponents without making any effort to determine the truth.

First he read passages from the article illustrating its method of "linking" Stevenson with Communism. Burnham fell back on the claim that he was merely "noting objectively" that Stevenson's "behavior and activities . . . might aid Communism." This was a patent untruth since the whole article was written in terms of adducing *personal* relations.

After a while Rauh came to the passage in which Burnham had fanned out from Stevenson to the candidate's research director, Schlesinger, and then in turn to the latter's sister-in-law, who was married to John K. Fairbank, who in turn was in the IPR and was accused of being a Communist.

Burnham smugly told the hearing that he wasn't "particularly suggesting anything"—just recording interesting genealogical facts, it would seem.

A FRIEND INDEED

Then Rauh read from the article where Schlesinger was linked with "his friend William Remington, convicted of perjury. . ."

Q—"Would you kindly state where you got the information or on what you base the information that Schlesinger was a friend of William Remington?"

A—"I don't recall. Might well have been from hearing him [Schlesinger] say so, but I am not sure. . ."

Q—"Isn't this a pretty serious charge if you don't know where you got the information?"

A—"I don't know how serious it is. . ."

Q—"It is important enough to put in an article against the then candidate for president of the U. S. The fact of the matter is, you don't have any basis for calling Schlesinger a friend of William Remington?"

A—"You ought to know; you were Remington's attorney. . ."

Q—"Where did you get the statement that Mr. Schlesinger was a friend of a convicted perjurer?"

A—"I think you had to do with too many people among your clients and employees who have the habit of not telling the truth. Apparently it is rather unusual for you to be confronted with a witness whose purpose is to give the truth as accurately and fully as I can."

Q—"Will you answer the question? . . ."

A—"In a letter that Schlesinger wrote to the *American Mercury*, he pointed out the one factual error which I have already mentioned [the article had called Mrs. Fairbank a sister of Schlesinger, instead of sister-in-law] and I of course accepted his correction. I presume that if this had also been in error, he would have pointed it out and I would have accepted that if there seemed no reason to doubt it."

At the next day's hearing, the issue of the *Mercury* with Schlesinger's letter (and a rejoinder by Burnham) was brought in. To the dismay of the self-proclaimed exponent of the Truth, it turned out that Schlesinger had called the "friend of Remington" charge a lie, right out in print. And the Custodian of the Truth had paid no attention to this in his rejoinder, not to acknowledge it, not to refute it, not to apologize for error.

Confronted with this denial, Burnham backwatered at a great clip.

Q—"You didn't feel you owed him [Schlesinger] an apology for having said that in the article after finding out it was not true?"

A—"I tried to make clear in my reply what I meant by speaking of a 'friend.'" [There was not a word about this in the reply.]

Q—"Where do you make clear what you mean by the word 'friend'?"

A—"It is my understanding that Prof. Schlesinger has expressed his disbelief in the charges against these men and his confidence in their political integrity."

Q—"You mean if a man expresses disbelief in the charges against somebody he is a 'friend' of his?"

A—"Politically."

This was obviously dishonest. To be sure, there is a sense in which one speaks of a man's political associates as his "friends," but (a) the whole context of the *Mercury* article was explicitly *personal* relations; (b) Burnham didn't even think of retreating to this exegesis until he was backed into a corner; and (c) he didn't even try to make a case that Remington was a political associate.

Rauh demonstrated the same Burnhamian habit with another passage from

Nehru-Tito-Nasser — —

(Continued from page 1)

Hence Nehru made a trip to Russia to flatter the butchers in the Kremlin and be flattered by them; while at the same time he protests, naturally sincerely, that he is really "pro-West," and is no doubt ready to support another war to defend democracy if it comes to that.

Hence Tito's regime speaks up as the most vicious slanderer of the Poznan fighters for freedom, viler even than the Warsaw regime itself, while at the same time he calls for East Europe's "freedom" to come under his own domination rather than Moscow's, and while he cohabits with NATO and its American cash.

Hence Nasser thinks it is coexistence when he buys from both war camps arms with which to threaten Israel. He has a complete sovereign right to do so without being bullied by hypocrites in Washington, but that does not confer upon him the right to pose as a force for peace.

All this could be overlooked indeed, perhaps, if the One-and-a-Half Camp had a program to ensure peace by reconciling the rival war camps with each other. They have no such program, and no such program will come out of Brioni.

There are plenty of reasons from the point of view of their national regimes why these leaders prefer to stand be-

tween the rival blocs ("non-aligned") instead of lining up with one or the other. These reasons range from the cynical one that it has been very good business (particularly for two out of the three), to the no less real but more complicated reason that, in so doing, they indubitably reflect the real aspirations of their peoples to peace and to a third road different from capitalism or Stalinism.

BRIDGES AND BANKS

But the Brioni trio know no such road which diverges from the social systems of the Big Two, nor do they know any program which can really reconcile the irreconcilable interests of the two exploiting systems which are struggling for the world.

Being small powers, they will come out foursquare against colonialism and for self-determination—and mean it too, for every case that does not impinge on their own interests—but they cannot lead any fight against the rival colonialisms which they want to reconcile.

If they want to act as a bridge, they must try to win the support of the two banks which they aspire to unite.

They habitually denounce the "system of blocs," but there is absolutely nothing wrong with blocs, international or other. It is a question of what a bloc is for. If

the Brioni three make up a very ramshackle bloc, it is because they have no real program to bloc up on, articulate or implicit.

An injunction to love thy neighbor is not a program; it is a splendid goal which deserves an internationalist socialist program that can bring it to realization.

There are great social forces that are fighting along the line of a Third Camp road. In every case these are real struggles against the dominant blocs; they are not bridges; they are not conciliators of oppressors.

Among these is the great fight for liberation in Algeria—in one world. Among these is the great blow for freedom struck by the Polish workers—in the other world.

We do not want any bridges between these combatants and their enemies. We do not want any reconciliation between these movements and their dominators. We do not think the fight between them is simply a "misunderstanding" which can be patched up by the placatory good offices of non-aligned "friends of all."

At any rate, that's what we think, and if we're wrong, why then Brioni will give birth to something different from the fuzzy exhortations which neutralists are accustomed to substitute for the revolutionary transformations which the world needs.

CPs Won't Break — —

(Continued from page 1)

mentioning, or that, with the abject crawling of the foreign CPs, the whole question has been resolved and peace and harmony will now prevail throughout the Stalinist world?

Not at all. Inside every Stalinist movement in the world the pot is still boiling. In a country like Italy, where the CP is flanked by Nenni's powerful independent Stalinoid party, the danger which Togliatti had hoped to head off is just as great, if not greater, today than it was yesterday.

In the pre-convention discussion issues of the *Sunday Worker*, one voice after another from the ranks is raised demanding the political scalps of the present CP leaders—an absolutely unprecedented procedure in the American Stalinist movement.

No one can say, at the present time, just how much ferment and dissatisfaction there is inside the world Stalinist movement. It varies from country to country, depending on the history of each Communist Party, on a host of social and political factors in each country, and the like. Thus, no one can say exactly what forms the crisis of the Stalinist movement will take on here, there or elsewhere.

In one country the lid may be clamped on tight, and the crisis may express itself in a quiet ebbing of the vitality of the movement as the best elements drop out of politics or shift their allegiance elsewhere. In others, there may be open fights and splits. In yet others, the crisis may pass with little or no visible effect on the strength of Stalinism.

After all, this drama is not being played out on a stage in which the Stalinists are the actors while the rest of the world are spectators. For instance, what happens to the Italian Stalinists will depend in large measure on what is done by the people of Nenni's party, of the Independent Socialist Union, and others.

Another example: going by his record, John Foster Dulles may be counted on, sooner or later, to commit some colossal blunder in this field which will contribute immeasurably to the ability of the Stalinist leaders to regain their tight hold on their followers.

SELECTED SPECIMENS

But whatever variants may show themselves, one is the least likely to occur in any country. That is the organic evolution of a Communist Party out of its status as a political dependency of Russian Stalinism into the status of an independent movement expressing the political and social needs and aspirations of the working

class of the country in which it functions.

By an "organic evolution" is meant a process in which a Stalinist party, with its present leadership at its head, declares its political independence of Moscow, breaks all ties with the world center of Stalinism, denounces it as anti-socialist, and sets out to reconstruct its ideology, its practice, its objectives and its methods on a foundation of democratic socialist principles and concepts.

One of the most important reasons for the conclusion that such an organic evolution away from Russian domination is not to be expected in any major country of the world is that the leaderships of the CPs in all such countries are composed of men who owe their position not to their native abilities or their record as effective leaders, but precisely to their unbroken record of unquestioning subservience to Moscow.

During the past three decades a careful process of selection has created the leaderships of the Stalinist movements. Every man who showed any degree of independence, personal or political, has long since been weeded out. Dennis leads the American CP because he has never wavered or shown any tendency to waver when the orders were handed down from above.

He proved it to the hilt (and his colleagues with him) when they turned on their former leader and mentor, Browder, and tore him to pieces like a pack of jackals. They had never detected a sentence or paragraph of his which was other than brilliant, Marxist to the core, until Jaques Duclos, a Moscow mouthpiece, criticized him in a French Stalinist paper. After that, they could not remember a word of his which had not been patently anti-Marxist, and who knows what else.

NO TURNING BACK

For any person trained and developed in the ideology of Stalinism, no matter what his personal qualities, it will be difficult enough to re-think and reorient himself. This is true for the thousands and tens of thousands of honest rank-and-file CP members whose disgust with capitalism, whose devotion to the working class, and whose hopes for a better, more democratic, more equalitarian, more human society have been channeled off into the swamp of Stalinism.

But for people who have become accustomed to the privileges, prerogatives and power conferred upon them by leadership in the bureaucratic hierarchy of even such a relatively miserable movement like the American CP, to make such a break is least likely.

For, after all, they know that if they

should continue their criticism of the Russian leadership, for them there would be no turning back. To orient toward a completely new political life.

They know, from their own experience, that once the word has been passed down—"no more questions, no more criticism"—even the mildest expression of disagreement, even the most politely and meekly put-forth suggestion that the last word has not been said, will mean their utter political destruction in and by the Stalinist movement.

They know that even while the Stalinist movement may be willing to overlook all its past differences with social-democrats, Democrats and even reactionary Republicans in the interest of the Peoples Front, or the National Front which is its twin, they will be denounced as fascist wreckers, paid agents of the monopolists, racists, warmongers, and anything else which may come to the fertile minds of those who have been elevated in their place.

ON MOSCOW'S TRAIN

Further, they know that Stalinism is as powerful a movement as it is because of the appeal to anti-capitalist masses of the idea that they have a great power on their side. They know the power of the idea that over there, in one-third of the earth, "socialism" is actually being built right now, and that this third of the earth stands ready, sooner or later, to come to the rescue of suffering humanity all over. How much easier it is to ride along with and on this understandable feeling than to tell the people the truth about Russia, and to work for the time when the masses of humanity will once again be ready to rely on themselves rather than on the hope of foreign saviors.

There is no Stalinist leadership in any major country (we are not speaking of those countries in which the Stalinists are in power in this article) which is capable of making such a turn. Here or there, a leader may perhaps be found who is willing to stand up and take the consequences, and who can lead a section of the party on a new political course. Where socialist movements stand outside the CP and exert strong pressure upon its ranks, this is more possible and likely than where such movements are lacking.

But Stalinism is a world movement

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

historically built by the Russian bureaucracy and oriented toward it. To be sure, it was possible to build it because all over the world the decay of capitalism left the human material at hand for its construction.

The mass of this human material is, not irrevocably set in the Stalinist mold, although Stalinism has pressed its imprint deeply into the minds of millions. The crisis through which the Stalinist movement is now going, and of which the short-lived "criticism" and "questioning" by its leadership of the inflexible Moscow prelate was a cramped and distorted expression, is a demonstration of this. But the masses who now make up the rank and file of the Stalinist movement will enter as an indispensable part of the great socialist movement of the future as a result of the breakup of the Communist Parties of the major countries, not through their organic evolution.