

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 27, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**DOVES AND POLICEMEN:**  
*The Stalinist Youth Festival  
In Berlin—An Impression*

... pages 6-7

*The Liberal Party and Halley*

... page 3

*Johnsonites Split from SWP*

... page 4

## Sequel to the Case of the New York Post

Two weeks ago we published an "Open Letter to Editor James A. Wechsler" under the head "The Strange Case of the New York Post."

**A sequel now has to be recorded, and we are more than glad to do so as prominently as the original Open Letter was featured.**

The Open Letter dealt with the stand of New York's liberal daily on civil liberties and the government witchhunt. We stressed that it has an "outstanding editorial record" in opposing such features of the government witchhunt as the CP trials and arrests, the loyalty-oath drives, etc., but discussed "the point beyond which the Post's boldness, forthrightness and intelligence fail it, not to speak of its willingness to tell the truth and the whole truth about what is happening to democracy in this country."

This was its line of whitewashing the Fair Deal president of responsibility for the acts of his administration which it individually condemned, while editorially assigning the blame for the government-sponsored cloud of fear over the country only to Attorney General McGrath.

Taking up the Post editorial on Truman's Detroit speech, in which he hypocritically denounced the very methods (employed by McCarthyism) which his own administration has most fully used, we went through the president's major responsibility point by point.

### An Installment on the Truth

**The following Tuesday, Truman made another speech oozing with the same variety of rampant demagoguery and hypocrisy, directed of course against McCarthyism still. Speaking before the American Legion in Washington, Truman mouthed such pious phrases as the following:**

"True Americanism . . . is being undermined by some people in this country who are loudly proclaiming that they are its chief defenders. . . . They are chipping away at our basic freedoms just as insidiously and far more effectively than the Communists have ever been able to do. . . . Character assassination is their stock in trade. Guilt by association is their motto. They have created such a wave of fear and uncertainty that their attacks on our liberties go almost unchallenged. Many people are growing frightened—and frightened people don't protest.

"These things are a threat to every single citizen everywhere in the country. When even one American—who has done nothing wrong—is forced by fear to shut his mind and close his mouth, then all Americans are in peril."

Commenting the next day (August 15) in an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman and Comrades," the Post did not repeat its nonsense about Truman's "faith in freedom" and its hope that "he will find an attorney general who shares" it.

After quoting the above passages from Truman, it comments: "President Truman said those things before an audience where the voice of Joe McCarthy has been

(Turn to last page)

## UAW Leaders' Line for Election In Detroit Rejected by Conference

DETROIT, August 19—The leadership of the United Auto Workers (CIO) received quite a shock this past week when its main political-action policy in the municipal election here was unexpectedly rejected by a large and representative meeting of the Wayne County CIO council delegates, local union leaders, and CIO precinct delegates in the Democratic Party.

At the Wayne County convention last weekend, Emil Mazey, UAW secretary-treasurer, had spoken briefly on political action, and he recommended the defeat of incumbent Mayor Albert Cobo, a Republican, at any cost by anyone, on the theory that Mayor Cobo was the "greatest evil." There was no opportunity for delegates to discuss the mayoralty campaign or Mazey's speech, since the whole question was referred to this special meeting, which was enlarged to assure the dominance of the leadership's views.

To understand the outcome of the special enlarged meeting review briefly the political events preceding it.

In the early days, the Wayne County CIO convention used to take place before July 28, since that was the deadline for filing for office in Detroit's municipal elections. This enabled the delegates to decide for themselves what course of political action they desired. Holding the convention afterwards permits the top leadership to make deals, and then present the rank and file with an accomplished fact.

Long before the July 28 deadline, the UAW leadership had been putting out feelers to various prominent political personalities, and in each case the potential mayoralty nominee turned down the bid.

Louis Miriani, president of Detroit's Common Council, was approached and he said no. The fact that Miriani in the last campaign did not support the CIO's candidate, George Edwards, seemed to matter little to the UAW's leaders. How unpopular Miriani is with decisive sections of the UAW will be described later.

What is interesting at the moment, however, is that Miriani refused to run because he thought CIO backing would hurt him, that he wouldn't stand a chance against Mayor Cobo.

A feeler was then put out to former Mayor Eugene Van Antwerp, another Democrat, whom the CIO had opposed when he was in office. Van Antwerp also declined the honor, for reasons largely identical with Miriani's.

**George Edwards was approached and he too refused to be "honored." Such was his appraisal of the present political influence of the Reuther-Mazey leadership in Detroit campaigns.**

### At the End of the Line

Two days before the deadline, the UAW did not have a single candidate of any stripe, variety or species. It was a most embarrassing situation. Of course, the idea of an independent labor candidate, the kind that Reuther and Mazey talk about once in a while at some convention where no concrete action is required, was the most remote from their "practical" thinking. Putting on an educational campaign and really building up a UAW political machine on a grass-roots level was something for the future, although the 1948 UAW convention made that policy official.

The acute dilemma of the UAW leaders was further aggravated when Joe O'Connor, a state legislator, of Chrysler Local 7, filed for mayoralty candidate. O'Connor bucks the UAW leaders at every turn, he often votes with the Republicans on critical issues, but the fact remains that if he were the only other name in the race the UAW might "have to" endorse him, or so they feared.

**At this point, a candidate entered the race who was a complete surprise to the UAW leaders. His name is Ed**

On Your Feet!



## British TUC Yields on Wage Freeze

By GORDON HASKELL

The leadership of the British trade-union movement has officially junked its policy of "wage restraints." For the first time in over three years the leadership shows willingness to give official sanction to individual unions to go out for whatever they can get in increased wages.

At last year's Trade Union Congress, the delegates repudiated the policy urged upon them by their leaders of continuing to accept the self-imposed wage freeze. However, it is a well-known fact that such convention action, taken against the will of the leadership, is often ignored in practice. This time, however, it is the general council, in its annual report to the 83rd meeting of the TUC, which itself urges a policy of wage increases.

It appears that this action is in response to the general dissatisfaction of the union membership with the old policy. It stems from the same political feelings which formed the background for the resignation of Aneurin Bevan from the government, although it seems that the majority of the general council is taking special pains in their report to dissociate themselves from the specific program of the Bevan group.

Press reports state that it refrains from attacking the scale of the British armament program, one of Bevan's chief targets. Instead, it confines itself to a statement that the government should not neglect its duty to make adequate provisions for de-

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued on page 2)

# UAW Leaders' Line Rejected—

(Continued from page 1)

Branigan, and his present position is Wayne County clerk. The last time he received public attention was when the UAW denounced him as a phony and incompetent to hold public office because he refused to rule on some fraudulent petitions used against the CIO in its fight within the Democratic Party a year ago.

The entrance of Branigan was a surprise to the UAW top leadership but not to certain CIO politicians who are very active in the Democratic Party, and who are no more under Reuther's thumb than any other of the regular Democrats. These CIO people are Mennen Williams-Blair Moody people first and Reutherites second, when it comes to politics in the Democratic Party. They favored Blair Moody for senator rather than George Edwards, as a case in point.

These Williams-Moody followers believe strongly that Branigan would stand a chance if the CIO did not endorse him. They make no pretense that he is a labor candidate. They are against labor candidates as "impractical."

Unwilling to admit they had no real candidate in the mayoralty race, and in spite of their known antipathy to Branigan, the UAW leadership recommended his endorsement to the special enlarged meeting called last week!

## Home Truths

Incidentally, at every question of the legality and constitutionality of this meeting, Mike Novak, Wayne County CIO council president, insisted that the convention mandated such a meeting and that it had policy-making power!

What happened at this meeting is very ironical in view of the fact that only one speaker took the floor for a five-minute speech to oppose the official policy. In a matter-of-fact speech, delegate Jack Widick of Chrysler Local 7 described the "painful embarrassment of the UAW leadership." He analyzed the situation in the Detroit election as similar to the dilemma the CIO faced in Ohio on the problem of defeating Taft. He showed how the failure to have independent candidates in Ohio made the CIO the tail of the Democratic Party, with the result that no one, certainly not the rank and file in Ohio, took the CIO-PAC's policies seriously.

"Everybody in this room knows we don't have our own candidate, and that we are going from defeat to defeat in political action. Four years ago the CIO was a major influence in Detroit in the Frankenstein campaign. Two years ago, it still had a fair influence, as the Edwards campaign showed. Now the UAW is reduced to supporting anybody the Democratic Party puts in a race, since it is the tail of the Democratic Party. Isn't Branigan the man who never joined a union although he was in the newspaper field for 17 years? Isn't he the man the UAW denounced last year in radio broadcasts as a phony?" Widick asked.

"The rank and file in the shops are confused. They don't follow the leadership, because they sense the leaders don't know where they are going. You can't sell them a bill of goods. Ohio showed that. Until the labor movement gets its own candidates, has its own program and its own political machine, it is doomed to failure. Let's quit kidding ourselves. We must reject the basic policy of our leaders."

Mike Novak, the council president, answered the speaker with a blast at the record of Mayor Cobo. He insisted labor could defeat him with Branigan "if we stick together and work hard. We have no other choice in the matter."

## VOTE-UPSET

A delegate from the American Newspaper Guild briefly attacked Branigan for his anti-union record. Another delegate from the floor shouted to Novak, "We've been hearing that story about winning for a long time. Only we're always losing." A Negro delegate from Briggs 212 challenged Novak to "answer the speaker from Local 7. You haven't done it!"

## DEFEAT TO DEFEAT

At this point things looked as if they were going to get out of control, so the usual call for previous question was made and a vote was taken!

Out of nearly 450 people in the room, only a small handful, certainly not over 50 at the most, voted to accept the recommendation of the leadership to endorse Branigan. It was a stunning defeat, so overwhelming that it set the leadership back on its heels.

What did it signify?

What did it signify?

Above all, it was a protest against the obvious blind alley into which the UAW has been led on political action at least in the municipal campaign. It was a sign of the unrest and uncertainty that prevails in the union movement today. Although there were many UAW leaders in the room, none of them felt strongly enough about the value of the present official policy to answer the criticisms. Privately, many of them agree with most of what the critic said.

**THEY WILL SQUIRM**

Twenty-four hours after this meeting, Mike Novak was quoted in the daily newspapers as saying that the meeting had only advisory powers, which suggests that the UAW leadership may force a reversal of the position taken at this gathering. But they have an unpleasant and painful task!

The brief but accurate recital of facts presented to the delegates by the critics simply cannot be denied by the UAW leaders. Much of the Democratic Party machine will support the Republican Mayor Cobo. The AFL is split as usual. The Teamsters' officials are for Cobo, while Frank X. Mar-

tel and his colleagues, who supported Cobo last time, are now supporting Branigan. The UAW leaders can't effectively use that old shop-worn argument, "He's going to win, so let's get on the bandwagon," in view of the facts. Branigan is simply a Detroit Joe Ferguson. They will find difficulty in using the argument, "Let's have labor unity. Let's stick with the AFL on this matter," for the AFL is openly divided.

**BLIND ALLEY**

It is quite hard to sell any program with enthusiasm when no one has any faith or belief in it, and this is the case in the Detroit municipal election situation right now. How difficult the UAW leaders task is was illustrated at the meeting also by a

violent discussion that arose over Council President Miriani, who was bitterly attacked by the UAW's PAC coordinator, even though his name was not suggested for endorsement by the Wayne County CIO officials. However, many local union politicians have a private pipeline to Miriani and vice versa; and his defenders, who stated "He's as good as any of them," are burned up.

And in this incident too the UAW leadership shows that it no longer has any real ideological control over its ranks. Unless there is a drastic and most unlikely change in policy, it appears that for 1952, the UAW will be merely a tail to the Democratic Party, within which its own cliques, be they the Williams-Moody followers or the Miriani crowd, will dispute the influence of the Reuther leadership.

Any professions of unity, such as may be forthcoming as a result of the exposure of the real situation in the UAW political-action program at the special meeting, may be written off in advance as face-saving and lip-service.

The UAW leaders are in a blind alley, and haven't the courage to admit it.

New York State seems to be the exception to the exception. In this state, we have for some time had the Liberal Party. Regardless of its form, it is based upon the trade unions and derives its principal strength from them.

Its base in New York City is pretty much confined to the needle-trades organizations—mainly the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and the Hatters Union—plus other unions especially upstate. Insofar as it has failed to extend this basis to the rest of the organized labor movement, it has shown its main weakness. But what strength and value it does have is due to the fact that it is nevertheless based upon a strong section of the labor movement.

**SLOW, BUT INEVITABLE**

Yes, the "exception to the exception" has been far more appearance than reality.

Up to yesterday, the Liberal Party participated in politics only as a humble auxiliary of the Fair Deal wing of the Democratic Party, and occasionally as an equally humble auxiliary of the "progressive" wing of the Republican Party. In other words, it was an independent party which existed for the purpose of endorsing "acceptable" candidates nominated by and responsible to the old capitalist parties.

In days to come, workers will surely look back upon this phenomenon with incredulous amazement. That labor unions should have supported the candidates of the capitalist parties was, they will see, preposterous enough; but that unions should have formed a political party of their own in order to support the candidates of opposing parties—that will be hard for anyone to understand!

Fortunately, the irreconcilability of class interests always manages to assert and reassert itself under capitalism, even if slowly, even if the manifestations of it are confused or confusing, even if they are distorted, sometimes beyond easy recognition. The Democratic and Republican Parties are capitalist parties. They do not exist as a free field for use by the working class, but as political instruments of capitalist groups who, whatever their differences, are united in the defense of capitalism. The more difficult the problems of capitalism become, the less possible it is for workers to deceive themselves or to be deceived into believing that these parties are instruments they can use for promoting or even defending their own interests.

The break between the working

class, between the labor movement, and even between the labor officialdom, on the one side, and the capitalist parties, on the other, has been all too slow in coming, but it is inevitable.

One of the first signs of this truth to appear in recent times is the New York City municipal campaign of the Liberal Party. For the first time in many years, the party has put forward a candidate of its own for the main office in the election—in this case, the office of president of the City Council—against the candidates of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties.

The choice of Halley by the party leadership is symptomatic. Although it was forced to take the long overdue and in any case altogether justified and necessary step of putting forward its own candidate against the two capitalist parties, after failing to make a deal with either of these parties,

The campaign of any genuinely independent working-class party would loudly proclaim its intention of cleaning out of government the corrupt capitalist politicians and machines. But if it is to arouse the enthusiastic support of the masses of the workers—and New York City is one which is rich in militant working-class traditions—it would carry on such a campaign in the name of achieving a democratic working-class municipal government which aims to provide a radical remedy, within the limits set by a local administration, of the multitude of grievances of the people of New York.

Thus far, at least, Halley has talked about "clean government" at length but the significant issues of the day have remained unmentioned either by him or by the party leaders.

**IN SPITE OF HALLEY**

On the housing question, nothing. On discriminatory practices perpetrated upon our large Negro and Puerto Rican population in New York City, nothing. On the iniquitous ten-cent fare and the planned fifteen-cent fare, nothing. On low-cost municipal markets, nothing. On what is to be done about our miserable school facilities, nothing. On the wages of municipal employees, especially the wages of school teachers, nothing.

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

# The Liberal Party and the Halley Campaign

## A Step Forward Toward Independence—with a Feeble Candidate

By M. N. TRENT and PETER WHITNEY

Advocates of independent working-class political action have toiled at an uphill job for years.

Big political changes have taken place in the American labor movement. There is hardly a union of note that has not reached the point where it is organized for political action. By and large, labor is now mobilized as a class in politics, and that fact marks an encouraging advance over the past.

But this mobilization of the workers, as represented by the PAC in the CIO unions, the LLPE in the AFL and similar bodies in other unions, has not yet reached that minimum which is required before it can be said that the labor movement is engaged in independent political action. For thus far its political mobilization remains at the service of the old capitalist parties and their machines.

Labor politics still consists of rounding up the working-class vote for a "good" or "liberal" or "progressive" candidate on the ticket of either the Democratic or Republican Parties, whom the labor movement has next to nothing to do with choosing and over whom it can exercise no control.

The U. S. thereby still remains the exception among all other countries whose labor movement has a political party of its own, with its own program, its own candidates, its own parliamentary representation, and its avowed aim of establishing its own government.

New York State seems to be the exception to the exception. In this state, we have for some time had the Liberal Party. Regardless of its form, it is based upon the trade unions and derives its principal strength from them.

Its base in New York City is pretty much confined to the needle-trades organizations—mainly the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and the Hatters Union—plus other unions especially upstate. Insofar as it has failed to extend this basis to the rest of the organized labor movement, it has shown its main weakness. But what strength and value it does have is due to the fact that it is nevertheless based upon a strong section of the labor movement.

**SLOW, BUT INEVITABLE**

Yes, the "exception to the exception" has been far more appearance than reality.

Up to yesterday, the Liberal Party participated in politics only as a humble auxiliary of the Fair Deal wing of the Democratic Party, and occasionally as an equally humble auxiliary of the "progressive" wing of the Republican Party. In other words, it was an independent party which existed for the purpose of endorsing "acceptable" candidates nominated by and responsible to the old capitalist parties.

In days to come, workers will surely look back upon this phenomenon with incredulous amazement. That labor unions should have supported the candidates of the capitalist parties was, they will see, preposterous enough; but that unions should have formed a political party of their own in order to support the candidates of opposing parties—that will be hard for anyone to understand!

Fortunately, the irreconcilability of class interests always manages to assert and reassert itself under capitalism, even if slowly, even if the manifestations of it are confused or confusing, even if they are distorted, sometimes beyond easy recognition. The Democratic and Republican Parties are capitalist parties. They do not exist as a free field for use by the working class, but as political instruments of capitalist groups who, whatever their differences, are united in the defense of capitalism. The more difficult the problems of capitalism become, the less possible it is for workers to deceive themselves or to be deceived into believing that these parties are instruments they can use for promoting or even defending their own interests.

The break between the working

class, between the labor movement, and even between the labor officialdom, on the one side, and the capitalist parties, on the other, has been all too slow in coming, but it is inevitable.

One of the first signs of this truth to appear in recent times is the New York City municipal campaign of the Liberal Party. For the first time in many years, the party has put forward a candidate of its own for the main office in the election—in this case, the office of president of the City Council—against the candidates of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties.

The choice of Halley by the party leadership is symptomatic. Although it was forced to take the long overdue and in any case altogether justified and necessary step of putting forward its own candidate against the two capitalist parties, after failing to make a deal with either of these parties,

The campaign of any genuinely independent working-class party would loudly proclaim its intention of cleaning out of government the corrupt capitalist politicians and machines. But if it is to arouse the enthusiastic support of the masses of the workers—and New York City is one which is rich in militant working-class traditions—it would carry on such a campaign in the name of achieving a democratic working-class municipal government which aims to provide a radical remedy, within the limits set by a local administration, of the multitude of grievances of the people of New York.

Thus far, at least, Halley has talked about "clean government" at length but the significant issues of the day have remained unmentioned either by him or by the party leaders.

**IN SPITE OF HALLEY**

On the housing question, nothing. On discriminatory practices perpetrated upon our large Negro and Puerto Rican population in New York City, nothing. On the iniquitous ten-cent fare and the planned fifteen-cent fare, nothing. On low-cost municipal markets, nothing. On what is to be done about our miserable school facilities, nothing. On the wages of municipal employees, especially the wages of school teachers, nothing.

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Compared to the kind of candidate and campaign an independent party of labor can and should have, the nomination of Rudolph Halley by the Liberal Party is a pitifully feeble, hesitant, shamefaced and trivial step forward. But compared to the policy thus far pursued by the Liberal Party, it is a big step forward and as such we welcome it.

**SAUCE FOR THE GANDER**

The literature of the Liberal Party always emphasizes with pride that, unlike the Democratic and Republican Parties which are controlled by machines and, indeed, are nothing but machines, it, the Liberal Party, is democratic. It would be far better if this assertion could be made with justification as well as pride.

The question of who should be the candidate of the Liberal Party for president of the City Council was never submitted to the party membership before it was finally decided upon by the party leadership. The membership was not consulted—it was informed.

It would not hurt if the party which is running Halley on a slogan of "clean government" for New York City would introduce some "clean government" into its own organization, at least to the extent of providing that the membership has no less right and opportunity to propose who shall represent the party in elections than the leadership, and has equal right with the leadership to decide both the candidates and the program, on the basis of the good democratic procedure of one member equals one vote, not more but also not less.

**"THE MAN WHO . . ."**

The choice of Halley by the party leadership is symptomatic. Although it was forced to take the long overdue and in any case altogether justified and necessary step of putting forward its own candidate against the two capitalist parties, after failing to make a deal with either of these parties,

The campaign of any genuinely independent working-class party would loudly proclaim its intention of cleaning out of government the corrupt capitalist politicians and machines. But if it is to arouse the enthusiastic support of the masses of the workers—and New York City is one which is rich in militant working-class traditions—it would carry on such a campaign in the name of achieving a democratic working-class municipal government which aims to provide a radical remedy, within the limits set by a local administration, of the multitude of grievances of the people of New York.

Thus far, at least, Halley has talked about "clean government" at length but the significant issues of the day have remained unmentioned either by him or by the party leaders.

**IN SPITE OF HALLEY**

On the housing question, nothing. On discriminatory practices perpetrated upon our large Negro and Puerto Rican population in New York City, nothing. On the iniquitous ten-cent fare and the planned fifteen-cent fare, nothing. On low-cost municipal markets, nothing. On what is to be done about our miserable school facilities, nothing. On the wages of municipal employees, especially the wages of school teachers, nothing.

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

The other well-known personage who shares this silence is the Democratic candidate, Sharkey. He apparently knows when to be quiet; Halley apparently doesn't know when to speak up.

**Nominating its own candidate for the outstanding office represents progress for the Liberal Party—slow, tiny, anxiously-respectable, but progress. Socialists who, like ourselves, will unhesitatingly vote for its independent candidates, including Halley, and call upon all workers to vote for them, do so not because of the candidate the party leadership has selected, but in spite of him; and not because of the kind of political campaign that is at present indicated and will very likely be conducted until November, but in spite of it.**

It offers us all an opportunity to cast a telling vote against the old capitalist parties and for incipient political action, however primitive and inadequate the form in which it appears. Our vote will go to the Liberal Party's independent candidates this year not because we are able to endorse its program and theirs—for we are not able to—but because we want to see the greatest strength put behind an idea and a movement whose triumph is a triumph for labor and its ideals.

**THIS IS THE IDEA**

It is the idea that the working class should not rely or depend upon the capitalist parties, but upon a party of their own; not upon capitalist party candidates, but on candidates chosen by their own party and running only on its ticket. It is the idea that a working-class party, even if its class character is as heavily disguised or apologized for as is that of the Liberal Party, should present itself for support by the people in its own name and in its own behalf and that it can thus win wide support without relying on capitalist machines and candidates.

It is the idea of which the present Liberal Party campaign is not the full-blown realization—it is unfortunately very, very far from that—but of which it is a promising if half-hearted beginning.

As against candidacies like Halley's, every socialist will continue to work, inside and outside the Liberal Party, for genuine labor candidates on a genuinely independent party ticket. But, as against the old policy of supporting the candidates of the Democratic and Republican Parties, the nomination even of Rudolph Halley will be supported by every thinking socialist and every thinking worker.

And certainly, as against the candidacy of Sharkey, the Democratic Party nominee, which has been endorsed by the leadership of the New York City AFL and CIO—an act which disgraces both organizations—the independent ticket of the Liberal Party represents in the New York elections this year the interests of progress and the working class.

**Marxism in the United States**

By LEON TROTSKY

35 Cents . . . . . Order from

Independent Socialist Press

114 West 14 Street

New York 11, N. Y.

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written).

Not even the fight over the question of whether policemen have the elementary democratic right to organize into unions has elicited a word of comment from the party or its clean-government candidate. Everybody is discussing the question; both the AFL and CIO councils in the city have taken a stand, the right stand, on the question; every prominent politician in town has spoken out on it; so has every newspaper; but not the Liberal Party and not Halley (at least, not as this is being written

# 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 world-wide 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!

**INTERESTED?**

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th 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 .....

Address .....

City .....

State .....

# British TUC Yields —

(Continued from page 1)

fense, and seeks to minimize the economic effects of the armament program on the workers.

Nevertheless, the action of the trade-union leaders is a further indication of the general dissatisfaction with the policy of the Labor Party which exists in the ranks. Even the correspondent of the *New York Times* points out that the wage proposal was made in order to "take the sting out of nineteen resolutions on wages, prices and profits" which have been sent in for consideration at the forthcoming Labor Party congress.

### LINKED TO BEVAN

Whatever the intentions of the TUC leadership may be with respect to the Bevan movement, there can be little doubt that in the minds of the ranks this action will be linked up with the political tendency represented by Bevan.

The TUC report demands that the government "establish as soon as possible a new and more stable level of prices," and states that "the present apparatus of price and production controls and of profits and income taxes is insufficient. . . ." In view of the government's inability to hold the price line, the report states that "it is apparent that in the present situation trade unions must endeavor to maintain the real wages of their members by demanding wage increases."

With regard to general economic policy, the press reports that the TUC general council urges the extension and tightening of economic controls, an increase in food subsidies, a limit on dividends to be set by law. Further, the council states that it has been considering the advisability of a capital-gains tax, such as that in force in the United States. This would make it possible to tax gains made by trading in the stock market.

### WORLD VIEW NEEDED

Whether or not the policy of the council will actually result in major struggles over wages, only the future will show. From the available reports it does not appear that the leadership of the TUC has taken up the question of workers' control in the nationalized industries, one of the chief political and economic problems

in Britain. Further, their policy, like Bevan's, is confined to seeking a solution for the economic problems of the workers inside the present British economy. Within these confines only very small gains, if any, are actually feasible.

As LABOR ACTION has pointed out repeatedly, Britain's economic plight is dominated by the weakened position of British industry in the world market. This is more decisive for Britain than for almost any other country. A redistribution of the national income in Britain in favor of the working class could raise its standard of living somewhat. But the total national income, and the production from which it derives, is not sufficient to give the British people a stable, high standard of living.

Thus any policy which has such a standard as its long-term goal must look beyond the "tight little island" for a broader base. The British Empire which used to provide this base has shrunk drastically, and the attempt to maintain the remains as an area of British exploitation is being resisted with increasing vigor by the newly awakened peoples of the colonies.

A progressive economic policy must have as its major aspect a positive program for uniting the British economy with the economies of Western Europe. As the Labor Party pointed out in connection with the Schuman Plan, it would be futile to attempt this unless the countries of Western Europe were controlled politically by their own working people. But the fact that the British Labor Party lacks an internationalist attitude, program or policy hinders rather than aids such a development in the rest of Europe.

Certainly, the British workers have every right and even duty to improve their wages at the expense of the wealthy class in Britain. But they have an even higher duty: to take the lead in advocating and organizing for the formation of an independent West European union led by the workers in the various countries of Europe. Such a program might not lead to any immediate rise in the standard of living of the workers of Britain. But it is the only base on which their standard can hope to rise and stay up in the long run.

## Socialist Youth League MIDWEST CAMP September 7-8-9

At Recreation Camp, Genoa City, Wis.  
on Militarism and Marxism  
and Current Problems of the Labor Movement

Featured Speaker: B. J. Widick  
Co-author of "The UAW and Walter Reuther"  
Also: sports, games, square dancing, campfire, etc.

For reservations, write to Mills, 6337 So. Kimbark  
Chicago 37



## LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 35 August 27, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) 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.

Editor: HAL DRAPER  
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH  
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Asst. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIX

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

# READING from LEFT to RIGHT

WORLD REVOLUTION—TVA SHOWS THE WAY, by William O. Douglas.—*The Progressive*, August.

Mostly, this is another of those naive liberal touching pleas that the powers that be in America should become the vanguard of the world revolution—in other countries. But it has a special interest as the product of the well-known Supreme Court justice, and he does not mince words in setting down the bad odor in which American imperialism is held by non-Stalinist Asia.

Douglas (last reported at this writing tramping in the Himalaya foothills above India) writes of his trip through the Middle East. His report does credit to his eyes and ears as well as his heart, if not to his political understanding of world social forces.

The main theme is "anti-Communism is not enough." His target is Washington's "negative" attitude; this seems to mean to him that the trouble is not that the U. S. has done anything wrong—it has merely not done anything right. For a country whose intentions are, it appears, flawless, the results he describes are disconcerting:

"As a consequence of our negative attitude and military approach to the problem, the tide of Soviet Communism has picked up momentum. . . ."

"The revolutions which are brewing [in the countries visited] are not, however, Communist in origin nor will they end even if Soviet Russia is crushed through war. The revolutionaries are hungry men who have been exploited from time out of mind. . . . There are grumblings in every

village I have visited across this broad belt. Revolution is brewing. . . . [If we knew the facts] we would help them make their revolutions. . . ."

"Unfortunately, we do not do that. As a result of a combination of circumstances, we are mostly signed up on the side of the landlords. . . . To Asiatics we appear to be against change. . . . We associate ourselves with the status quo; and America becomes identified in the eyes of the peasants with the forces that hold them in eternal serfdom. Soviet propaganda about America, these peasants often told me, has proved correct. . . ."

"This criticism of America is not fair; we intend no such consequences. . . . We have been so relentlessly anti-Communist that we have rushed to the support of every group that opposes Soviet communism. That has put us in partnership with the corrupt and reactionary groups whose policies breed the discontent on which Soviet Communism feeds and spreads. Thus we have ended up as allies of some of the worst foes of the peoples of Asia."

The next sentence is, literally: "It is easy to reverse the trend." This is so to Douglas, no doubt, because all it takes is a change of mind and heart in Washington. . . . There is no indication in the article that Washington's policy is anything but a product of ignorance which would be corrected if enough leaders talked to peasants in the Middle East; or that the ruling classes in the countries there would have any objections to the use of "the TVA as the political instrument for remodeling the economy of Asia."

## A CASE HISTORY FOR CERTAIN SCIENTISTS—

# Johnsonites Split from SWP—at 8:30 Sharp

"Never in the whole history of the Trotskyist movement has there been a minority like ours."

This claim strikes the keynote of the document from which we quote it, a statement called "The Balance Sheet Completed" which the leaders of the Johnson-Forest group have just dropped into the lap of the Socialist Workers Party in announcement that they have left that organization. It isn't the first time they have left it, to be sure; but this time, they take their oath, it's for keeps.

Their above-quoted claim is a pretty small mortgage on fame. But if it isn't much, at least it is true.

The Johnsonites? Quit the SWP? But isn't that impossible?

The question itself shows an ignorance of political trivia. For this group nothing is impossible. Long ago and by pure rhetorical effort, they reached those remote outer spaces which mere bourgeois scientists can only dream of attaining by still inadequate rockets. Now safely removed from our wretched earth by many light-years, they spin around it at a dizzying speed and by keeping their eyes closely focused on each other they shut out the problem of impossibility. An ever so imperceptible jerk of the head, and they see before them, as big and pulsating as life itself, things which remain invisible to the eye of the earthbound.

IN THE CRYSTAL BALL

In 1940, when the Trotskyist movement split over the Cannonite majority's support to Stalinist Russia in the war, the minority forming the Workers Party, the present leaders of the Johnsonites were with the latter. To the accompaniment of much head-jerking their faction crystallized. After the head-jerking came hallucinations.

For the next seven years—during which Hitlerism held Europe under the swastika, the war drowned Europe in blood, and Stalinism celebrated monstrous triumphs—the Johnsonites proclaimed the good tidings that never before was socialism so close. With the post-war advance of Stalinism over Eastern Europe, they proclaimed that capitalism was reaching a new apex in the form of Stalinism. For the United States they proclaimed

that we should look forward to sovietism in America, if not just around the corner then no more than a couple of blocks down the road.

Whereupon they quit the Workers Party to return to the bosom of the SWP, which they had denounced as hopelessly in the camp of imperialism, hopelessly strangled by bureaucracy, and on the other side of the barricades.

They discovered simultaneously that they had been wrong to split in 1940 and that, as a matter of fact, it was wrong to split parties anyway. In other words, they had been disastrously wrong for the whole past seven years of their existence and unable to make the simplest distinction between the "petty-bourgeois opportunism" of the WP and the sterling "Bolshevism" of the Cannonites.

This no doubt adequately prepared them to complete their balance sheet by the present announcement that they have been equally at sea for the past four years of phantasmagorical existence in the SWP.

### AT 8:30 SHARP

Jacob may have toiled longer in the vineyard than the Johnsonites did in the SWP, but it is far from historically established that he toiled as silently. For four years they labored in the party of Bolshevism which they had rediscovered, but nobody could discover more than a couple of syllables out of them. The head was jerked and the tongue was firmly anchored at both ends.

Their party still called the Stalinist barbarism a "workers' state," called for its defense, supported Stalinist parties everywhere in practice, found a new Trotsky in Tito, remained ruled by the dead hand of bureaucracy—but their tongues remained anchored.

A couple of weeks ago, the head jerked again, this time with the tongue unanchored at either end. With watches synchronized all over the country, the Johnsonites rose at their branch meetings, promptly at 8:30 p.m., and announced to an utterly stupefied membership: "We are leaving the SWP. This statement will explain." With a few exceptions, all the Johnsonites marched out in orderly fashion, not whispering, or laughing, or weep-

ing, or faltering in their march through and into the void, which is no mean feat for people who had used their legs for four long years.

The statement itself has no political value or importance, none. But it is an authentic item for collectors, and not only for those who confine their researches to the science of politics. Indeed, the case history it presents deserves inclusion in a book, not at all necessarily a political one.

### PIECES DE RESISTANCE

Two temptations must be resisted in quoting from the statement. One is to appear critical of its authors. We not only resist the temptation but shrink in terror from it, for one of the declarations in the statement reads—word for word, honor bright!—"To attack Johnson-Forest means inevitably an attack on the proletariat." And that is something we will not do. The other is to quote and quote and quote. But there is a limit to all things, even good ones, and we will give here only a small sampling—always word for word.

We add only this: knowing the Johnsonites for what they are, and the Cannonite regime for what it is, we take responsibility for neither of them, neither the accusations of the former nor the defense of the latter.

"We are leaving behind forever the ideas of those who today represent Trotskyism, their unsocialist, anti-proletarian practice and organizational life. For years we loyally stood all this, bearing in mind constantly the interests of the movement as a whole. But by now things have reached a stage where we have to fly not only from their dehumanized politics but from their social immorality and the personal degeneration

Interested? For information about the INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

Write to 114 W. 14th Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

# Youth and Student Corner

## A Report on the SLID Convention: Now We've Seen Everything

By BOB DENNIS

The Wayne University chapter of the Student League for Industrial Democracy recently was host to a national convention of that organization. Delegates representing about 150 votes were present, including representatives from Columbia, CCNY, NYU, Harvard and Syracuse, in addition to the delegation from Wayne. The convention was of particular interest to the Socialist Youth League because it gave an object lesson in the politics of a socialist student group which follows a pro-war approach.

There was a definite split among the delegates into a right and left wing, with the conservatives in a definite majority which included the groups from Columbia, NYU, Harvard, and CCNY Day Session. The left wing came from CCNY Evening Session and the Wayne chapter. Syracuse vacillated between the two groups, although voting with the right wing on all major issues and attending its caucus meetings. Both groups were well organized for the convention, with the right wing having the benefit of careful tutelage by representatives from the League for Industrial Democracy (the parent organization of the SLID).

The Wayne University chapter came to the convention with a prepared program which it submitted for adoption. It was a general Third Camp position similar to that of the magazine *Anvil* and *Student Partisan*. It had arrived at this program through a series of pre-convention discussions in which SYL members had played a conspicuous part, and the Wayne delegation had been elected by a membership educated in the need for a Third Camp. Anti-war YPSLs also played an important role in the left-wing caucus.

The right wing, on the other hand, came to the convention with little more than a determination to scuttle anything that the minority presented. Its program was hastily assembled the night before the convention, and represented a hodge-podge of socialist, liberal, and

even reactionary ideas. The right-wing program and speeches betrayed a deep cynicism with respect to socialism and hostility toward the idea of building an anti-war Third Camp movement. Their delegates accepted the cold war as a permanent feature of life, with the eventual perspective of a hot war following it. These "socialists," proceeding on this assumption, set themselves up as the most "intelligent" strategists of this coming war by preparing a blueprint for the government.

In many ways this convention was unique, for never before have American socialists argued in favor of compulsory military conscription, or called for an end to racial discrimination because it deprived the war effort of a large pool of labor. Remember, these people were not arguing before some reactionary congressional committee, with excuses for opportunistic maneuvering; they were laying down the ideological basis for a socialist opposition to racial discrimination.

An even more flagrant violation of democratic ideas in civil rights was the proposal of the right wing favoring federal aid to housing on a non-segregated basis except in those states already having segregation. Here it was not a question of the permissibility of compromising on an issue where complete victory was impossible, or even of defending the past actions of compromisers in the Senate. It does mean a willingness to limit the program in advance to fit the framework of existing institutions, in this case, Jim Crow practices in the South.

### Pro-War Majority Afraid to Vote!

Needless to say, the programmatic debate was not a quiet one. The minority fought with the passion appropriate to its convictions and toward the principled end of educating the membership. The majority, however, was as unprincipled in its tactics as it was cynical over program. The question of military conscription pointed this up clearly.

The first vote on whether to include a plank favoring conscription won a majority on a hand vote. But when a left-wing delegate called for a roll-call vote, the majority delegates were thrown into consternation. An LID representative handed them instructions on a slip of paper, and they abstained on the roll-call vote (with the exception of the delegate from Harvard who announced that this was the logical conclusion of his position).

Then the left wing moved that the SLID convention categorically oppose any enforced military conscription, and the majority again abstained, with the ludicrous result that a minority position carried the day in the absence of a majority with enough courage to vote its views!

With complete right-wing control of the organization the anti-war elements were doubtful whether or not they could remain a loyal minority continuing to present a socialist alternative to the war and its conclusions. But toward the end of the convention the majority collaborated in working out a more acceptable general program and even gave the minority proportional representation on the National Executive Committee.

The reason for this moderation was two-fold: (1) The LID is known to have exerted pressure on its junior partner, toward the end of insuring a more radical line which could appeal to students; and (2) the conservatives feared the loss of the left wing and its closer ties with the anti-war movement on campus. Since the left was in no position to dominate the organization, but still controlled a couple of chapters of fairly large membership, it was decided to continue to tolerate its opposition.

On one question, however, the left won a real victory. For years members of the SYL have been classified as "totalitarian" and excluded from the SLID by constitutional provision. At this convention the constitution was amended (as usual, with the majority abstaining) to "allow" any "Shachtmanites" to remain in the organization.

The vicious amalgam whereby the SYL was lumped together with the Stalinists as a "totalitarian" organization was abandoned and this precedent can be used in all future disputes with social-democratic groups who attempted to prevent the SYL from participating on an equal basis with other socialist organizations.

The passages above, which do not exhaust the citations of interest to certain scientists with which the document is studded, present the main basis on which this group has now split from the SWP. It is very clear that the decisive reasons given are not political ones. If they smack of scandal-mongering, this impression must be false; for did not these same people denounce scandal-mongering (as well as splits) in no measured terms when they left the WP?

The "balance-sheet" is completed, if not for the Johnsonites, then at least for us. Their statement has a good deal to say about the Cannonites but, as the saying goes, what is true is not new and what is new is not true. Much more does it reveal about the Johnsonite leaders themselves. People capable of such a career in less than a dozen years, could get worse advice than to keep silent about politics, for a while, at any rate. There is no lack of evidence that some of them will take such advice to heart, but not for the best reasons and not for the best purposes.

"Never in the whole history of the Trotskyist movement has there been a minority like ours," they boast. They would be dead right if they amended their claim to read: "Never in the history of any movement."

"How is it possible for a revolutionary party, aimed at the overthrow of bourgeois society, to be led by men who openly discuss the past, present and future demoralization of each other and their comrades? . . . What kind of people are these? Finally there was forced upon us a shocking recognition of the callousness, the brutality, the lack of elementary leadership even to carry out its

**SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE**  
114 W. 14th St.  
New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.

I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

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

SCHOOL (IF STUDENT).....

Thursday at 8:30, August 30

## The Permanent War Economy

The Impact of the Cold War on American Economy

**ABE KIMBAY**

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

# Doves and Policemen: A Sketch

By BENNO SAREL

BERLIN, Aug. 5—It is 10:30 in the morning in Alexanderplatz, the central square of the Russian sector: it is a kind of fair, a flea market, a sausage emporium, a big saloon. Little German peasants or provincials stroll in pairs, in the blue shirts of the FDJ (the Stalinist Youth), eating watermelons, even the seeds—a typically eastern scene! Everywhere you see drinking mugs, watermelon rinds, bits of paper thrown away with sausage skins and mustard stains. Truly, Berlin has been balkanized.

Foreigners, much better dressed than the Germans, can be distinguished among the crowd: pretty Italian women in Roman sandals; groups of French students engaged in horseplay as in the Latin Quarter. The Chinese and the few Negroes at the festival are completely surrounded: their entourage ask them for autographs, coax, embrace them. They exchange addresses, scarves, buttons and insignia. All of which is, after all, very touching and appealing. Above and dominating everything: anthems, appeals, loud marches blared out by the loudspeakers. It is all catching at first, but very tiring after several hours of it.

I return to one of the two seven-story buildings which are the headquarters of the gathering. Extraordinary disorder: no one knows anything about the program, about admission cards, about the rights and duties of journalists at the festival. So much the worse: I will have to clear it up myself.

## They're Out of Order

One o'clock at the Walter Ulbricht stadium: the festival opens. It is a splendid-looking sight—the FDJ shirts and red, yellow, brown and black vests of the sport contestants are magnificently arranged. The parade of the 90 foreign delegations begins. There is an extreme diversity of types, costumes, gaits; the whole world shuffles past you in two hours, and in spite of everything it is all unified by the slogans and the portraits of Stalin.

The crowd is enthusiastic. But they pay less attention to the portraits than to the faces of the delegates. Here are the Hindus, with their magnificent bearing and noble carriage; there are the Bolivians, led by a girl who shakes her fist and waves her flag and never stops yelling slogans and singing. Here are the Chinese—frantically applauded, distinguishing themselves from the others by their red banners of silk, which float much better in the air; there are the Rumanians, with a whole orchestra of gypsy violins, preceded on the track by a dancing group; the Poles, Hungarians, many Czechs. . .

Since the parade order is alphabetical by countries, the Russians' turn comes next, and—surprise!—they aren't there. But there they come at the very end; it is their place to wind up the parade. The people around me do not seem to be offended by this distinction, which certainly is not democratically justified. The Russians, highly applauded, have an impeccable bearing; they are the only ones to go by with a military step; and later, during the speeches, they will be the only ones to remain in their ranks and at attention.

## Where Are the People?

Another detail: all the groups from the "popular democracies" carry a large portrait of Stalin in front and, some ten yards behind, another smaller one of the local leader. Only the Chinese bore in front portraits of the same size of Stalin and of Mao Tse-tung.

The parade is ended. Hundreds of cages at both ends of the stadium are opened, and some thousands of doves fly up into the air. But why on earth did they have to choose . . . policemen in uniform to give them their liberty?

I did not wait for the speeches to come to an end. In the stadium restaurant near my table there is a man of about 40—with the blue shirt and insignia of the FDJ. He is the special chauffeur of one of the leaders of the Communist Youth.

"Are you satisfied with your work?"—"Yes, it's fine."—"And what do you think of the pa-

## BERLIN:

**"The parade is ended. Hundreds of cages at both ends of the stadium are opened, and some thousands of doves fly up into the air. But why did they have to choose . . . policemen in uniform to give them their liberty?"**

rade just before?"—"All right . . . I wasn't there. . . . You see, my boss may come back and he must know where to find me."

It's the well-known line, this excuse by the 40-year-old FDJ "youth," well known also to chauffeurs in the capitalist countries. . . .

In the evening, there is dancing in the squares. Clearly the French and Italians are the life of the festivities. The FDJ youth are having a good time, but where is the Berlin population?

## Behind Barricades

TUESDAY, Aug. 7—The Friedrichstrasse is the main thoroughfare of the assembly, highly decorated and garish. I run into an American colleague and we walk along the sector boundary. At several places where the street runs toward the Western sector, barricades have been raised.

"What's the reason for that?" I asked a policeman.

"There are inexperienced youth here, and they've organized regular hoodlums on the other side."

At the end of the Friedrichstrasse, in the No Man's Land between the Russian and American sectors, there is a "discussion group": two Stalinist Youth agitators, a score of passers-by, mostly from the Western sectors. All the issues are gone over: the cost of the flags and who's paying for them, food, the purchasing power of the two marks, the borders of Germany, rearmament, etc. Same at the Potsdamerplatz, the "square of the three sectors." There some dozens of FDJ youth lean against the rail which marks the sector boundary, looking at the sidewalk 10 yards away in the same way as they might look across a river. There is something both tragic and foolish about the sight.

They are forbidden to cross the street; if they do, their admission card to the festival is taken away; then, no more food and they return to their city on their own. Not to speak of the eventual trouble with the police.

My friend has a fine-looking Chevrolet. Every time we get into the car, a group of FDJ youth stand by admiring it on all sides. We invite four of them to take a ride.

"Have you already gone into the Western sector?"

"I'm afraid of going there," replies one, a young girl of about 16. "They told us that the Stummppolizei arrests and beats up FDJers. And besides you'd need a well-lined pocketbook. . . ." (Stummppolizei is a pun: stumm means silent and it is also the name of the police prefect of the Western sectors.)

"And how goes it in your FDJ group?"

"Fine. We recruited the most in the whole district during the contest in honor of Stalin (Stalinaufgebot) before the festival."

## Sight-Seeing

We come to the monument of the Russian Soldier: a monster with a medieval sword which indubitably achieves its aim, to remind the Germans continually of their defeat. The FDJers and also the foreign delegations swarm around there. We talk with a couple of teachers from Saxony—he circumspect, she much more open although a convinced Stalinist: "I think it's a mistake not to let them go into the Western sectors. It's not a good tactic to turn one's back on what is."

But an FDJer from Bautzen in Saxony, on

the other hand, gives his complete approval to the measure. He picks up an argument furnished by the party press:

"The party alone is right. They would be only too happy on the other side if, instead of learning and working, we wasted our time studying what they are doing."

"And how goes it in your group?"

"It's fine. Almost all the youth around our way are already organized. So for the Stalinaufgebot we got the task of going over the production plan."

We leave the car for a while and join an official sightseeing group. A lad of about 20 is conducting it. What an amazing Berlin he shows us! For him the city did not exist before 1945 or thereabouts. The Brandenburg gate? He does not even mention it. The Marienkirche? The monument of Luther? He scarcely points to it. But here, there is an FDJ headquarters; there is a Pioneers camp; there is a statue of Stalin; there is a reconstructed factory. . . . A half hour of the official sightseeing tour educates us sufficiently.

We have lunch at a "free restaurant"—no coupons. The meal is equivalent to about two days' wages for a worker in the Russian sector (only three hours for a worker in the Western sector!). We do not have enough Russian zone money, but what of that? The West-mark, illegalized in the Russian sector, is welcome enough.

In the evening there is a show put on by the Russian music and dance group, a remarkable performance. Of course, the majority of the performers are professional artists and no doubt among the best. But on the artistic plane it is perfect. How gay and attractive are the dances from the Ukraine, Byelorussia and the Urals! In the intermission there is free fraternization between the delegations from the different countries.

But in spite of all . . . why does one NEVER see the Russian delegates walking alone or in little groups like the others? Why does one never see them freely engaged in conversation?

And how tiring and boring are the eternal hymns to Stalin, mingled with the songs and popular dances. But the audience was enthusiastic and applauded constantly.

A typical incident: The show was announced for 8:30. Through a chance encounter, I learn that it has been postponed an hour and a half. The evening paper does not announce the change, nor do the posted notices. Only the initiates know it and the news is spread at random. A high artistic level on one side, and on the other such contempt for the public! Likewise, it is impossible to find out the nature of the show in advance. "Soviet program": that is all that's announced and no one can tell you any more than that.

## Stalinist Types

THURSDAY, Aug. 9—The Eastern zone press club in the Friedrichstrasse: a magnificent room, stylish maitres d'hotel, tables occupied by leaders of the delegations; no little rank-and-file FDJers around here. I go there with a French girl delegate, a non-Stalinist who has come with a desire to get herself convinced on the spot, and a couple of young German journalists who are part of the Stalinist youth cadre. But these two are the hardbitten Stalinist type with 120 per cent party loyalty, to the point where it approaches cynicism—a frequent type among the leaders of the party and the youth.

At the next table a man sitting all alone seems to be listening to our conversation. Perhaps he isn't, but that is the impression I get. I mention this to my companion. He does not deny it, he does not smile at my fear.

"It's possible. You know in our situation we have to . . ."

"And what do you think of the festival and of the possibility that the FDJ youth may be influenced by the Western sectors?"

"Effective steps have been taken to prevent that. And I am sure that the whole atmosphere of the festival will gain us more as far as the youths' spirit is concerned than the Western

# Of the Stalinist Youth Festival

sectors can make us lose."

I did not like this way of looking at things very much. We parted. The street is as garish, stirring, laughing as ever. In all the public squares in the center, platforms have been built and song-and-dance groups are performing—Bulgarians, Rumanians, Polish, the German Eastern provinces—excellent stuff jostling the mediocre. Of course, none of the shows attain the levels of the Russians'. But the atmosphere is young and full of life. And in spite of everything, the endless portraits of Stalin and the incessant hurrahs which the majority give out with at every mention of Russia (by this time without even thinking about it) make the atmosphere unbreathable for one who is not in the swim.

The French girl delegate tells me about the state of mind in the French delegation:

"Ninety-five per cent are members of the UJRF (Stalinist Youth) and they have not come here to learn the truth but to convince themselves still more. Almost all of them will leave enthusiastic over what they have seen. They have all been impressed by the really extraordinary reception that we got. And besides, how find out what's really what? Very few know German. They tell us to go in groups with an interpreter. One can do that, no doubt. But willy-nilly, since we are delegates we have taken sides in the eyes of the people and even if we can manage to strike up a conversation, they are partly suspicious and partly don't want to be killjoys and say what they think. Then one hears comments like 'Yes, things are better than they were three or four years ago. . . .'"

## Korean Pantomime

We get on Unter den Linden. At the end of Thaelmannplatz, the government section, we meet a young manager in the Russian zone radio who at the same time is intelligent, cultivated, convinced and acquainted with French literature. We go over everything: J.-P. Sartre, according to him, is a dishonest writer; in Eastern Germany the economy and culture are developing and soon will be the people's.

"The workers feel that the factory where they work now belongs to them," he tells us.

"What do you think of the German youth nowadays?"

"Why, the youth of our republic is right here! Don't you find them marvelous? And look over there: isn't it magnificent to see those 20-year-old cops arm-in-arm with the young workers?"

We were sitting at a table in front of three Mokkas in a café where he was known. I wanted to ask him how many Mokkas a young worker in Eastern Germany can afford: each costs 5½ marks and his wages are 150-200 marks a month. And as for the police, yes, they go arm-in-arm with the FDJ youth—but why are there so very many of them? And it would not have been difficult to cite the names of young democrats who were in prison.

In the evening there is a Korean show at the state theater—a remarkable performance on a high artistic level and of great interest.

The dance and pantomime of the partisans is set in a magnificent décor of Korean hills at night. The mother loses her child, killed by American aviators. She joins the partisans. She throws grenades. Three Americans capture her and torture her hideously, but other partisans free her and she kills the Americans with her own hands.

Of course, the whole thing is impregnated with chauvinism and cruelty. The way in which the Americans are presented approaches the grotesque at times. The woman's bravery in the struggle with the three men is exaggerated. But this only on reflection: the whole is admirably executed and very taking. I learn during intermission that the dance is performed before the North Korean soldiers at the front.

## The New "Democratic Woman"

I left the show with a group of foreigners, two Swiss, a Czech, and a Rumanian. Marvelous coincidence! I had known the Rumanian before the war in Paris; she was a student then and vaguely Stalinist. She is now fiercely pro-party and a member of the permanent Rumanian delegation to the Eastern Berlin government. All of

them are enthusiastic, not only about the show but about the festivities in general. The Czech delegate, like the French delegation, has been impressed by the reception—

"Everywhere we go they shake our hand. From the border on and even on the train there were words of welcome. Really I believe that the Germans have changed enormously."

The Swiss delegates had visited a "Pioneers' Republic" (the Pioneers are the younger FDJers, 12-13 years old), near Berlin; they were quite carried away by what they had seen and could not keep still on the subject.

I take the risk of saying that one must not trust appearances, that there are other sides to it, that all this is perhaps a little superficial. . . . Immediately, their faces harden, the gayety is broken, the conversation dies. The Rumanian takes me aside:

"By the way, what are you doing now?"

I tell her the paper for which I work, and . . . I really have reason to stand aghast: she knits her brows and, without looking at me, without putting out her hand, she says: "I have to leave. I think I will not see you again."

It is clear that for her I am only a "traitor."

SATURDAY AFTERNOON, Aug. 11—The Kurfürstendamm, the main artery of the Western zone, which is not usually very appealing, now however offers relaxation in comparison with the Russian sector: no loudspeakers blaring anthems, no flag, no political hubbub. As usual, elegant dresses, loungers, hawkers. But there is a new and different note now: the avenue has been invaded by young lads and girls, in provincial dress: FDJers out of bounds. Some are still wearing their blue shirts; most of them have hid the shirt under a pullover or carry it in a little parcel; they will pull it on again in the evening in order to re-enter the Russian sector. The Western Berliners give them an excellent reception: they invite them to the movies, offer them chocolate, bananas; for many of them these are the first they have seen.

A mixed group formed at the street corner. They were discussing:

"Well now, how do you like it here?"

"Fine. I passed into the Western sector without being aware, while taking a walk, and then all of a sudden I see the shop windows full. Too bad, it takes a lot of money to live here. . . ."

Another FDJer tells how afraid he was to go into the Western sector:

"They told us that we would be immediately arrested and beaten up by the Stummppolizei. In our group at Zittau," he continues, "they scared the smaller one, the Pioneers, by telling them that the bananas and oranges in the West are inoculated with infantile-paralysis germs. . . ."

"They really told them that?"

"They said that in all Pioneer groups. It was a directive."

As a matter of fact, it didn't surprise me. A rumor was circulating in the French delegation that the water coming from the Western sectors was purposely contaminated by the Americans. . .

## "I Like It, But . . ."

"And how goes your FDJ group? How did you make out in the Stalin contest?"

"The group's very lively. Most of them are convinced and believe what they're told about the West. We are very well classified in the Stalinaufgebot. But the older ones grumble about the food: since a month ago our food cards get us margarine instead of butter and fish instead of meat. Everyone knows that the better stuff goes for the festival."

"What do you get here for food every day?"

"A thick soup, but not very good; 250 grams of sausage; and heavy biscuits. The sausage isn't bad, but when you eat it every day you quickly have enough of it. The foreign delegates offered the festival managers to give us a part of their supplies, since they have a surplus, but that wasn't accepted."

I knew as a matter of fact that the foreign delegates got plentiful meals, noon and evening, prepared in the manner of their own countries, and that in the morning they got milk, butter,

cheese, and preserves.

I turned toward a youth house in the Western sector, accompanied by a student from the Russian zone:

"I like everything I see here very much," he tells me. "And yet in spite of that I would not want to live here. I am the son of workers. There is unemployment here and life is not easy for the poor. I would never be able to study in the West. I was a worker myself, before. I do not live well now, but I have a scholarship and when I have finished my studies I am sure of having work."

The argument is incontestable. The success of the East is in direct proportion with the defects in the West.

## Freedom—for Foreigners

The youth house is overflowing with FDJers, in the dining hall, in the game rooms, in the lecture rooms. I notice how avidly they read the Western papers and magazines. An Eastern refugee of long standing who manages the house pointed out to me how even the least worth while of the Western papers is dynamite for the East: "Look at that headline: 'The Difficulties of the Adenauer Government.' Where can they see something like that about Grotewohl?"

The press had announced that several train stations in the Russian sector were temporarily closed—"obstruction," was the official explanation. The Friedrichstrasse station, keystone of traffic in the Russian sector, is closed. It had been renovated, and its new entrances had been made so that they could not be closed; since they did not hold, big planks had been nailed across! There was no notice at the station, no way of getting information on how long it was going to last without reading the press. Would-be riders gathered, revolted by the procedure. A Berlin working woman made her ironic comments:

"Oh yes, you're free, you can go anywhere you want, only not here. And besides, why take the train just today. . . . As if anyone has any such idea!"

An old worker explains it to me:

"There were too many FDJers who went over to the other side. They closed the station bordering on the Western sector; in that way they could control the trains better."

In fact, on the preceding days, at the boundary stations, a trusted FDJer went from train to train scrutinizing the passengers to spot his comrades. But this proved insufficient; the trains were too full.

I run into a gate which is partly open, guarded by police and FDJers.

"Foreign delegate? You have the right to enter."—"Only foreigners?"—"Yes. . . ."

All the participants in the festival should have been able to hear that.

## Built on a Lie

"Kim of Korea applauds the Spanish dance; Kitty the Mexican salutes him."

Jimmy and Dorothea clasp their hands, In August, in August in Berlin!"

So goes one of the gay songs of the festival. It has indeed become a reality these last few days, and one cannot but rejoice at it in itself. There is nothing more beautiful and richer in hope than the fraternization of the youth of all nations and races.

The very great majority of the foreign delegates will leave Berlin with the intoxicating impression that they are part of an immense international of peace. For one reason or another, they will not have seen that the people of the host country have been squeezed still more in order to make available a surplus for their stay. They will not know that in reality the German people—and of course not only they—have turned their backs on the festival; that for them all this is built on the shifting sands of a lie, of lack of understanding.

But it is not possible to get away indefinitely with cunning maneuvers of whole peoples. Without any doubt, one day the thousands of youth who were in Berlin "in August, in August" will confront reality, and then, alas for them, their dream will crumble. It is to be hoped that this debacle will not carry down also their aspirations for fraternity across the frontiers.

# Sequel to Case of the Post — —

(Continued from page 1)

stronger, louder and more popular than his own. They are simple words. In their context they have an eloquence that goes beyond rhetoric and a courage beyond politics." But after this pat-on-the-back, Editor Wechsler presented a 10 per cent installment on the truth:

"And they are words that Mr. Truman himself would do well to think through. If our internal freedom is shadowed today, the guilt is 90 per cent that of the McCarthys, but it is 10 per cent that of Harry Truman. For it was his Department of Justice which sent to prison the tawdry brass of the American Communist Party for their advocacy of ideas so repugnant to most Americans that only 'hysteria' could have thought them dangerous. And it is his Department of Justice which is solemnly arresting Communist after Communist, throwing them to McCarthy's ravaging for the blood of a Democrat. The whole process does violence to everything the president said yesterday. For when Harry Truman took that oath to safeguard 'justice, freedom and democracy,' he swore to protect opinions that are not just unpopular, but downright repulsive."

## About the Escape-Clauses

Well, that's something. To be perfectly frank, it is also more than we expected. Keeping in mind the miserable spectacle presented by the rest of the organized and semi-organized liberals in this country in the face of the Truman witchhunt, it more than ever puts the Post out in front. We'll doff our hat for a salute.

But to paraphrase: They are words that Mr. Wechsler himself would do well to think through. We hope some necessary comments will not detract from the first welcoming cheer.

It is not necessary to say much about the escape-clause thrown in by Wechsler, with his 90-10 per cent assignment of responsibility. Or whatever is necessary was already said in our Open Letter. The swing clause is demonstrably *not* the truth, and would hold up in a reasoned argument only if the assignments were reversed.

If Wechsler protests inflating the power of "the tawdry brass of the American Communist Party" as an excuse for bludgeoning civil liberties, it is no better to inflate the power of the tawdry Wisconsin senator and his henchmen as an excuse for playing down the role of the man who controls, instructs and directs the whole government apparatus of "loyalty" terrorization and repression.

It is necessary also to comment on Wechsler's second escape-clause which implies that, in "solemnly arresting Communist after Communist, throwing them to McCarthy's ravaging for the blood of a Democrat," Truman's little 10 per cent of "guilt" is in turn mainly due to a regrettable desire on his part to appease the man with the 90 per cent guilt. He's under pressure, it is implied.

That's the rationalization of some liberal supporters of Truman—the way in which they find it possible to live with themselves—but it is *not* Truman's.

It was not McCarthyite pressure which led Truman to set up the "subversive list," which is at the heart of the system of fear. It was not McCarthyite pressure which caused him to create a bureaucratic system of repression based on the "subversive list" which carefully excluded any possibility of recourse by "even one American." It was not McCarthyite pressure, certainly, which leads Truman's cops to spread their arrests of the CP brass from city to city.

The Post's insistence on clinging to 90 per cent of its faith in Truman's good intentions in civil liberties is further highlighted by a consideration which we did not take up in the Open Letter. It is another thing for Wechsler to think through.

## Truman vs. McCarran

That was the presentation of Truman's views on the subject at a critical point: the passage of the McCarran Act, only last October.

At the risk of seeming extreme—than which there is no more heinous political sin in the eyes of some practical-minded liberals whose practicality consists in adapting their consciences to the practical power-politics of the people's enemies and false friends—we point out that the justly condemned McCarran Act is virtually a democratic measure compared with the grounds for Truman's veto of it, and his actual practices!

It will be understood, we trust, that this "compliment" for the McCarran Act is purely in relative terms. . . .

The point is that, outside of democratic verbiage, Truman's concrete objections to it were essentially based on the argument that ALL its provisions could be more effectively accomplished without law, administratively, by bureaucratic decree, indeed by the SUBSTITUTION of administrative suppression for suppression by law.

Now it is the former that is especially characteristic and new in the Truman witchhunt as compared with McCarranism. The United States has known other periods of repressive legislation. It can be added that even on this field McCarranism reached a new high. But at the risk of seeming to play down the importance of such repressive legislation, we have to emphasize that what is qualitatively characteristic of the modern police state is not merely such repressive legislation but rather unchecked and uncheckable administrative suppression by the police organs of the executive.

### WHERE WE STAND

To get acquainted with the ideas of Independent Socialism, send for the special issues of LABOR ACTION listed below:

May Day Issue 1950

THE PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM OF  
INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

May Day Issue 1951

INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

Ten Cents Each

LABOR ACTION, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

Against the first, the citizen over whom Truman wept his crocodile tears has at least formal recourse: the courts, which at any rate make possible a public airing of the infamy, even if they are notoriously no invincible barrier to it; and the legislature, which, as long as its members are elected by the ballot, has a certain amount of sensitiveness to public scandals.

What is characteristic of the method of repression which Truman counterposed to the McCarran Act is—as the Post well knows—that there is no legal means of recourse at all, none whatever, as far as the government is concerned.

This is no regrettable mistake or oversight by well-intentioned people. The Department of Justice's operating procedure was set up that way. And if there could be any doubt about that, Truman's message vetoing the McCarran Act was calculated to end it.

The McCarran Act provided for the registration of Communist and "subversive" organizations, etc. This is bad enough in itself, but it is not Truman who objects to it as undemocratic. His subversive list is itself an arbitrary administrative registration. In contrast, the McCarran Law provides for the right to a public hearing and judicial review of any findings by the board it creates. This is exactly what the administration does not want!

Truman correctly argued that trying to achieve such control through legislation could only hang the cops up in endless red tape and law-jawing. He counterposes, in practice, a system of McCarranism which cannot be reached by any democratic recourse.

## The Heart of the Police State

His approach could not be made clearer than he does in stating his concrete objections to a series of provisions. Note:

"It is claimed that this bill would deny income-tax exemptions to Communist organizations. The fact is that the Bureau of Internal Revenue already denies income-tax exemptions to such organizations.

"It is claimed that this bill would deny passports to Communists. The fact is that the government can and does deny passports to Communists under existing law.

"It is claimed that this bill would prohibit employment of Communists by the federal government. The fact is that the employment of Communists by the federal government is already prohibited and, at least in the executive branch, there is an effective program to see that they are not employed.

"It is claimed that this bill would prohibit the employment of Communists in defense plants. . . . Fortunately, this objective is already being substantially achieved under the present procedures of the Department of Defense. . . ."

Truman's objection to the concentration-camp provision of the law (which had been inserted under the pressure of "liberals," to be sure) was that it raised the question of habeas corpus and would therefore have to be considered further; he was not against the idea.

It is the high development under Truman of those repressive procedures which are qualitatively those of the police state, as distinct from anti-democratic legislation, which should appal genuine liberals as well as socialists.

It is myopic to comfort oneself with the undoubtedly true observation that a McCarthy would go further and faster if he were in power.

It is blindness to assign 90 per cent of the "guilt" to the witchhunter who is NOT in power, in order to make a "lesser evil" out of the witchhunter who IS in power, under whom the system has been created and who is driving it through right now.

But the N. Y. Post is politically committed to the Fair Deal and Truman, and the clear fact is that a consistent and thoroughgoing appreciation of the role of the Fair Deal and Truman's assaults on democracy points toward a break with them.

It is not the Post that we have a right to look to, if a progressive political alternative to Fair-Dealism is to be presented to the people. We will be modestly happy enough if that newspaper continues to publicize the elementary facts of the attack on democracy in the United States. It is the labor movement, which as yet does not have even the courage of the Post in setting its face against the system of repression by fear, which has the responsibility and which bears the burden of guilt for the fact that there is no place for the liberals to go, let alone the workers.

## A Lesson in Practicality

We do not fail to understand the predicament of even the most liberal editor in telling the full truth about Truman and drawing the inevitable immediate conclusions. If liberalism today is in a grievous state, it is not from within liberalism that the cure can come. There is only one force in the country that can draw the liberals after it in the only progressive political alternative to the Fair Deal blind alley. That would mean an independent labor party, a declaration of political independence by the trade-union movement.

We do not dispute the fact that reactionary pressure from the right is a factor in intensifying, speeding up and worsening the witchhunt which the Fair Deal got under way. But even on this plane, it is futile merely to issue blasts, however justified and necessary, against the Hitlerite type from Wisconsin and his ilk. If McCarthyite pressure from the right is a political force today, it must not be forgotten that the labor leaders and labor-liberals who bemoan that sad fact are reprehensibly guilty PRECISELY BECAUSE IT IS THEIR LINE WHICH RELIEVES TRUMAN OF ANY SERIOUS PRESSURE FROM THEIR OWN SIDE.

Here is a lesson in genuinely practical politics for the oh-so-practical liberals and labor strategists:

McCarthyism—which they themselves claim to be so powerful a pressure on Truman that this otherwise democratic gentleman moves toward police-state methods, no less!—did not achieve this pinnacle of influence by supporting the Fair Deal, by fawning before it, by whitewashing it, by apologizing for its crimes. If it is a power it is because it is not a tail to the Fair Deal, it is a political threat to it!

Can any very practical person explain why the politician in the White House should be more concerned about concessions to people who announce that they are safely in his pocket, as compared with concessions to serious (if repulsive) forces on his other flank?

That's on the "practical" plane, one understands, apart from the deeper and longer-range considerations we more usually discuss with regard to a labor-party policy.

If liberalism, even its unquestionably best representatives, are in a blind alley, it is only labor's break with the Fair Deal that can open a way for them and all the people.

With this in mind, and despite any strictures above, we'll settle for the August 15 editorial as far as the New York Post is concerned. It is labor that has to go further.

## Not in the Headlines

### Free Press

Commenting on the demise of the St. Louis Star-Times, a Nation article by A. M. Lee summarizes some interesting facts on the growth of monopoly in the U. S. press.

The newspapers of the 25 largest cities in the country are now under only 45 different ownerships, 7 less than six years ago. These 45 corporations directly control 56.4 per cent of the morning and 40.4 per cent of the evening papers of the land. In the last 50 years, the number of dailies in these 25 cities has dropped from 153 to 86; in the last 30 years, from 126 to 86, and in the same period the circulation of these dailies has risen from 14,400,000 to 24,000,000.

"Upon the judgment of 45 like-minded corporation presidents now depend the major policies of the daily newspapers purchased by 49.1 per cent of American newspaper subscribers. . . . The 45 dominate, among other instruments of integration, the powerful Associated Press and the American Newspaper Publishers' Association."

In addition: "In 1920, 42.5 per cent of America's cities . . . had competing dailies. By 1950 only 6.8 per cent . . . had dailies under more than one ownership. And in many of these 96 cities competition was abridged by gentlemen's agreements and interlocking directorates not publicly avowed. In the same 30 years the number of cities with only one daily newspaper increased from 724 to 1124, and the number of those with one or more dailies in a local monopoly from 743 to 1314."

### Dirty Story

We record here, for the information of anyone who thinks that the New Leader degenerated from fossilized social-democracy to *liberalism*, that this organ has come out editorially in favor of the U. S. turn to Franco. Realistic military considerations are the grounds, naturally. "For if Spanish bases are necessary to our survival then they count more than the nature of the Franco regime." It deplores "emotive" attitudes toward Franco fascism. Maybe Spanish bases aren't "absolutely essential to our defense," but "at any rate, we can take no chances," and besides the joint chiefs of staff say they are. However and at the same time (these things are entirely possible—in writing editorials) we must not "deceive the Spanish people into thinking that we approve of him [Franco] politically," we must demand conditions "looking toward the liberalization of Spanish life," and "continue (sic) to support politically the anti-Franco resistance movement."

Ugh.

## Next — A Labor Party!

by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty  
Presentation of the Need  
for an  
Independent Labor Party

25 cents Order from:  
Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.