		*					
						500)	
	No.						
	b.						
					ħ		
	e						
şi							
	E.						
	* 8						
	# %						
			ž	,			
						×	
	*						
	100				75		
		18:					
	* e						
	S D						
							*
				120			

LABUR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 28, 1952

FIVE CENTS

THE COLUMBIA STRIKE: Students and the Class Struggle ... pages 2 and 5

FRITZ STERNBERG AND STALINISM: A Study in a Type of Ambiguity

. . . page 6

MAY DAY 1952

Greetings to All Fighters for Freedom!

MAY DAY 1952 -One Way Only

"The emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves."-Address of the First International, 1864.

This sentence, written by Karl Marx in 1864, is the fundamental and irreducible concept which distinguishes the socialist approach to politics from all others.

It constitutes the general guiding principle on which socialists base their political strategies. It is the cardinal idea which socialists seek to disseminate among the working class until it becomes an almost instinctive habit of thought. In fact, it is one of those ideas which acquires the impact of an article of faith.

And because socialists remain true to it, they stand as the unshakable champions and adherents of democracy when others tend to abandon it in despair. The moment they cease to believe it, socialists lose their reason for existence as an independent

The main forces of official American liberalism have long ago abandoned, if they ever accepted, this democratic and revolutionizing concept of the role of the working class in the historical

They maintain that the working class is just one "interest group" among many of equal social and historical importance, and that its political role must and should be restricted to that of one "pressure group" among the many that vie for political recognition and influence in capitalist society.

They resist and deplore the proposal that the working classes of this country, the vast majority of the population who are bound together by the central fact of their common economic exploitation by capital, should form their own independent political party and seek democratically to assert the paramount political and social rights which follow from their numerical strength and social weight in the country.

They urge the working people of the United States to retain their former political alliances with those sections of the capitalist class which dominate the Democratic party, despite the fact that this alliance has been achieved and can be maintained only at the expense of subordinating the interests of the workers to those of a financially and politically powerful minority.

LIBERALS AND THE "STRONG MAN"

The policies of the liberals, both inside and outside the labor movement, have been carried into practice for the past twenty years—the twenty years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. And yet today, all sections of official "liberalism" in America are suffering from demoralization and a mood verging on despair.

They face the elections of 1952 not only without a political party which they can truly call their own, but even without a presidential candidate in whom they have any confidence. And to them, this is a matter of acute political and even psycho-

They hark back to the good old days of the '30s when they had a feeling of power in society, when they felt that they were riding the wave of the future, that they were reconstructing society of saner and better foundations; when they felt that they were the bearers of a profound, though orderly, revolution.

They do not, and in fact, cannot, recognize that the old feeling of power and purpose was a function of the surge of the American working class which brought the CIO into existence, and which tamed the unrestricted and arrogant power of the mighty and seemingly impregnable industrial giants in auto, steel, rubber, oil and the other basic industries.

They believe, fondly and with a longing for the past, that

(Turn to last page)

Next Week's LABOR ACTION -

will be a specially planned number, such as we have issued on May Day for the past two years, devoted entirely to a presentation of the Independent Socialist view on SOCIALISM AND THE FAIR DEAL.

Our regular articles and features will be back as usual the following week.

You'll want to order extra copies of the Fair Deal number. It will amount to a pamphlet on the subject.

Michigan Hits a New Low In Police-State-Type Law

By BERNARD CRAMER

The new Trucks Act adopted this past week by Michigan imposes a police-state law on the people with few rivals for viciousness and ferocity in any part of the country. It may be matched by the Texas law after which it was modeled, and it may be approached by Maryland's Ober Law, but no industrial state with a strong organized labor movement has yet seen its like.

Through a registration procedure deliberately designed to make registration out of the question, the Communist Party is not only effectually outlawed, but any member of the Communist Party may be jailed. In defiance of all other, provisions on the subject, any minority party can be kept off or thrown off the ballot by a simple say-so of the attorney general. "Communists" or

"subversives" are to be ex- Mennen Williams, whose election cluded or fired from any gov- was supported by the United ernment job without the necessity of adducing proof.

After being rushed through the legislature with hysterical speed, following the recent visit to Detroit of the congressional Un-American Committee, this police-state act was signed with similar speed by the Democratic governor of Michigan,

Auto Workers (CIO). Williams has been touted as a liberal by the UAW leadership, which was instrumental in boosting his polit-

ical fortunes. When the bill was passed, the legislature voted down an attempt to make it apply also to "known members of the Ku Klux Klan and the Black Legion." The reactionary

opposed" to "communism and fascism," in the usual doubletalk.

Liberal and socialist opponents of the measure, who regard the Stalinists (main butt of the law) as enemies of labor and democracy, will have no difficulty in pointing out how the law uses the "Communist menace" only as a whipping-boy in order to put through fundamentally anti-democratic changes in the government

FORM FOR STOOLIES

The main provision of the Trucks Act requires that all members of the Communist Party and Communist organizations register with the state police, empowering the latter to demand any information they wish. Quicker than you could say "totalitarianism," the state pólice made public a registration form carefully drawn up with triple safeguards to ensure against any possibility of regis-

tration. Their form not only requires registration of the individual but (Turn to last page)

EXCLUSIVE: A Firsthand Report

The Nationalist 'Revolution' in Bolivia

By a SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT

LA PAZ, Bolivia, April 13—Since its defeat in 1946, the Nationalist Revolutionary Movement (MNR) has not ceased fighting in this country to win back to power. Its coup group attacks by armed workers d'état this week was originally prepared for Saturday, April 12, but it was advanced in time because of the crisis in the military government. This crisis was behind the meeting of the cabinet on the afternoon of April 9.

The military government's minister of police, General Seleme, was a member of the nationalist conspiracy and assured the support of the police and part of the government machinery. Therefore, on the morning of April 10, a proclamation on the government Radio Illimani announced

revolution" under the leadership of General Antonio Seleme. On the same day began the resistance of all the regiments and military schools of La Paz against the MNR-Seleme coup. But the coup was carried through, to the sur-

"the trumph of the national

Three regiments, the Bolivar, Sucre and Perez regiments, undertook a heavy-artillery bombardment of the workers' quarter Villa Victoria, as in the time of the rightist regime of Urriolagoitia. This section of the city is considered to be the center of the MNR's political power.

prise of everybody and amid the

general indifference of the people.

The workers were indifferent to the "revolution," but when the

bombardment began they followed the advice of the Nationalist leaders and mobilized themselves under arms. Groups of armed workers went against regular heavy artillery with hand rifles, to defend their homes and families, their wives and children, against the criminal massacre launched by the military.

After two days and nights of an infernal bombardment of the city, the provisional organizations of the embattled workers not only repelled the attack of five regiments and two military schools but won complete victory in the struggle, by encircling the regiments, dispersing them and taking thousands of soldiers and officers as prisoners.

Of course, the workers' resist-

ance was greatly favored by the hilly topography of the city and the barricades in the streets, and carried through by audacious against the nests of artillery. In addition, the police forces (carabineers) were very well armed without the workers' heroic fight against the "military heel," and their fervency in taking revenge for the bombardment of their homes, the struggle would have been lost.

The situation leading up to the Bolivian coup d'état, ignored generally by the big press, could have been followed by readers of LA-BOR ACTION in the dispatches from Latin America of our correspondent Juan Rey. Since the military junta took over (see issue of June 11, 1951), the growing political crisis and the policies of the political groups have been described in articles in the issues of December 31, 1951, and of this January 21, March 17 and April 7. As we have mentioned before, the interpretation of events in these articles is that of our correspondents, but we are glad to present their informed articles.—Ed.

Columbia University's Strikebreaking Policy Divides the Campus on Rights of Labor

NEW YORK, April 21-A year of political apathy and boredom at Columbia University was suddenly shattered last week when, because of the intransigence of the university administration, the entire campus maintenance staff walked off their jobs in sympathy with the striking college cafeteria workers. In the twinkling of an eye the vast campus was turned into the scene of a serious labor struggle, and everyone within sight was talking, debating, tak-

The sudden transformation revealed much latent political sentiment. A most striking demonstration of this was the tremendous applause a speaker for Mike Quill's Fransport Workers Union (CIO) received at a rally held in support of the strike when he forecast that, no matter what, the

tration "to its knees."

The issues at stake were not very complex. The cafeteria workers, pitifully low-paid, decided to unionize, and asked for recognition from the university. The Columbia officials, however, asserting that a non-profit educational institution could not tolerate unionization among workers in the cafeteria sector, refused to grant ecognition. The workers, in turn. offered to submit the dispute to the New York State Mediation Poard: the administration refused, and the workers promptly went out on strike, taking with

them the entire maintenance staff. Pickets suddenly appeared one morning before all the campus gates. Elevators stopped running. Leaflets appeared explaining the aims of the strike. The college appealed frantically for "cooperation" from students and faculty TWU was determined to bring the 'in maintaining essential services.

AN EDITORIAL

How About It, Mr. Truman?

When will the steel workers get the full Wage Stabilization Board

President Truman's "seizure" of the steel industry has stirred up one of the hottest issues in recent congressional history. Aside from the effort of both major parties to derive the maximum political advantage from it in this election year, this action does raise fundamental questions with regard to the powers of the government and the future of collective bargaining in America.

At the moment we want to take up only one immediate and pressing question: When and how will the steel workers get the full package recommended by the WSB?

. The United Steelworkers accepted the WSB recommendations as a compromise with their original and fully justified demands. In his speech of April 8 the president said that these recommendations were just, and that the refusal of the steel industry to grant them without an exorbitant price increase was "about the most outrageous thing I have heard of." But as we go to press, just two weeks after the government "seized" the industry, the WSB recommendations have not

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer is now deciding what to offer the union in the way of a new contract. UNLESS THEY ARE GIVEN THE FULL WSB PACKAGE, WITHOUT A MAJOR INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF STEEL, THIS SEIZURE WILL STAND AS JUST ONE MORE INSTANCE OF GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ON BEHALF OF THE EMPLOYERS. And this is true despite Truman's prolabor speech, and despite the howls of rage at the seizure coming from

The full WSB package includes: (1) the wage increase is retroactive to the time when the last steel contract expired, which was January 1, 1952; (b) the workers get 121/2 cents per hour now, with subsequent increases later this year and next year; (c) improvement in the vacation and holiday provisions; (d) the union shop.

This was the compromise which the United Steelworkers was willing to accept. This was what President Truman described as a fair and reasonable offer. This was what the steel industry arrogantly rejected. What possible justification can there be for giving the workers less on any of the items?

If the union is given only a small part of this package (say the industry itself had offered some minor improvements before the seizure, which the union rejected. If they now get similar improvements from the government and no more, it will be clear that they can expect little more from their friends than they were offered by their enemies. They would then be in a position, once the "seizure" has been lifted, in which if they insist on the rest of the WSB package they would actually be striking not for major gains but rather for a portion of them.

We are sure that the United Steelworkers and the rest of the labor movement see this clearly. The important thing is to drive this truth home to their memberships, and to make the welkin ring from coast to coast with the demand: GIVE THE STEEL WORKERS THE WHOLE WSB PACKAGE ... NOW!

JUST OUT -

BOUND VOLUME of LABOR ACTION for 1950 WITH FULL INDEX FOR YEAR \$3.00

Order from:

Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street, New York City

small knots to discuss the situation. Slowly students began to take positions; some tried to maintain neutrality, but as the strike wore on and the atmosphere grew more tense this grew increasingly impossible. The college newspaper came out boldly in favor of the strikers. Many cheered, some The point is that, for once, the 50,000 students of this enormous academic factory had to face a vital social issue. Many students

> an incredible pettiness or else an cutright anti-labor position. The nconveniences caused by the breakdown in normal sanitation and upkeep services roused in some a feeling of antagonism toward the strikers ("I'm not used to making my own bed," one inaignant student wrote in a letter to the editor of the college paper!) Others felt different, and, cornectly blaming the university for the breakdown, tried to convince

> > Of course, many petty, personal considerations entered into the minds of a large proportion of the student body. What was even more alarming was the fact that the university was able to find, without too much searching, a number of students willing to take over the jobs of the striking maintenance and cafeteria workers. Many of the elevators, for example, are now manned by students who are not moved by the argument that, by scabbing, they are "taking money right out of the pockets of the poor, struggling girls of the cafeteria." And although interest in the strike runs high and the disputes are often feverish, only a very small percentage of the students have actually taken an active part in

their colleagues. Some arguments

went far into the night.

The various liberal groupings-Students for Democratic Action. Young Liberals, NAACP—have issued mimeographed appeals to the students not to scab, and have gathered in support of the strikers. A semi-Statinist clique organized a moderately well-attended rally in which the point of view of the

cafeteria workers was rather effectively presented. Other students ined in the mass TWU demonstration of last Monday which culninated in the aforementioned rally. Word has been passed pround among many students not buckled quickly, displaying either to cooperate in administration attempts to keep the campus as ilean as possible so that the striking maintenance men would not be missed. The university powerhouse is now being run by student engineers, and the possibility of a breakdown-if too much electricity used-is ever-present. Hence it is not uncommon for students sympothetic to the strikers to absent. mindedly turn on a light as they

leave rooms at mid-day.

But the most dramatic demonstration of solidarity with the strikers was the protest walkout by students in two large sociology lasses last Friday. The students simply refused to attend the classes and, instead, went around taking up a collection for the strikers. Thus far however, this idea has not caught on very widely. Other techniques of protest have been conceived and may be carried out: various means of pressure might be applied to the scabbing students. Attempts might be made to buttonhole students entering the cafeterias, which are now, with student help, running at half-speed. Larger rallies might be planned to make clear to the administration that it can expect little sympathy from the student body.

This might offset the effect of the vote taken in favor of the

administration on Monday by the University Student Council. This body, about which most of the students know and hear very little, actually represents only a small segment of the school, but its vote has done much damage already.

The TWU rally was the highpoint of the events thus far. The speakers—although not thoroughly understanding the relatively sophisticated college audience—sucreeded nevertheless in giving many hundreds of sympathetic students a sense of real strength. At the height of their oratory, the union speakers referred to the fact that this strike would get, if necessary, the full support of the massive WU organization, and, if that was insufficient, they reminded the uwed crowd of the size of organized labor in the city of New York! The cheers were loud and sus-

Some boos and hisses were heard from a far corner, and many in the crowd shouted "shut "throw them out!" But the hecklers, many of them law students, continued to make cynical wisecracks until a TWU speaker, noting that he was a college graduate himself, rather effectively ridiculed their cries and shut them up for the rest of the meeting.

In conclusion, it may be said that the events at Columbia over the past week, exhibiting consider able pro-labor sentiment among the students, are encouraging. But, on the other hand, the fact that no effective organized student participation in the strike has yet been achieved reminds one of the deep inroads which the witchhunts have made into camous psychology. The anti-Stalinist eft has been slow in finding itself, slow in forming a coalition for action, and has been plagued by the fear of resorting to the more rigorous tactics the situa-

Impellitteri Cancels Invite to Mayor Of Madrid After N.Y. Labor Protest

NEW YORK, Apr. 18-Mayor Impellitteri's withdrawal of his invitation to Mayor Torres of Madrid to attend the U.S. Conference of Mayors next month was heartily commended today by Norman Thomas, chairman of the Joint Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims.

Declaring that "it would have been a disgrace to American democratic traditions to have let that invitation stand, in view of the shameful persecutions of labor unionists by the Franco regime." Thomas made public a letter which he sent this afternoon to Mayor Impellitteri.

His letter said: "I was glad to learn through today's press dispatches that you have withdrawn the invitation you extended on behalf of the city of New York to the mayor of Madrid to attend the United States Conference of Mayors next month.

"I wish to re-emphasize what was made clear in our earlier protest to you, that I and those who are associated with me in protesting this invitation did not question the right of the mayor of Madrid to visit New York. What we did question and challenge was the invitation extended by you. It was obvious that such an invitation would be interpreted as giving honor and recognition to the Franco regime.

"I regret that you did not withdraw the invitation on this basis rather than placing the responsibility upon American labor. That responsibility, of course, labor and all of us who have worked to have this invitation rescinded will gladly assume, with honor.

"I sincerely hope that you do not subscribe to the comment of the Spanish labor unionists by Fran-State Department official avoted in the Times that 'it is just the sort of thing that is losing us all our friends abroad.' There certainly could be no more twisted conception of what is likely to create friends for the United States. Any alignment that we might make with the Franco regime would undoubtedly weaken the democratic forces in Europe and the position of the United States throughout

Dispatches from Madrid quoted Mayor Torres as saying that Impellitteri cabled him that New York labor unions had threatened a city-wide strike if the Madrid executive attended the Mayor's conference here on May 15.

the world."

"I am sure," Thomas comment-"that if the Madrid mayor had come to that gathering, organized labor would have united in a mighty demonstration against his presence because of the great

injustice perpetrated against co's military courts in closeddoor trials.

A printed leaflet has now been published by the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims for use in the campaign against the Franco regime. Headed "Franco Terrorism Must Be Stopped!" it presents a clear and vigorous explanation of why the American people must take action to deened by the Falangist dictator. quotes supporting statements by the CIO and AFL, and calls for the following:

"DEMAND that our government protest against these persecutions, and that no further U.S. aid be granted to Franco.

"TELEGRAPH OR WRITE TO: President Harry S. Truman; Hon. Dean Acheson, secretary of state, Washington, D. C.; your senators and representative.

No Execution for POUM'S Baldris

The Spanish POUM's La Batalla announces that their Comrade Gerardo Baldris will not be executed in Spain. Baldris, a hero of the Madrid struggle against Franco in the civil war, has been condemned to life imprisonment instead by the fascist

Writes La Batalla: "The Francoists have not dared to murder so courageous and irreproachable a revolutionary military leader. They have contented themselves this time with a sentence of life imprisonment.

"Gerardo Baldris has already spent many years in jail. And now the Francoists intend to bury him in some prison. Within the framework of the general campaign against the Franco terror, we must unceasingly demand the liberation of Gerardo Baldris and all the other victims of the Franco regime."

AT THE CALIFORNIA CP TRIAL-

Stoolpigeon Parade Gets a 'Marxist Expert'

By DAVE BERN

April 28, 1952

LOS ANGELES, Apr. 14-The trial in this city of 15 Communist Party leaders on charges of "conspiracy to advocate and teach the overthrow of the government by force and violence" continues with its seemingly inexhaustible array of informers and paid spies who reported to the FBI while pretending to be loyal and zealous Stalinists within the CP ranks.

One of the witnesses. William M. Foard, a former member of Harry Bridges' longshore union, claimed that he quit the CP in 1948 because, he said, "when Moscow barks the American Communist Party wags its tail." Foard began to have "misgivings, he stated, when his unit, led by Harry Glickson, planned to picket a high school where fascsit Gerald L. K. Smith was billed to

At another meeting, Fourd related. "Glickson said the Communist Party was distinctly opposed to freedom of the press as well, and that the suppression of this freedom in the 'New Democracies' of Eastern Europe was advan-

Incidentally the local press has claimed that, in Foard, the government at last has a witness who "reveals a complete understanding of Marxism." At the same time, the Daily News of April 3 said, "Some of the government's former witnesses, especially those revealed to be undercover agents for the FBI, have frankly admitted that they had no familiarity with the documents and theories about which they were questioned by defense attorneys.'

But if Foard understands Marxian "fundamentals," as he and the press boasted, even Marxism in its perverted Stalinist caricature, he gave no concrete signs of this knowledge in his testimony. Instead, he did tell much about the Stalinist movement's POLICIES here, but only those characteristics generally well known to students of politics.

\$1.15 PLOT

The government introduced documents and records purporting to bear on the relevance of its charges of "revolutionary conspiracy." These included the party registration certificates of the defendants, affidavits about the candidacies for public office of some of the defendants, and records of the CP's bank accounts in Los Angeles and San Francisco. One amount on deposit was a civilrights defense fund of \$19,000 for the present trial and for which the CP is trustee: At one point, according to the record, the Los Angeles CP bank account was reduced to \$1.15. These records deal with accounts only in the CP name. But how this evidence sheds light on conspiracy or revolutionary least.

Foard claimed that another motive for his break with the Stalinist party came when longshore union members in San Francisco were "intimidated" into participating in the 1948 Labor Day parade. At the meeting in question, Foard claimed he went to the microphone and said, according to the Mirror (April 3):

"I refuse to march. I have always interpreted Labor Day as a day of rest. It is no pleasure for me to clomp my dogs up Market Street to the Civic Center." A

Foard claimed (April 7) that he was, at first, reluctant to become

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

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

Send for our free book list.

been "gullible enough to believe the FBI wanted to smash the unions and make if tough for all minorities." Foard said he confided these fears to a party member, whom he named to the court. Apparently, his fears faded away very quickly and he found the FBI to be such a vigorous champion of democracy as to merit his full confidence and the revelation to them of CP names.

U. S. Attorney General Walters S. Binns revised an earlier announcement when he reported that the government would call 40 instead of 35 of the original 65 witnesses it had planned to use. Foard is the seventh witness One or two more have been called since this date. Binns predicted it would take a minimum of two more months to complete the California case of Stalinist leaders tried under the sedition law, the Smith Act. If past testimony is any indication, this prediction is an understatement.

LOVES HIS BOSS

Last November or December (Foard is uncertain), the FBI approached him again and requested his testimony in the current Los Angeles trial. He volunteered. Foard is employed by the Alleghany Ludlum Steel Corporation. "It's a good company," he said. "They pay their employees" salary while they're on jury duty because they want their employ ees to perform their civic responsibilities, and I expect they'll pay my salary while I'm here.'

Finally came the cross-examination. The News, which, like the Mirror, claimed earlier the singular competence of Foard to deal with Marxist theory and Stalinist policies, had this lead item on April 8: "Government contention that California Communists used the works of Karl Marx to teach violent revolution was dealt a blow today when the defense used the same works to show Marx espoused parliamentary procedures."

The document in question was Marx's work on the Paris Commune from which the government previously had read selected pas-

that a socialist state could be established only if the capitalist state were "smashed and destroyed." (Those who maintain Marxist teachings are not on trial but only the Stalinist leadersplease take note.) Foard had testified the book by

Marx had been used in CP study classes to "demonstrate that the same thing must happen in the United States." But Defense Attorney Margolis, a clever partyline lawyer, picked up the book and read that the "smashing" of the French Empire and its replacement by the Commune was achieved by universal suffrage. "Were you taught this?" Mar-

golis queried. "In a sense, yes," admitted Foard.

"The smashing and destroying was accomplished by various laws and decrees, were you not taught?" Margolis insisted.

"Yes," answered Foard, "by the dictatorship of the proletariat." The News stated: "At many points Foard became vague in his answers, though he previously had testified he had read the disputed volume in its entirety." A heated exchange took place

etween the witness and Attorney Margolis when the latter asked Foard what "relationship could be made between the Paris Commune and current issues" in the U. S., in reference to Foard's earlier statement that he had been taught there was none Foard, asked why a certain CP speaker at a class had drawn this historical parallel, replied he didn't know but said with an attempt at wit, "Maybe he's not as good a Marxist as you are, Mr. Margolis." Margolis objected and Federal Judge Mathes ordered Foard's "sally" stricken from the record on the grounds it did not answer Margolis' question and was prejudicial.

LENIN REVERSED

The eighth witness, Howard C. Litt, followed Foard to the witness stand for the government. Litt, a 30-year-old professional

FBI in order to spy on local party members." (News, April 10.) Litt linked Philip (Slim) Connelly with CP activities in Los Angeles. Connelly, a defendant, is an editor of the People's World, and once the leader of the CIO .County Council before the national anti-Stalinist purge of the CIO. Litt said he saw Connelly at a 1948 party meeting in the Parkview Manor and "thought" he saw him at another Stalinist affair "but I couldn't be sure." He also testified to seeing Connelly's wife, Dorothy Healey (Connelly), Ben Dobbs, Henry Steinberg, Berna-

CP meeting. The News continued: "In earlier testimony, Litt told of his brief career in the party, quoting the remarks of party functionaries who had charge of his indoctrination. The defense made frequent objections to this line of questioning, contending that present defendants had nothing to do with the witness' schooling of Marxism and were not even present. . . . Judge Mathes already has before him a written motion from the defense that such 'third party' evidence should not be heard in the trial." Margolis' objection was that even if this testi-

mony is ruled inadmissable. "it

dette Doyle and Rose Chernin

Kusnitz, other defendants, at a

will already have had the effect of prejudicing the jury." The News described Litt, the dancer and spy, as a striking figure with his black mustache and goatee (who), created something of a stir . . . as observers noted his resemblance to youthful pictures of the late V. I. Lenin against whose latter-day followers (sic) he has been called to testify. Although Litt sounds like a character out of comic opera or out of the melodrama of the musty past, his goatee and countenance apparently stood him in good stead in his role as a voluntary spy in the CP. Another attempt at humor came when U.S. Attorney Norman Neupom laughingly said, "This is the closest I've ever been to Lenin in my

Litt, new employed by Bendix

was graduated from USC law school in 1948, a year after he was approached by the FBI to join the CP. He agreed to join also the Jewish People's Fraternal Organization, which was suspected of having been infiltrated by "Communists." Judge Mathes recognized the defense's stipulations that this group "is a non-Communist social" organization. Litt named Phil Bock as a CP

member to whom he, Litt, expressed his interest in belonging to "some organization as progressive as I am," and who is alleged to have suggested the Communist Party. A few days later, claimed Litt, "one Al Sherman called at his home, took his membership card in the name of Howard Charles, the name by which he was known as a professional dancer. After his induction, he joined the Virgil CP Club which met in the homes of party members on North Manzanita Street starting in 1947. Litt identified several members of the club, his "old comrades." He also identified Jack Weatherwax as the "leader n the thinking division" of the CP, a lecturer.

A defense motion for a mistrial on grounds that the government was guilty of "entrapment and prejudgment" was denied. Liff had said the FBI, which assigned him, wanted to "find out if the (Communist) party was advocating vioment." Defense attorney Shullman admonished the judge, while the jury recessed, for calling crossexamination items "trivial and immaterial." He called these remarks prejudicial.

Litt admitted reporting names of CP members to the FBI even before he joined the party! He turned in Phil Bock, active at UCLA, who had recruited him. Litt had received gifts from party members for his newborn child, including one from Seema Weatherwax, whom he turned in He turned in so many he can't remember when. Meanwhile the defense seeks to have the testimony of the first five witnesses

ISL FUND DRIVE

Fund Drive Hits \$8000 with Only Two More Weeks to Go

Pittsburgh

Oakland

Newark

Boston

Detroit

Chicago

St. Louis

Buffalo

Seattle

Philadelphia

Los Angeles

Cleveland

New York

The Fund Drive made a decided pickup this week, so that the total sum contributed now stands at almost \$8,000. We are still far away from our goal, but we are now at least within striking distance of

The big guns this week were

cialist Youth League, Chicago and Oakland. All of them have moved up in the standings.

The SYL has just about reached its large quota of \$1500, and now needs only \$27.40 to reach 100 per cent. The Chicago unit, which in \$603! The New York unit with its quota, with a paid-in sum of drive. Several cities are within

Fund Drive Box Score

\$12,500

50 25

50

750

300

1.800

had a quota of \$475, has turned

a quota of \$375 is just \$11.50 from make the largest quota in the

\$7973

31

50

1472

133

426

156

227

37

2695

441

1045

26

300

123

200

100

63.7

124

100

100

98.8

85.2

75.7

67.3

58.6

52

33.3

33.3

\$104; General \$53; St. Louis \$55; Buffalo \$40; Northwest \$37.50; Madison \$20, and New Haven \$20. New York City made a big jump

and has now raised \$2695 of its quota of \$4000. It has still a long way to go, but this marks a decided upswing in its efforts to They are Pittsburgh, Oakland, Cleveland, Newark and Boston. They can do it by next week.

If the areas which are now below 50 per cent come through within the next two weeks we can certainly go a long way toward the goal of the drive. We are assured from Seattle that they are gunning for their quota and will

as follows: Berkeley \$167; Detroit come close to achieving it. We still need to hear from Los Angeles, which has been strangely silent for some weeks: also Detroit. Philadelphia and General. Chicago, too, is still quite a way from its goal even though it has made some substantial gains in the past three

> There are only two weeks left to the whole Fund Drive. This is drive when all efforts have to be heavily concentrated to make good on the quotas assigned. In another week we will know better just how we will stand at the end of the drive. We are calling on all branches to do everything they can to make their quotas, get after all delinquents, and to send in all moneys they are holding.

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

Independent Socialist League 114 West 14 Street

s my contribution t
+
STATE

nauer government.

The **ISL Program** in Brief

The Independent Socialist League By DAVID ALEXANDER 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 des-

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 everpresent 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!

LONDON LETTER

Major British Union Lines Up with Bevan

LONDON, Apr. 16-Besides the finest weather for 40 years. Easter here was the occasion for a number of conferences.

The most important of these was the National Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers, with a membership of 350,000, meeting at Margate.

As this letter is sent off, the Bevanites have just won an overwhelming victory at the conference, on its last day. Sixth largest in the country, the union voted that the government should cut down its 5200 million pound arms program—and it took this stand by the great majority of 1000 votes to 12!

The resolution was moved by General Secretary Birch, and opposed by Robens, who was Bevan's successor as minister of labor. In opposing he said: "I don't believe that any Labor government can carry the confidence of the people of this country if it decides on one policy in office and then, four months later, turns that policy

The Labor MP for Jarrow, Fernyhough, disagreed: "What we want is bread, not bombs; tractors, not tanks . . . Bevanism is the road back to Westminster, power and to peace."

Birch, for the executive, replied to Robens by saying that, if Labor were in power, they would be forced to modify the arms pro-

PUSH DEMANDS

In the previous sessions General Secretary Birch said that in his opinion there was no basis for moderation in wage claims. The government had "abandoned responsibility and given the spinning top of prices and wages a delib-

Four things he said the people were entitled to have, Firstly, full employment. (It was recently announced that unemployment here had reached the abnormally high figure of 433,000.) Secondly, we had a right to expect price stability. The recent budget had started a serious spiral by increasing the prices of basic necessities.

In a budget which the Conservatives called an "incentive budget," they had widened the inequalities without guaranteeing a grace.'

basic minimum standard Fourthly, Birch wanted to see an economy balanced in the people's interest.

The conference was in a militant mood; it also passed almost unanimously a resolution calling upon the government to abolish the draft. It said that it was wasteful to the country and that, if necessary, the conditions in the forces should be made more attractive for regular volunteers.

The National Union of Teachers, meeting at Scarborough, found themselves in a dilemma. Practically every speaker attacked the government policy of increasing the sizes of classes and cutting down the school-building program in favor of rearmament. But at the same time they agreed with union president Roberts that the union must be kept non-political.

CP ATTACKS BEVAN

The teachers protested about the purchase tax on stationery, saying that prices have gone up three times since 1947. They said that it was rather stupid to have to pay the prices of 4 extra notebooks for 15 purchased, especially when the money came from the government and the purchase tax is paid to them.

A unanimous resolution was passed condemning the government's statement that classes could not be decreased before 1961. The teachers warned that their salaries must be increased to attract the right people but pledged themselves not to lower their standards.

The Stalinists also met in conference. They had 520 delegates of whom 136 were from engineering industries, 34 from transport, and 42 from the mines. Points of interest from their conference

(1) A violent attack on Bevan as acting not only "in place of fear" but also "in place of socialism and common sense." (The reference is to the title of Bevan's new book in Place of Fear.)

(2) They must destroy socialdemocratic influences, especially in the factories, where they must concentrate.

(3) The Stalinists admitted a 10 per cent decrease in memberfigures. J. R. Campbell called the recruitment for the Young Communist League "a dis-

April 28, 1952

Get acquainted with

THE SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

For information on SYL program and activities, write to:

SYL, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

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

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL

Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

WORLD POLITICS

'BEVANISM' SPREADS IN EUROPEAN SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

The following report is from the London Economist (March 22), the eminent British periodical which is pro-Tory and virulently anti-Bevan. Its summary on "Bevanism Abroad." therefore, has the tone of apprehension and dread; but socialists will read it with interest-Ed.

It might be expected that Bevanism would rouse the loudest echoes in the German Social-Democratic Party, which opposes the Adenauer government not only on the military but also on the financial contributions to de-But for the most part the So-

interests than on Bevanism. The only common ground between them is the plea that a defense contribution may wreck the social and economic stability which is needed to prevent Communist penetration

cial-Democratic Party's position

s based far more on national

In recent weeks, however, Bevanite arguments have helped to mobilize trade-union, as distinct from Socialist, opposition against Bevanism, since, like most French

the rearmament policy of the Ade-A German translation of

Way Only has been widely dis tributed in the German Trade ion Federation (DGB). When the Bavarian trade un ions on February 10 led the way

to the DGB's recent withdrawal of support for a German contribution, they were fortified by a well-argued pamphlet which denied that Germany or Western Europe stood in danger of attack, and present Communist penetration as a greater danger than Soviet aggression. Bevanism has, of course, con-

siderable appeal in the French Socialist Party-indeed the British resignations received more acclaim in France than anywhere else in Europe.

A vociferous left-wing group led by the ex-Trotskyist M. Marceau Pivert, maintaines some contact with British Bevanites, particularly those of ILP origin. [Pivert is not an ex-Trotskyist.

But the French Socialist Party as a whole has not needed to adopt

parties, it finds no difficulty in voting for increased armaments while refusing to vote the funds necessary to provide them.

M. Jules Moch's defeat in the elections to the party executive, like Mr. Shinwell's in Britain, as the penalty of serving as Defense Minister; but this was only a contributory factor.

Only one Socialist Party has wholeheartedly accepted the Bevanite position-that of Belgium, which draws heavily on One Way Only for arguments to justify its opposition to the government's defense program. No doubt its hatred of the Christian Socialist Party now in office helps to explain its position. Moreover most Belgians are fatalistic about a Russian occupation, which they imagine as no more unpleasant han the German occupation they survived so well.

But much in Mr. Bevan's mode of argument corresponds to the ideological traditions of Belgian social-democracy. In Italy, too, the left-wing socialist splinter groups drew new confidence from

Many observers last year saw

The Columbia Strike: Students and the Class Struggle

Touth league Socialist fouth league Socialist

By LESTER COLEMAN

One of the reasons students find it so easy to believe that what they have heard called "the class struggle" doesn't exist is that they seldom meet it in their daily lives. Drawn largely from middle-class families, with little or no experience with the union movement, they may find it hard to believe that their own relative satisfaction with the world is not matched by all.

One of the few occasions on which this opinion is challenged occurs during a strike of university non-academic employees, such as that now in progress at Columbia University (see story on page 2).

The reactions to an event of this kind (and it is difficult even for students not to have some kind of reaction) are

of thinking of many. Faced with a

situation in which the union seeks

the most elementary kinds of rights

(at Columbia, recognition and an

increase in wage rates which now

average \$40 per week) and is flatly

rebuffed by the administration of

a huge university, the Student

Council tries to protect the "in-

dependent" interests of students

as opposed to both sides in the

By this assertion of independ-

ence, the student "leadership"

plays directly into the hands of

the administration. The adminis-

tration declares that "the uni-

proper places for union organiza-

tion" and the Student Council

echoes "that it is in the best

interest of the university to pre-

vent the unionization of the cafe-

The university, of course, has a

perfect right to declare its inter-

ests endangered by the threat of

having to pay its kitchen help an

extra two or three dollars a week.

While hardly catastrophic, such

demands touch it as they do any

capitalist employer. For student

representatives, however, to de-

clare the same, and that in the

name of "the general interests of

In the first place, it is well

known that many of the jobs around school are held by students,

and at ridiculously low levels of

pay. As non-profit institutions,

exempt from even the minimum

wage levels set by federal legis-

as 50 cents per hour even today.

In general, the wage level of stu-

dent workers reflects the prevail-

ing level of wages in the commun-

ity and tends to rise as the rate

of pay for non-student workers

It is thus very much to the

interest of student workers to

have non-student workers obtain

increases in wages and improve

ments in conditions, for these are

almost inevitably passed on to

the non-union student workers for

the university. Non-union student

workers are thus the "free-load-

ing" beneficiaries of any improve-

ments gained by their unionized

co-workers, and an excellent argu-

ment can be made out for their

The Columbia Student Council

resolution states that "the only

way an increase in student em-

ployment will occur is by forcing

students to join the union." The

implication is that this is about

the worst thing that could hap-

pen to a student; because of this

the members of the Student Coun-

cil "feel that it is in the best

interest of the university to pre-

vent the unionization of the cafe-

Unfortunately, in this regard

the union involved has not taken

ployed, it also abjures any inten-

unionization.

teria workers."

UNION'S POSITION

students," is a different matter.

teria workers."

versity's dining halls are not

STUDENT FREE-LOADERS

often revealing. They range from outrage that students should have to "put up with such trivial matters" as strikes while their education suffers, to a mealy-mouthed liberalism which tends to favor the strike but "deplores" its effects, as well as outright support.

The reaction of the Columbia University Student Council, if not

tion of organizing part-time employees or seeking to improve their position. While quite defensible from a strictly union point of view (the difficulty of organizing and representing a largely transient, unstable and constantly changing group of workers) the union's position would be considerably strengthened if it spoke for all employees, student and ron-student, and sought to improve the general level of wages.

But this is accepting the argument on the same grounds as the Student Council-the direct, even if short-range, interests of students as a special "group." Actually, what such a position implies is that students are some special typical, at least represents the line

privileged part of the population.

PHILANTHROPY

This is what lies in back of the imputation that a non-profit institution such as a university should be immune from pressure for higher wages such as is exerted through collective bargaining. What is really meant is that a university, as a non-profit enterprise (and we are speaking of the institution as a whole, and not some special branch such as a lunchroom or bookstore which may turn a profit in every month to a

right to pay lower wages than any other kind of employer.

The basic fallacy of this argument appears when it is reversed: some workers must work at less than the prevailing wage rate because their employer does not make any profit (as a rule) out of their labor. In other words, some workers must remain underpaid in order to subsidize the operations of a particular kind of institution. When Columbia University in-

sists on paying lower wages because of its status as a non-profit institution, it is asking one particular group of workers to contribute out of proportion to their means to the financial maintenance of this particular institution. And when the administration argues that a higher wage level may mean higher tuition, it is arguing (often with the agreement by "independent student leaders") that one particular group of workers (university employees) should sacrifice its living standards in favor of cheaper education.

This is not to argue that education does not need to be subsidized; but workers should not be forced into the role of unwilling philanthropists.

THE COLDEST WAR OF 1952 Or: Will World War III Break Out on Mt. Everest?

is demanding its rightful place in the world.

By PHILIP COBEN

Ideally the world of sport should steadfastly ignore the political and national tensions that bedevil the workaday world; but what if the latter refuses to ignore the former? There is a special sadness when it happens, as it has been happening more and more frequently in modern times. Nothing is immune, it says, you see-there is no pri-

It is happening again, in what may seem to be the sport most removed and remote from the civilized horrors of our day-in the opinion of the philistines, also most removed even from sanity. That naturally is high-peak mountain climbing.

There is an "international situation" taking shape around the far-off ummit of Mt. Everest in the Himalayas. Building up in the past year, t involves a split in the West and a threat from the East, as is fitting and proper for any orthodox "international situation" today. It involves the decline of the British Empire, the relationship of British imperialism to American imperialism on the one hand and to colonial rambunctiousness on the other; it illustrates the barbarity of Russian Stalinism, and it highlights the importance of Asia as the cockpit of world struggle

All this, of course, symbolically.

Since 1950 there has been a mobilization of three expeditionary corps to invade the top of the world, by three different aggressive powers. They have been preparing their war in hot haste and hope to end it up in the cold-thus reversing the better-known procedure.

The rivals are the British, the Swiss and the Russians, with American interlopers hanging around the rear.

It is vital to understand, first, that Mt. Everest has up to recent times been a "British" mountain-not only because it has been in British-dominated territory. The tradition in the Himalayas is that the nation whose climbers pioneer the route to any mountain is left in unchallenged possession of the right to further attempts. Nanga Parbat and Kangchenjunga have been "German" mountains. K2 is an "American" peak; cynical Continentals expect to see a hot-dog stand on top of it when it is conquered.

Even before this, Everest's status as a British preserve has been impaired. As any student of world politics should be able to guess, it was the Americans who muscled in on it. But this was done in the form of a mixed British-American party, as is only right in view of Anglo-Saxon brotherhood.

ANTI-IMPERIALIST UPSURGE OF SWISS GUIDES

The news is that this year the attempt on Everest will be made by the Swiss. The last international development to compare with this event was the separation of India from the British crown.

It is not enough to note the significance of this as a new stage in the fall of the British Empire to low estate in the world. Fix attention on the fact that it is the Swiss who are doing this.

Historically speaking, Swiss mountain climbing bears the same relationship to the British as the development of Indian capitalism bears to the British-mutatis mutandis, toute proportion gardée and lèse majesté. Just as the rise of an Indian bourgeoisie and proletariat was eventually brought about (though slowed and distorted) by British invaders from a different social system, so it was especially British mountain climbers who taught the mountain dwellers of Switzerland that scaling peaks, jumping crevasses and glassading down arêtes was a sport, not just work. It was under the impulsion of men like Whymper that the guild of Swiss guides developed out of the mountain shepherds to cater to the strange and abnormal desires of the foreigners.

Even up to about 25 years ago, the Swiss guides, though magnificent climbers (there was many an Oxford gentleman on a holiday whom they carried down on their backs), figured only incidentally in mountain-climbing history; for their role was that of paid servants. It was the Britishers who hired them who "conquered" the summit.

Now the Swiss are going into business for themselves with their

There is another group, precisely in connection with the Hima-

eyes on the biggest deal of all. One more backward and exploited group

This can be a trend. The next step is not far to see.

layan expeditions, whose just deserts have been underplayed by history because of their menial role. These are the Sherpa porters who formed the staunch underpinning of most of the previous British assaults on Everest, while the glory went to the sahibs. Read some of the accounts and one detects a suspicion growing in the minds of the European leaders of the climbing groups, as they tell of the amazing nigh-altitude exploits of the Sherpas, that these natives could romp to the 29,000-foot summit of the mountain for a high-noon lunch-if hey ever became civilized enough to see the point of doing so.

But these are reflections on the contradictions within the Western camp, with its combined and uneven development. There is also the

The present writer, not unaided by the power of Marxist analysis, redicted in 1950 that the Russian Menace would emerge on this field. That was when Tibet was invaded by the Stalinists. After being the first to invent the telephone, the steam engine, the self-pasting postage stamp and the walrus mustache, it was inevitable that the Russians would have to be the first to set their heels on Everest also.

BARBARISM OR MOUNTAINEERING!

Characteristically, the intrusion of the Russians into this field has mmediately raised completely new and unanticipated problems with which Marxists still have to grapple.

The first is adequately set forth by a recent article in the Manchester Guardian Weekly (March 27):

"It is difficult to know what to make of the reports that a Russian party 150 strong is to climb Everest from Tibet. Its size suggests a nechanized assault, and conjures up visions of a teleferique to the North Col, permanent camps blasted in the mountain walls, an oxygen plant half-way up, and supply by helicopter. is that Everest should be climbed by man unaided by any machines, other than the primus cooker and oxygen cylinders which he carries up on his own back. It would be a pity if Everest's summit first fell victim to the machine age."

The author, Basil Goodfellow, might have added that even the oxygen cylinder is suspect in purist circles. (See Ullman's Kingdom of Adventure for a discussion of the ethics involved.) If the lowlander cannot appreciate the deep feeling of apprehension and disgust behind Mr. Goodfellow's superficially calm words, he should try to think bout going hunting for deer with a machine gun.

Even this vision of horror to shake the soul, however, is perhaps dwarfed by a second consideration, illustrating how the hand of Stalinism leaves its traces of slime and defilement over everything which it

Consider: the Russians will announce that they have reached the top of Everest, bearing a portrait of Stalin before them all the way, after liquidating only 21.4 per cent of the party and maintaining a norm of 2,306 steps per hour. They show photographs, authentic corpses, letters postmarked "Mt. Josef Vissarionovich" at a specially erected post office at the very summit; they triumphantly bring back signed confessions by every native porter, and a special confession afrom the "Horrible Snow Man" who has been reported on the slopes, admitting to espionage for the Lhassa-Wall Street axis.

At any rate, the Russians announce that they got there. Who will believe them? They could not go back to Moscow and admit failure anyway. In fact, therefore, not even the Kremlin will credit their report . . . and we need not specify what this means for their future ability to climb mountains.

the kind of position which is easiest to defend. While it offers But still there will ever afterward remain the gnawing suspicion its assurance that the union does that Everest is no longer virgin; it just won't be the same from not wish to take any jobs away from student workers now em-

Anyone going to Amnyi Machen next year?

May Day Greetings

Let's Use Labor's **Power**

FORM A LABOR PARTY!

BUFFALO BRANCH, ISL

NEW YORK

May Day Banquet

DINNER promptly at 7 p.m.

DANCING at 10 p.m.

Saturday eve., MAY 3

LABOR FILMS at 9 p.m.

247 Lexington Avenue (near 34 Street)

Contribution \$1.50 at Women's Trade Union League

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League-

New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

114 W. 14th Street

ideas of Independent Socialism and

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.

that address. Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222.

of March 3, 1874.

A Study in a Type of Ambiguity Fritz Sternberg and Stalinism

Ry HAL DRAPER

A study of Fritz Sternberg's views on Stalinism and Stalinist Russia is of wider interest than merely an evaluation of Sternberg and his work. The latter we discussed in our review of his Capitalism and Socialism on Trial, issue before last (April 14). In that review we mentioned that Sternberg illustrates "in the case of an anti-Stalinist, a type of ambiguity with regard to Stalinism which is of interest today."

It may surprise some that we speak of ambiguity at all with respect to Sternberg's views on Stalinism. There would seem to be good reason for such surprise. How does this fit into his other views which we have mentioned? Here is a man who is obviously not only tender about the political reputations of the German Social-Democratic leaders of the post-World War I period, the Eberts and Scheidemanns, but who is also virulently anti-Leninist; who thinks the Russian Revolution was a mistake from the beginning; who is obviously antagonistic to the Stalinist regime, its totalitarianism and expansionism; etc. Where is there room for ambiguity on the question?

Sternberg's anti-Leninism is blatant enough, to be sure, but it is not that which need detain us. Even people who are looking for anti-Leninist "ammunition" will find only vacuous generalities in his book. There is not a single important question about the Russian Revolution or the post-revolution problems on which he even makes an intelligent comment, however hostile.

To the basic problem of the revolution he devotes a subordinate clause: "Precisely because Russia was an industrially backward country, and because therefore a socialist revolution was out of the question . . ." (his emphasis). Trotsky's or Lenin's views on this question never even get mentioned. (Incidentally, in recurrent chapters on the development of Russia through several periods after the war, Trotsky himself never gets mentioned in connection with the revolution, the struggle against Stalinism or the economic and political problems of Russian development.)

Sternberg asserts that the Bolshevik regime was a "party dictatorship" from the beginning, but the assertion exhausts his interest in the subject, it seems. He can even write that "at the very start of the November Revolution all the liberties won by the March Revolution were abolished, and even all the minor liberties which had been wrested previously from tsarism in years of hard struggle." (My emphasis.) This vulgar stuff, which would be too crude and fantastic even for Boris Shub, requires neither respect nor discussion; but what I am stressing is that at every point leading up to his passages on Stalinism, there is no attempt at any kind of political analysis, even the most elementary.

Stalin's theory of "socialism in one country" scarcely exists for Sternberg, though no doubt he has heard of it. The Stalinist "Third Period" line is mentioned in connection with the rise of Hitlerism but not a word ventured in explanation.

Later on he finds himself writing about the Statlinist Popular Front line; he is not in the least concerned with the question of why it came about and what relationship it has to understanding Stalinism itself. At this point, in fact, he seems to be favorably disposed, though I wouldn't swear to it: the French Popular Front government under Blum is mentioned almost incidentally but rather favorably. The Spanish civil war comes in for a page without a word said to indicate that the Stalinists played a role in it, let alone what that role was.

But if Sternberg was or is a supporter of Popular-Frontism, he approached it not from the Stalinist side but from the reformist side; and here again we wish merely to stress that there is not a single question connected with the development of Stalinism that gets a modicum of political discussion from him. This is of a piece with the rest of his book, as we have explained, and it characterizes his incompetence as a political writer.

But the man DOES have views on Statinism, as we shall see. All we can ascertain at this point is that these views have no visible foundation whatsoever in any political analysis of the development of either Stalinism or Russia; and we will have to find out for ourselves what they DO spring from.

The "Double Character"

Before the Second World War, Sternberg's view of Stalinist Russia was a kind of cruder version of Trotsky's "workers' state" theory, unaccompanied by Trotsky's qualifications and reservations. In his usual stark, unanalytical fashion he embodied it in his 1938 book Germany and a Lightning War, as follows:

"Thus the economic system of Soviet Russia remains progressive (because socialist planned economy is progressive compared with the capitalist economic system) even though her political regime is experiencing its Thermidor. . . . [Emphasis in original.]

"If we bear in mind this double character of the present regime in Soviet Russia (progressive as compared with the capitalist states but reactionary as compared with the tasks of the international working-class movement) then it will not be difficult to understand why, despite the clear increase of reactionary tendencies in the Stalinist regime, the fascist states, and in particular National Socialist Germany, continue to regard Soviet Russia as their worst enemy."

This type of interpretation had its similars throughout the working-class movement, from the Trotskyist movement to Norman Thomas, at that time; but the point is that Sternberg has to this day not departed from this

line of thought, though he has whittled it down and become more incoherent on the subject. He would not now repeat the above direct formulation, but his thought has not broken with it.

Even the Hitler-Stalin pact did not shake him. In his book From Nazi Sources: Why Hitler Can't Win (1939) we find a version of the apologia for the pact given by the more conscience-stricken of the Stalinist fellow travelers (pages 125-126). But characteristically the apologia is cast in terms of economic considerations (every word of which is now known to be 100 per cent false)

Now, in Capitalism and Socialism, the section on the Hitler-Stalin Pact is entirely a denunciatory one. In this book, also, we learn from him that Stalinist Russia is not "socialist." Some of his opinions and illusions about Stalinist Russia have been dropped (with no more analysis than his previous convictions were presented). But nothing has taken their place. And the remnants of his previous view stick out here and there even in his latest book, like the working parts of a mill which has been partially dismantled but is still operating in a limping fashion.

Cataloguing "Aspects"

This can be seen most easily at three points.

(1) His approach to the character of the Stalinist Russian state is still dominated by a cataloguing of "reactionary elements" and "progressive elements," though the items and their relative weights have changed. Stalinist Russia, he keeps saying, is neither socialist nor capitalist, but following is the nearest he comes to saying another word about this interesting question:

"The result [of the revolution] was that both progressive and reactionary trends went to make up the new state. It is useless to give it a name which is not applicable. It is misleading to stress one aspect of Soviet development at the expense of another. It is not only useless and misleading, but it is dangerous. . . . [My emphasis.]

"What we must do is analyze objectively both the reactionary and progressive factors in Russian development from the days of the November Revolution up to the present time, and then we shall be able to see the real Russia, instead of a phantom built up of hopes, fears and emotions, and to give her her rightful place in the general constellation of world forces." (Page 209.)

Sternberg predates his description of Russia as "neither socialist nor capitalist" back to the revolution, and adds on page 210: "a state which despite its reactionary tendencies also contained extremely powerful progressive elements."

He never gets a step beyond this eclectic view of Russia as a congeries of "reactionary and progressive factors." The "progressive factor" which he now emphasizes is the progressiveness of Russian Stalinism "as compared with" Asiatic feudalism....

This eclectic approach, in which reactionary and progressive elements jostle each other in his mind as he thinks of the Russian phenomenon in different aspects, while he sees no way "to stress one aspect at the expense of another," is what makes possible the coexistence in his thinking of anti-Stalinism and illusions about Stalinism.

The Illusion of Democratization

(2) We mentioned in our review that Sternberg argues, in respect to current politics, for a policy based on a Socialist United States of Europe, which would make possible a political struggle against Stalinism. In both his How to Stop the Russians Without War (1948) and in his latest book, he presents this vigorously, even rather agitationally. For us, these sections are the best things about Sternberg's politics. But right in the middle of this section he opens another door on his views about Stalinism.

In his own italics for emphasis, he takes us aback with:

"Then, and then only, will the emergence of democratic currents within the Russian dictatorship be a real possibility."

Does he mean merely that "then and then only" the Stalinist regime could be overthrown by "democratic currents" within the country? or is he really envisioning an eventual democratization of the regime itself?—that typical illusion which is so often common to both the Stalinist fellow traveler and the non-Stalinist who has not entirely sloughed off his illusions about the Soviet myth, not to speak of certain types of anti-Stalinists both in and out of the U. S. State Department.

The ensuing passage clears up nothing; it contains sentences which point both ways; the two thoughts may indeed be indistinguishable for Sfernberg. It begins, however, with thoughts which can imply only a democratization within Stalinism, not its overthrow. At the very least this seems to be as likely for Sternberg as the other.

Is it "Imperialist"?

(3) Stalinist Russia is expansionist, Sternberg now recognizes, and he describes its expansionism. But he seems to be uneasy about the characterization.

Is it "imperialist"? He is especially uneasy about this, in a manner reminiscent of the official-Trotskyists' approach. "If imperialism is taken to mean that a state uses its economic and military power to influence the economic and political future of other countries, then present-day Soviet Russia is an imperialist country..." he admits (my emphasis). "However"—he then points out that "present-day Russian expansionism" and "the capitalist imperialist expansion of the past" are different; and from that point on, the only term he uses is Russian

Perhaps we are too suspicious because the official-

Trotskyists also use the substitution of "expansionism" for "imperialism" as a result of their pro-Stalinist orientation; but then we run into something else. We find Sternberg devoting a whole subsection to emphasizing the thesis that this expansionism is not a necessity for the Stalinist regime. In the course of one page he repeats this assertion with five changes of language, without adding an additional idea.

Now one can assert that expansionism or imperialism is not an "inevitable compulsion" for the Stalinist regime, that it is not inherent in its system, only on the basis of an analysis of the nature of that system. (The same goes for the assertion that it is inherent.) But Sternberg repeats and repeats this claim without even a vestige of such an analysis. Why?

If it is so indeed, if Stalinist imperialism is only a policy of "bad" leaders and not organically rooted in the Stalinist system, if therefore it could conceivably be sloughed off as a characteristic of this regime, if furthermore this regime can be democratized by "democratic currents" within it, then a number of conclusions may follow about Stalinism. Sternberg's "iffy" uneasiness about the term Stalinism imperialism becomes a little clearer: IF Russia is acting imperialistically, yet it is a superficial, eradicable, reformable imperialism, a policy of a leadership and not a characteristic of the SYSTEM. It becomes, in fact, one of the elements and factors which is "more progressive" about Stalinism "as compared with" capitalism. If means that in this direction at least, there is more hope to be placed in the further development of Stalinism than of capitalism; etc.

I certainly do not mean to imply that Sternberg has either thought these conclusions, and others, out to the end or is necessarily even aware of them. If he had done this, he would either have written a better book or none at all. But they indicate how his thinking about Stalinism is conditioned by unarticulated beliefs and assumptions about which he does not write but which signal their presence in such passages as these.

The Basic Source

What is it that holds Sternberg bound to unarticulated or half-articulated illusions about the "progressiveness" of Stalinism?

The ways in which Sternberg manifests his continuing illusions are very often quite peculiar to himself; but with respect to their underlying basis, there are few cases more typical or which illustrate the case more clearly.

This is so because of a characteristic of Sternberg which we already mentioned in our review.

Sternberg is at bottom an economic determinist in the sense in which that is different from Marxist historical materialism. He tends to see political questions quite literally as reflections of purely economic factors—and not merely in the famous "long run" either. He tends to make a one-to-one correspondence between politics and economics at every point in the curve. He tends to think as if political views are to be mechanically derived from economic analysis. He illustrates precisely that methodology which ignorant or malicious critics of Marxism have so often attributed to Marxism itself. Sternberg no doubt sincerely believes that his methodology is "Marxist"—just as, no doubt, the above-mentioned uninformed critics sincerely believe that what they are refuting is "Marxism."

With such a methodology, Sternberg is a marked-out victim for that which is the Illusion of Illusions about Stalinist Russia: that the decisive thing is the "economic basis" of Russia, the existence of nationalized property, which is of course "progressive," while most of the "reactionary elements" are "merely" in the field of politics. The economic basis is progressive; yet we observe that the politics is reactionary. This is bewildering, to be sure, but can we forget the decisive role of the "economic basis"?

The thoughts of better men than Sternberg (Trotsky, for example) have run ragged around this vicious circle, as long as they could not break away from the fatal gravitational pull of the central illusion: the "progressiveness" of the "economic basis." Sternberg could not even start to find a way out without changing his whole approach to understanding political and social phenomena. That which was a trap for Trotsky is Sternberg's whole mode of thought!

Anyone who is at all acquainted with the way in which intelligent Stalinist fellow travelers think (as distinct from whatever they may write) need not be told that this is also the central consideration which holds them enchained to pro-Stalinism. Capitalism in Russia has been destroyed; therefore anything is possible, all our hopes and desires, in spite of zigzags and unpleasant detours in the road to the future, for the economic basis is there.

If Sternberg, nevertheless, is not a Stalinist fellow traveler, it is because he does in fact give greater weight to his democratic sentiments and convictions; it is because he personally cannot reconcile himself to the unpleasant zigzags which the Stalinist fellow traveler learns to swallow if he wants to stay on the train. And the irony of it is that Sternberg thereby disavows his whole mode of thought! A central inconsistency is introduced. His thinking on economics and his thinking on politics are uncoupled and set adrift separately. All the tendencies of his methodology clash violently with political convictions which he cannot bring himself to abandon.

But democratic sentiments and convictions, important as they are, are no substitute for political understanding, which alone gives a solid basis to the democratic convictions of genuine socialism.

We Fight for Socialism and Democracy

MAY DAY GREETINGS

For the Third Camp of World Labor and the Colonial Peoples!

New York Branches, ISL

"THE FUTURE
BELONGS TO THE YOUTH"

FORWARD TO A SOCIALIST WORLD!

National Buro, Socialist Youth League

Organize Youth for Socialist Democracy

New York SYL

SOCIALIST MAY DAY GREETINGS To The Anti-Fascist Fighters Of Franco Spain AND TO OUR COMRADES OF THE POUM

Berkeley SYL

Labor!

Abolish hunger, war, slavery, and all the evils of capitalism! You have the power to do it.

Boston ISL

from one of the Chicago

Greetings

CARRY ON THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS! Philadelphia ISL

Socialist Greetings
to a Great Paper
Newark ISL

May Day Greetings

Keep Up the Fight

for a

SOCIALIST AMERICA

Chicago ISL

IN MEMORY OF MARTIN ABERN

Will labor's rights be restored after the war? Political conceptions and methods in time always fall into line with economic trends. Developments point and lead toward a greater administrative and military bureaucracy in the post-war period, an economic necessity for imperialist survival and functioning. . . .

If labor is unable to maintain its rights now (major rights to strike and organize, when workers are employed), it will find the obstacles and struggles many times more difficult later...

For every immediate and ultimate reason, therefore, it is better for the workers now to learn the lesson of the ever-present conflicts with the ruling class; to fight today to maintain and extend union rights and organization—even if the fight is not always a winning one—in order to be able on the morrow to better withstand all onslaughts and to forge the better world of socialism.

—From: The Administration's Anti-Labor Policy,

LABOR ACTION, November 16, 1942.

MAY
DAY
Greetings

Cleveland ISL

A Salute from the Industrial Heart of America

Pittsburgh ISL

Build the Independent Socialist League!

Oakland ISL

Fraternal Greetings to LABOR ACTION On Its Twelfth Birthday

Chicago Socialist Youth League

The 'Revolution' in Bolivia — —

(Continued from page 1)

On Friday, April 11, the "revolution" had triumphed, and the Nationalists dominated the situation unchallenged.

Page Eight

Thus, after six years of persecution and struggle, they have reconquered political power, thanks to the fact that the workers were pushed to their support in heroic battle. The tenacity and vitality of the Nationalist Party can certainly be admired but the real explanation lies in the tenacity and revolutionary heroism of the Bolivian workers.

The main reason for the Nationalist triumph in Bolivia lies in the reactionary, stupid and corrupt policy of the Right, which ended in the criminal bombardment of the capital itself. The rickety bourgeois "democracy" degenerated into the crypto-dictatorship of Urriologoitia, who massacred the mine workers and industrial workers, and it wound up with the stupid and reactionary military dictatorship which was incapable of solving any of the country's problems.

The second reason for the Nationalists' victory lies in the imperialist policy-also stupid and reactionary-of the U.S. and its embassy in Bolivia. The latter intervened in Bolivian politics against the workers, the leftists and the Nationalists. The tin question mobilized the majority of the Bolivian people against the U.S. and so made the climate favorable for the Nationalists.

The third reason lies in the backward and anachronistic economic and social structure of the country, which demands rapid and radical solutions: the colonial-type one-product economy of low standard of living of the workers-all making for a permanent and stubborn opposition of the working class against the ruling class and its policy. These factors were ably exploited by the Nationalist Party.

PROMISES

been in exile in Buenos Aires), promised the workers that "our government will not only be one of reform but it will be a government of political, social and economic transformation." He promised a change in the colonial economic structure and a transformation of the one-product economy (tin and other minerals) toward a diversification of the national economy, that is, toward a development of industry and agriculture. He also promised agrarian reform and the integration of the Indians in national life. The secretary of the miners' union, Juan Lechin, promised nationalization of the mines.

This is indeed the key to the situation, the reason for the heroic fight of the workers and also the tragedy of the Nationalists in power. The workers were and are fighting only for power and for a transformation," that is, for "social revolution," and the MNR is fighting only for power and for a patchwork reform of Bolivian capitalism. The MNR government will be only a patchwork government because the MNR is only a pettybourgeois party and not a revolutionary workers' party.

The Bolivian workers want a revolution but are quite confused about its content, for the MNR talks about the "national revolution" and the Stalinists (PIR) and Trotskyists (POR) talk about the "democratic revolution." But this is precisely the basic error of the Stalinists and backward Fourth Internationalists: in our time what is possible is only a revolution carried through and led by the workersthat is, only the social revolution, the country; the enslaved condi- which will solve the national and tions of the two million Indians; democratic problems of backthe need for agrarian reform; the wardness in passing. The social revolution of our time is the socialist revolution and its leader is the proletariat, not the petty bourgeoisie or the Stalinist bureaucrats.

The Bolivian POR (Trotskyists) supported the MNR; the Nationalist Party, hungry for powmilitants of the POR fought un- er. What took place was only a der the leadership of the Nation- changing of the palace guard, a In his first official declaration, alists, in Lechin's groups on the change in the men in control of the the No. 2 man of the MNR, streets, as this writer was able to state apparatus and not a change Hernan Silez Zuazo (the top see personally. They fought in the in class power.

leader is Paz Estenssoro, who has hope that the MNR would start the democratic revolution in Bolivia and that "then we (the POR) will come." But in Bolivia there is no revolutionary bourgeoisie or petty bourgeoisie; there is only the nationalist petty bourgeoisie, which is oriented toward Peronism, and the Stalinist "intelligentsia," which would introduce state capitalism. The sole revolutionary force is

the proletariat, which can lead the Indians and enslaved peasants to the social revolution, to socialism. Therefore the workers must pass through the nationalist experience, through the illusion of the "national revolution," before finding their way to the authentic revolutionary socialist workers' movement. The "nationalist experiment" will prove the revolutionary incapacity of the Nationalists, who will not be capable of "social and economic transformation," because they are not a revolutionary party and because Bolivia is a poor, backward semicolonial country which is incapable of loosing the social revolution with its own forces, under the conditions of imperialist domination.

Therefore the MNR's victory and seizure of power is the beginning of its defeat. For they will not and cannot achieve the promised "program of transformation" but will resort to patchwork; then, much as in the case of Peronism, the workers will separate from the Nationalists, for they desire a fundamental social change and not Peronist-type "reforms." And this split between the workers and the Nationalists in power will be the end of the Nationalists.

In spite of barricade fighting and bombardments, what has taken place in the country was not a revolution, not even a "popular" or "national" revolution; it was only a Nationalist coup d'état, begun by the ambitious, grotesque and cowardly general, finished by the workers and exploited by the

One Way Only —

(Continued from page 1)

this was in the main the work of one man, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

April 28, 1952

And from those days to the present they have been yearning for and seeking another champion, another Leader. That, and only that, can explain the tendency of so many of them to support, uneasily and with a feeling of frustration, another man of magnetism and power, even if he is named Eisenhower.

From the same basic lack of faith in the capacity of the working classes, of the great majority of the people both in our own country and abroad for democratic decision and action stems the liberal's support of American foreign policy. To be sure, the boldest among them criticize and deplore decisions to support this dictator or that reactionary ruling class or colonial regime. Abstractly, most of them profess the idea that America should champion and encourage the national and democratic revolutions in Asia, or the Middle East, or Spain.

But concretely, the fact that the American government stands as the bulwark of capitalist reaction all over the world does not deter them from supporting its foreign policy in the main. When the democratic aspirations of the masses clash with the military plans and programs of the government, they join the chorus which insists that the latter must be given priority.

For the vast majority of them, even plans with a democratic potential like the general idea of a Point Four type of program are seen as means to assure "social stability" in the backward countries of the world. Their lack of confidence in the capacity of the masses for democracy results in a paralyzing fear of Stalinism.

Like the generals in the Pentagon, they have real confidence in only one political force: the potential superiority of American arms.

It is the lack of confidence in democracy which leads to the sterility of "anti-Communism" as a substitute for a social pro-

THE STRUGGLE NEVER CEASES

Democracy does not win the allegiance of millions as an abstract idea. It is a means for achieving more tangible and concrete social and economic ends.

Yet when democratic forms are manipulated for the purpose of keeping in power an economic oligarchy which keeps them in a position of poverty and insecurity, they will turn, for a while, to political parties which promise them a new and better status in society, even if at the expense of democracy.

It is this promise, and the willingness to act upon it to the extent of crushing the old ruling classes, which gives Stalinism its political appeal in Western Europe and Asia. It cannot be defeated by propaganda about "democracy" which turns out to be nothing but support of the existing and hated economic

It cannot be countered with an "anti-Communism" which amounts to the same thing. It can be defeated only by a mobilization of the working people in a movement which seeks to put a thoroughgoing democracy into consistent practice as a means of transforming the economic system into one which corresponds to their needs and aspirations.

But the cry rises in this year of 1952: Are the working classes of the world really capable of emancipating themselves? We have been waiting for them to do it ever since 1864. And although there have been powerful movements, revolutions, struggles for national liberation, labor victories in elections . . . nowhere have the working classes succeeded in emancipating themselves and building the new society, more democratic, more free, which is the historic goal of human struggle. Has not the socialist faith in the masses turned out to be an illusion?

The road has been a long one since the founding of the First International in 1864, and it is true that the defeats have been more lasting than the victories. The new oppressive society of totalitarian Stalinism now vies for world rule with the old and sagging system of capitalism. The socialist movement in America is weaker than it has been in recent history, and in most countries of the world it is contending for its very existence with the mass movements of Stalinism.

All this is bitterly true. The working classses have not exhibited a miraculous capacity-which socialists never thought they had-to avoid false leaders and false programs. They have not at all times been able to pick out the main enemy and unite to defeat him.

They have not always shown a greater capacity than the liberal professors and professional labor leaders to resist the lure of following and depending on the strong man. In short, they have not everywhere and in their mass learned the primary lesson which socialists seek to teach: that their emancipation can only

be won by themselves. But they have never ceased to struggle.

With greater determination and unity at times, and with less at others; with greater illusions here, and with fewer ones there; with a clearer understanding of their historical role now, and with a more confused one then-the struggle has gone on. And as long as that continues to be true, there can be disappointment and discouragement, but there never need be

Whatever the successes or the failures, one fact remains: There is no individual, there is no group or military machine on earth which can achieve democracy let alone economic emancipation FOR the working classes, the masses of human beings in the world. They can only do it for themselves.

To aid them to understand this truth as clearly and rapidly as possible, and to act on it is the central task of the socialist movement in general, and of the Independent Socialist League

Detroit's educators, if such

they can be called, hastened to come forward, salute, and toe the line. Heads of the school system promised to carry the banner of the witchhunt and purge among the teachers. The presidents of Wayne University and Michigan suspect, he said. 'Others have re- State College issued statements signed for various reasons. The en- of humble compliance, as quoted

The Detroit News quoted one observation." (News, Apr. 18.) "known Communist" as saying: "If they jail us we'll get publicity all over the world from this. The Russians will have a fine time writing about the way we're treated."

As we write it is yet to be seen whether liberal and labor proponents of civil liberties will speak up vigorously against the act and Gov. Williams' approval.

Michigan Police-State Law--

(Continued from page 1)

It can be said that the stupid and criminal bombardment and the cowardice of the military camarilla was what mobilized the working class in vengeance, and so helped to gain the day for the Nationalists.

From Wednesday afternoon to Thursday night the Nationalists' situation was so bad that General Seleme, who had delivered the police power to the MNR, took refuge in the Chilean embassy and sought a reconciliation with the ders. His role was certainly a very grotesque one, for the Nationalists had proclaimed him to be "the leader of the national revolution." But though the leaders lost hope of victory, the workers did not, and thus they were able to defeat the army and military schools with only small arms and machine guns.

also obliges that individual to become a wholesale stoolpigeon. He is asked to put the finger on the person who recruited him, name the CP members in groups he belongs or belonged to, "name any Communist schools or classes that you may have attended and list the names of the instructors and your fellow students," etc. Failure to register, as well as any omission in filling in the form, carries the penalty up to 10 years in jail and a \$10,000 fine.

The Detroit press makes it amply clear that officials consider the form a necessary farce; no registration is expected. The reason is also clear for going through the motions of invoking a registration procedure.

This procedure is modeled after a similar Texas law which brought not a single registration

in two years of operation. Yet, state police, Leonard, Texas officials have been "satisfied with it."

Since no one will register, CP members can then be automatically jailed for refusing to register, NOT (repeat not) for being a Communist. It is for this reason that the form was drawn up so as to make registration impossible even for publicly acknowledged leaders of the CP.

ture by Governor Williams, the barred from the state ballot. This, after the SWP had already filed 12,000 petition signatures to get on the ballot. This action was taken, admitted-

ly, by decree of the state attorney general, who "said that the United States attorney general had designated the Socialist Workers Party as a 'dissident Communist group.' (Detroit News, Apr. 18.) Thus the infamous "subversive list" drawn up at the behest of President Truman becomes the basis for the Michigan atrocity. The text of the Trucks Law is not available to us. as we write, and it is unclear whether the law itself refers directly or indirectly to the Truman "subversive list."

FIXING A "DEFECT" All provisions for the legality

of minority parties and their candidates thus become subject to veto by one man, with no provision for any democratic check.

In fact, the Trucks Law was adopted, at least in part, in order to avoid the necessity of presenting positive evidence in "subver-

sive" cases. This is the "defect" said the head of the Michigan of the Michigan statute already on the books. As the Detroit Times explained (Apr. 18): "Michigan for several years had had a statute permitting up to a life sentence for subversive activity. No one has been prosecuted because it must be proven by testimony that the accused had advocated overthrow of the U.S.

government by force or violence.'

In a slip of the tongue, state The first victims of the law, Police Commissioner Leonard is however, have not been the Stalin- quoted: "In future trials or arists. Immediately upon its signa- rests, if a proven Communist is picked up he can be tried under Socialist Workers. Party was the new Michigan law instead of requiring the state to prove that he is a subversive." (Detroit Free Press, Apr. 18. Emphasis added.)

Detroit also has a charter amendment, passed in 1949, which proved "unsatisfactory" because it required more proof than does the new state law. Thus in successive stages the police-state mentality "improves" its legal bludgeons. Special provisions of the Trucks

Act are aimed at all government employees in state or local offices. All public rolls are to be cleared of "subversives," decisions on "subversiveness" to be purely administrative by department heads. Employees are denied the right to refuse to answer questions. The state civil service director announces the beginning of a virtual reign of terror:

"Arthur G. Rasch, state civil service director, said his staff is checking records of employees about whom there has been some suspicion.' 'There are about 12 we tire 22,000 workers are under close in the city's press.