

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 24, 1952

FIVE CENTS

**STUDENT SOCIALIST
BROOKLYN COLLEGE**

The CP and Academic Freedom

... page 7

South's One-Party System Crumbles

... page 6

Which Way for the CIO?

... page 2

H-Bomb Makes Third Camp Struggle Doubly Urgent

By JACK STUART

November 1, 1952 marks another milestone in the so-called progress of humanity for it was apparently on that date that the long awaited H (for hydrogen) Bomb was exploded over a coral atoll in the Western Pacific. In the light of the current public discussions, it is necessary to analyze not only certain facts about the bomb's effects but also the political implications of atomic energy in the hands of the military. In doing this we will bring up to date what Willem De Voofter wrote on this subject in the September and November 1945 issues of the *New Internationalist* while the ruins of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were still smoldering.

First: about the bomb and its effects. Physically the bomb is apparently quite large since it has been stated that it is "triggered" by a "normal" A-bomb. (The complete bomb is so huge that it can be carried in only one plane in the world, the B-36.) The function of the A-bomb, it seems, is to raise rapidly the temperature of the H-Bomb's explosive material, tritium or hydrogen of weight three. This tremendous heat (in the neighborhood of 30 million degrees—almost the temperature of the sun's core) sets off a nuclear fusion reaction (as opposed to the nuclear fission reaction of the conventional A-bomb). This reaction converts the hydrogen into helium with an attendant release of energy five to ten times greater than the simpler fission of plutonium.

According to eye-witness accounts the bomb was exploded over a coral atoll, apparently three or four miles long and one-half to one mile wide, giving forth a blinding light equal at least to the light of "ten suns" and a blast of heat which at 35 miles reached 180 degrees.

ISLAND BURNS

The most impressive result was that after the explosion the island "... started to burn and it turned a brilliant red. It burned for about six hours." And "within six hours an island which once had palm trees and coconuts ... had disappeared!" I should hasten to say that this is not the observation of the much feared chain-reaction starting in the coral of the island. A little armchair extrapolation leads at once to the following conclusion: Coral is made up mainly of carbonate of lime which decomposes under intense heat to an oxide of calcium (soluble in ocean water) and carbon dioxide. Thus one can say with much assurance that Manhattan, if so bombed, would not burn and disappear although its entire human population might.

We are obviously faced here with a means of destruction many times worse than even the dreaded A-bomb. It is interesting to see

what those great intellectual leaders of the human race, the professional scientists, have to say of this earth-burning event.

Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer, the leading scientist on the A-bomb project, said when pressed for comment "these tests are very remarkable technical developments and technically a really impressive piece of work." It must be remembered that it was this same Oppenheimer who in 1945 and 1946 was stricken by such guilt feelings as a result of the slaughter caused by his first "baby" that he helped or-

ganize the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* and even made several public speeches stressing the "guilt of the scientists."

Another A-bomb boy, Dr. E. Fermi at the University of Chicago (world famous for his intuitive skill) made the earth-shaking observation that "some sort of large scale explosion took place." Apparently Dr. Harold Urey was the only scientist interviewed who realized that these "impressive" toys were no answer to action on a political level (even though his

(Turn to last page)

BERLIN SOCIALIST KIDNAPPED

We have just been informed from Berlin that Hermann Möhring, editor of the socialist discussion magazine *Pro Und Contra*, has been kidnapped by Stalin's gangsters.

The Berlin newspapers report the following: "Editor Hermann Möhring is missing since early Friday (November 7). He left his residence in Charlottenburg early that morning, but never arrived at his office. Möhring left the Soviet zone four years ago, and was known as an opponent of the Russians."

This is another of the repeated kidnappings of anti-Stalinists by the Russians in Berlin. Comrade Möhring's wife and children have been left in dire want, as they now have no means of support whatever. We appeal to all readers of *LABOR ACTION* to send in contributions for these victims of Stalinist terror.

PHILIP MURRAY — AND THE CIO

By BEN HALL

Philip Murray was America's outstanding average labor leader. As president of the CIO and the Steel Workers Union, he was distinguished from the old line AFL craft official who clings to pure and simple unionism and expresses the narrowest and most primitive outlook of a thin stratum of skilled workers. Murray represented the new industrial unionism of the CIO, concerned with the demands of the broad masses of industrial workers, involved in politics, and occupied with social and political questions affecting national life. But he represented it in the most commonplace fashion. The rank and file democracy, the militancy from below that flowered in the early days of the CIO and carried it along its formative years passed him by.

Some of the most reactionary labor officials have been guilty of founding their administrations on graft, on



PHILIP MURRAY

cooperation with gangster elements, and on physical terror against critics. But Murray's honesty was never impeached. He served the labor movement, faithful to

his own conservative creed and loyal to his own beliefs. Other labor leaders have risen to positions of power after an early career of radicalism; or were lifted to the heights of union leadership after arousing and leading the ranks of their union in battles against rivals within and enemies without the labor movement; or were carried up by an impulse of the rank and file. But not Murray. He, the average labor leader, rose to first place in the steel union at a time when the steel workers had no voice in the selection of their own leadership. He was appointed to head the Steel Workers Organizing Committee by John L. Lewis. And it was Lewis, again, who handpicked Murray to succeed him as president of the CIO. In his career, he was not raised from below by a union membership; he was

selected from above by other officials. In the CIO, created in a surge of new rank and file democracy, he became the symbol of the old, ordinary officialdom.

He became the conservative leader of a movement that had radicalized unionism and chartered a new course for American labor. As a conservative, he quickly brought to his own union the bureaucratic practices of the past; he persisted in support of capitalist politics and capitalist politicians and cast a suspicious eye on any move that might be interpreted as straying from it; and, naturally, he was a firm advocate of the capitalist system under its euphonious new title "free enterprise."

As a labor leader, particularly as a CIO leader, he was frequently in conflict with his own conservatism. He led two nationwide steel strikes, the most recent

(Continued on page 2)

Why Vote For "LABOR"?

During the recent electoral campaign, the Republicans sought to win votes by convincing the electorate that the Democrats were supported, or even controlled by "labor." Stevenson was denounced as a "captive of the labor bosses," as were Moody and Williams in Michigan, and many other Democratic candidates.

It is difficult to estimate just to what degree this particular "pitch" in the campaign was effective. We would not, for a moment, seek to deny that it had an appeal to a large section of the middle class, and even to some of the less politically advanced workers. Further, it is quite evident that the trade union leadership itself feared that this line would be effective, and sought at every turn to deny that it had "captured" either the Democratic Party or its candidates, or that it had any intention of doing so. This denial on their part could be regarded as simply an honest attempt to set the record straight on the question, as the truth of the matter is clearly that they were much more the captives than the captors of the Democratic Party. But actually a lot more than that is involved.

In this campaign the labor leadership did not attempt to conceal its partisanship. It endorsed the Democratic candidates in its major conventions, and set into action as much of the trade union machinery as it could mobilize to insure their election. If the rest of the Democratic Party coalition had worked half as hard in the campaign as the trade unions did, the results might have turned out rather different than they did in actuality. Yet throughout the campaign the labor leaders kept on insisting that they were only a minor factor in the party, and that certainly they had

(Continued on page 4)

Struggle for CIO Presidency Raises Issue: Unionism as Usual, or Social Role for Labor

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Nov. 16 — The death of Philip Murray, CIO president, coming right after the severe blow to CIO prestige in the national election, has served to aggravate and bring into the open the internal tensions and conflicts of the industrial union movement.

For the moment of gravest crisis for the CIO, in terms of policy relating to political action and trade union prospects under a Republican administration, finds it without the recognized leader who dominated the two basic conflicting tendencies within the CIO.

The struggle between Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers Union, and Alan Haywood, executive vice president of the CIO, for Murray's post symbolizes this clash which is far more important and significant than what many journalists have dismissed as simply a fight for power.

CONSERVATIVE FACTION

Behind Haywood is a coalition of ex-Stalinists and the hard core of steelworkers union officials, the leader of whom, David J. Macdonald, has often spoken his personal distaste for "Reutherism," in all its aspects. These old-line labor leaders are strictly orthodox, inclined to business unionism, and think of the hard-crusted steel workers organization as the ideal union. They are a conservative faction, whose strength has derived from their subservience to Philip Murray. His death was an especially hard-blow to them.

Walter Reuther symbolizes the kind of unionism from which he emerged: The autoworkers union, a dynamic, restless, progressive social force which has frequently acted as the vanguard of the American labor movement in recent years. Its allies include the rubber, oil and communication workers unions, and its voting strength numbers almost half the CIO membership.

For years, the conservative faction has sneered at the very ideas which distinguished Walter P. Reuther from the run-of-mill union leader. Macdonald and Murray had no use for the strategy and program of the General Motors strike of 1946. "Open the Books" and "High Wages without Price Increases" was just "socialist" nonsense to them.

HATE REUTHER

Reuther's speeches on political re-alignment, his search for fresh ideas, new approaches; his social outlook, in a word, obtained only disdainful antagonism, sometimes put in rather

crude fashion by Macdonald and steel union officials. They seldom failed to show their hate and fear of Reuther.

At the last convention of the CIO in New York City only Philip Murray kept their attention. Reuther seldom spoke to a colder audience.

But now Phil Murray is gone, and the CIO leaders are left leaderless. The restraining hand over Reuther



WALTER REUTHER

is no longer there. Unquestionably he is the only CIO official with national stature who would be in a position to revive some of the old reputation of the CIO as the progressive stream of American unionism as against the American Federation of Labor.

Ordinarily his promotion to the main post would seem indicated. But he remains far too unorthodox for the tastes of his colleagues. Haywood represents a nice, safe and conservative choice. His selection would assure at least a temporary continuation of the standard union program and policies. It would signify the status quo, that elusive and useless goal of the labor bureaucracy in a changing world.

However, the Reuther forces are too sensitive to the social pressure of today and the opportunity for their emergence as the dominant wing of the CIO is far too great to pass up this situation.

STRUGGLE IN OPEN

In spite of all efforts to restrict this conflict and bid for control to the hotel rooms and to settle it by "deals" the struggle has burst out into the open. Its inevitability was recognized immediately by the Reuther strategists.

A postponement of the convention was indicated. It would give them time to rally more forces, and it would enable the Reuther forces to get aid from other social

pressures which might assist in achieving their aim.

In Detroit, it is widely understood that a decisive test for the CIO is its ability to recognize the need for some "autoworker unionism," to stand the stormy days ahead. The UAW-CIO international executive board is solidly behind Reuther.

No matter what differences board members may have with Reuther (and among them, as among the secondary leaders, there is plenty of grumbling over Reuther's insistence on a one-man show) the need for a new, fresh CIO national spokesman outweighs other considerations. The feeling is that both the CIO and the UAW would be strengthened by Reuther's triumph in this struggle. They know Haywood too well to have any hope or faith that he might become a real national leader.

PLANS DISCUSSED

Already, plans are being discussed for the creation of a new post in the UAW, an executive vice president, who would run the union, with Reuther remaining titular president, and exercising dominant influence. The man slated for that post by common accord appears to

be Emil Mazey, second top officer now.

With rough days ahead, the tendency to turn toward a hard, tough unionist seems inevitable here, and Mazey retains that reputation from the old days. He lacks Reuther's public flare, but few persons in the UAW leadership would deny that he is far better as a negotiator and "trade unionist."

That such ideas should percolate around the top Reuther caucus circles following the special board meeting here last week suggests how far in advance the over-all Reuther strategy has been worked out.

Everyone is hoping for the best, but expecting the worst in this situation. Few UAW officials fail to know the "hard antagonism for Reuther among steel union officials. They place no hope in the Quills or Currans for support. James Carey's record as a leader and organizer is far too well known here for anyone to take him very seriously as a compromise candidate. Nor is support from Emil Rieve, of the textile workers union expected. His hatred of Reuther goes back to Reuther's friendship for George Bal-danzi, who split from the

Murray and CIO

(Continued from page 1)

of which was called in the teeth of Korean war propaganda. At one point he came into violent clash with President Truman and some years later joined in labor's walkout from all war boards. If his actions were more noteworthy than the parallel course of scores of other labor officials, it is because he headed a decisive union and a powerful labor federation.

His death now leaves a big gap not because he had a distinctive or unique contribution to make to the ideas of practical activities of the labor movement, but because the CIO finds it exceptionally inconvenient to select a successor at this moment. Two wings or tendencies in the CIO are so evenly balanced that neither can claim the office by natural right.

The two leading contenders for the presidency of the CIO are Allan S. Haywood and Walter P. Reuther. These rivals represent not so much clear-cut opposing programs or policies as divergent leanings or tendencies.

CONSERVATIVE

Haywood, executive vice-president of the CIO, originally sponsored for that post by Murray, came with him out of the miners' union. He cannot claim independent strength of any kind; he has no international union of his own. He is the candidate of the Steel Workers Union and of all the more conservative sections of the CIO; those who are chary of any hint of anything new.

By the normal rules of succession, Reuther might seem the only logical choice. He is, after all, president of the most powerful union in the CIO, the United Automobile Workers. And he is perhaps the only major CIO leader with an international as well as a na-

tional reputation. But the innate conservatism of large sections of the CIO officialdom, especially of the steel union, stands in his way. They are suspicious of his more radical leanings. He is known to be inclined to a somewhat more vigorous political policy . . . a policy which occasionally goes to the extreme of advocating the formation of a new party. He has sometimes criticized the practices of the leaders of other unions, even if only in generalities which seldom point the finger at individuals. His whole background as a man who rose to power in a maverick union is enough to make the conservative labor officials uneasy.

It will be remembered that Reuther won the presidency of the UAW against the opposition of Phil Murray who supported his rival, R. J. Thomas. Later, Murray had to reconcile himself to Reuther. Nevertheless, he found places on the CIO staff for two of Reuther's most prominent opponents, Thomas and Richard Leonard. Murray and the conservative

wing which he best represented never fully accepted Reuther. In his fight for power in the UAW, Reuther found it necessary to take issue with Murray. After the General Motors strike of 1945-6, Reuther criticized Murray because he did not "take up a torch we lit in the GM strike," referring to the fact that the Steel Workers Union at that time had undercut the UAW demand for "Wage Increases Without Price Increases."

In preparation for the moment which has now arrived, Reuther later did his best to accommodate himself to Murray. In the past years, he has stepped gingerly through fear of injuring the sensitivities of the conservative bloc which will now oppose him at the coming CIO convention. Whether or not he succeeded in neutralizing their antagonism by watering down his own program will be revealed at the convention which opens in Atlantic City on December 1 and which chooses the next CIO president.

CIO, after the last convention.

The question mark here seems to be Jacob Potofsky, and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union. Has the election defeat forced a change in the thinking of the top leadership of the Amalgamated enough to make them want to take a chance on Reuther?

CHANCE FOR TURN

The stakes for Reuther and the UAW are high indeed. More than two years ago UAW officials recognized that either the CIO would tend in the direction of the UAW or the UAW would become more like the rest of the CIO. Since then the trend has been against the UAW. But the shock of the electoral defeat of the Democratic Party and the necessity of replacing the top leader of the CIO which have come so close together place before that organization an exceptional opportunity to make a new turn.

Unionism as usual, or a new approach? This is the choice before the CIO unions. The CIO convention in December may give the answer. Part of any sound answer could be the emergence of Walter Reuther as the new president of the CIO.

The Social Democrats And the Elections

By GORDON HASKELL

The Social Democratic Federation held its annual luncheon on November 15 at the Hotel Commodore in New York City. The chief item of business was a symposium on the recent elections. In view of the connections with the labor movement, and particularly with the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, we thought that the symposium might be instructive on the reaction to the elections and the Liberal Party.

Nagler ended his prepared speech by saying that in the period ahead the formation of "a third party of major proportions is not excluded . . ." but went on to say that many of the leaders of American liberalism like Humphries of Minnesota and Stevenson himself are opposed to it. This position means that "the time may not be yet."

Things Looking Up Nagler was followed by August Claessens, head of the SDF. He stated that since the elections his office has been receiving applications for membership from a number of people in the labor movement who used to be SDFers, and letters from all over the country to the effect that the SDF will now come into its own. He said that although he did not wish to be misunderstood, he could not help but feel that the socialist movement in America has reached the end of a long road of "suffering" under the New Deal and Fair Deal: when people kept telling them "why don't you fold up?"

Claessens was followed by Louis P. Goldberg, chairman of the SDF's National Committee. Goldberg emphasized that politicians like Stevenson could only be nominated and run with the support of the corrupt political machines, and that although they had attempted to create the illusion of independence from them during the campaign, no one had believed them. He scored the record of the Democratic Party in office, and the habit of "condoning opportunism in the people whom we support."

The remaining speakers were Joseph Tuvim of the ILGWU; Judge Jacob Panken, the old socialist democrat; James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post; and George S. Counts, candidate for the United States Senate of the Liberal Party. Tuvim and Wechsler had obviously been embarrassed by the "socialistic" speeches of Claessens and Goldberg, and made every effort to dissociate themselves from them. Panken gave a rambling oration about the contributions of the socialist movement to the reforms of the New Deal. Counts laid primary emphasis on the mistakes of the Truman administration, and particularly on corruption, the infiltration of Stalinists into high places in government, and again, vague references to "mistakes" in foreign policy.

MORAL REVOLUTION

Nagler gave the Korean war its due in the campaign, and referred vaguely to "mistakes" which had been made there and general dissatisfaction with the administration's policies in the Far East. Of course he did not describe these mistakes, or indicate any way in which they could be remedied. But he placed chief emphasis in discussing the reasons for Stevenson's defeat on the corruption issue. To him the elections of Impepeller in New York, and then of Halleley, and finally the great sweep of Kefauver in the primaries indicate that people are tired of the political machines and their connections with the underworld. "When Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected," said Nagler, "people were looking for a social revolution. This time they were looking for a moral revolution."

The conclusion from all this is that the liberal movement must be a movement for clean government as well as for policies of social reform. But how can they do this if they support candidates who are also supported by the forces of dirty government? Nagler stated that this can be done by building and supporting independent liberal and labor organizations both inside and outside the Democratic Party. In New York, this means support of the Liberal Party, in Illinois and places like Philadelphia, success can be achieved through the Americans for Democratic Action. Perhaps other states

should follow the course of the Liberal Party.

Nagler ended his prepared speech by saying that in the period ahead the formation of "a third party of major proportions is not excluded . . ." but went on to say that many of the leaders of American liberalism like Humphries of Minnesota and Stevenson himself are opposed to it. This position means that "the time may not be yet."

THINGS LOOKING UP

Nagler was followed by August Claessens, head of the SDF. He stated that since the elections his office has been receiving applications for membership from a number of people in the labor movement who used to be SDFers, and letters from all over the country to the effect that the SDF will now come into its own. He said that although he did not wish to be misunderstood, he could not help but feel that the socialist movement in America has reached the end of a long road of "suffering" under the New Deal and Fair Deal: when people kept telling them "why don't you fold up?"

Claessens was followed by Louis P. Goldberg, chairman of the SDF's National Committee. Goldberg emphasized that politicians like Stevenson could only be nominated and run with the support of the corrupt political machines, and that although they had attempted to create the illusion of independence from them during the campaign, no one had believed them. He scored the record of the Democratic Party in office, and the habit of "condoning opportunism in the people whom we support."

The remaining speakers were Joseph Tuvim of the ILGWU; Judge Jacob Panken, the old socialist democrat; James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post; and George S. Counts, candidate for the United States Senate of the Liberal Party. Tuvim and Wechsler had obviously been embarrassed by the "socialistic" speeches of Claessens and Goldberg, and made every effort to dissociate themselves from them. Panken gave a rambling oration about the contributions of the socialist movement to the reforms of the New Deal. Counts laid primary emphasis on the mistakes of the Truman administration, and particularly on corruption, the infiltration of Stalinists into high places in government, and again, vague references to "mistakes" in foreign policy.

HEAD IN SAND

It is not at all surprising that in searching for the reasons for the defeat of the Democratic Party in the elections the labor and liberal allies of the party should pounce on the "corruption" issue as the chief one. This is the one aspect of Democratic politics in which these people have no share, and for which they can disclaim responsibility. Yet whatever weight the issue may have had in the recent campaign, to attribute the frustration of masses of people primarily to this is to stick one's head in the sand. The real point is that New Deal liberalism has reached the end of the road both in domestic and foreign politics. It could promise the people nothing better. The beginning of wisdom for the labor movement is to recognize this, and thus to re-evaluate its relationship to a party and a "movement" which has mired down in its own contradictions.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 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.

LONDON LETTER

British Labor Party Plays Base Role in Kenya Conflict

By DAVE ALEXANDER

LONDON, Nov. 11—Up to the moment of writing, 8000 livestock have been rounded up in Kenya within eight square miles of the Theenge location. This was a reprisal for the assassination of the pro-British Senior Chief Nderi. The government announced that any African who gave evidence about the assassins of Nderi would have his cattle returned. However, if none did, the cattle would be impounded (that is, stolen) and sold on the market.

There are few socialists anywhere in the world who think that freedom can be obtained by assassination, as the Mau Mau does. But the measures which the government is taking to suppress this "secret organization" are calculated to strengthen its moral support among the people.

Despite the widespread advertisement of its activities, a government estimate shows that this organization has claimed 38 victims in five months. For this nearly 5000 people have been arrested (although a few hundred have been released). In order to justify such wide-scale action, the government has invented a vague formula to cover anyone who might be suspected of having anything to do with the terrorists.

MARTIAL LAW

It may well be asked from where the government of Kenya derives the authority to arrest these people. Is there no habeas corpus in Kenya? The answer is simple. A state of martial law has been proclaimed by Governor General Sir Evelyn Baring. His authority comes directly from the Queen, "advised by her responsible ministers."

IUE Local Rejects GE Offer

By A. RADIC

CLEVELAND, Nov. 4—On October 30, Local 707 of the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE) notified its 2000 members of a meeting during working hours to ratify the contract with the General Electric Corporation. This was the only large local in the GE chain that had taken an affirmative strike vote and was in favor of fighting the company.

Under the leadership of Dave Fitzmaurice, militant young president of 707, the local turned down the company offer and refused to ratify the contract knowing the offer was lousy and would again put the GE workers economically behind the eight ball.

The membership meeting attacked the company and the conservative local leaderships who had gone along with the company offer. James Carey, president of the IUE had refused to attach his name to the contract. Unlike the local leaderships who had capitulated to GE, Carey repeatedly condemned the company offer and kept stressing the necessity of waging a fight against this rich, anti-union electrical company. Because of the lack of support given by these local leaderships in the GE chain to the fight, Carey may in the future attempt to make decisions on such matters from the top.

If such a state of martial law were proclaimed in England, a democratically elected Parliament would be up in arms. We can understand the arrest of a few suspects, and their subsequent release when no evidence against them can be found. But the large-scale kidnaping of thousands can be condoned neither in justice nor by the laws of even this government.

AFRICAN UNION

The only possible people who could redress such an injustice would be a democratically elected Kenya Assembly. Since the Kenya African Union has 100,000 members, this might have served. But it has been rendered powerless by the arrest of Kenyatta, its able leader, and his replacement by Mathu—a lackey of the government, even though a sincere man.

One might have expected that the Labor Party would rise to the occasion, being the only powerful organization able to do so. But no, just the opposite has taken place. A fortnight ago Labor associated itself, in the House of Lords, with the government's measures to restore "law and order" in Kenya. Now, to his eternal disgrace and utter shame, Mr. James Griffiths, for the Parliamentary Labor Party, has also pawned his political honesty for respectability.

No labor voice was raised to question why Africans, when arrested, had been taken away in closed wire lorries, packed in like animals . . . although pictures of this appeared in many newspapers. I understand that one Labor M.P. is to ask if it is necessary to manacle those detained. That is the extent, so far, of Labor's criticism.

Unofficially, two Labor members of parliament have gone to Kenya themselves to see what is happening. They were followed and watched by police wherever they went. Mr. Brookway and Mr. Hale were provided with police "protection" which intimidated anyone who might have wanted to

talk freely to them. Five Africans among the hundreds they interviewed were picked up by the police after their interviews with these M.P.s. Immediately upon their arrival in Kenya, 300 Europeans signed a petition telling them to get out as they would only cause trouble!

In the midst of this all, Mr. Lyttleton, the colonial minister, was calmly saying that the problem of Kenya was not primarily an economic one. According to Africans, there were large areas of common land in Kenya before the Europeans came. As these were not marked out with boundaries and notices, the European farmers "assumed" that they were no one's property, and immediately laid claim to vast areas of the most fertile land. Later on, they made laws and regulations by which the Africans could not even buy parts of their own land.

Suppression, or rather the stifling of the growth of democracy has prevented five and a half million Africans and Asians from putting forward their interests against some 30,000 Europeans.

LAND HUNGER It is quite plain that the Mau Mau is a product of the land hunger of the Africans on the one side, and the political dictatorship exercised over them on the other. As long as the Africans are denied the right to express their anti-imperialist opinions, and even more important, are denied legal democratic channels through which to assert their desire for a restitution of the land and the end of foreign rule, terrorist organizations and their like will gain strength.

The fundamental question we ask the Kenya government is this: Is the African desire for self government "subversive" and "seditionous"? If not, why have so many hundreds of innocent people been arrested and their property stolen?

And we may ask the Labor Party: What are you doing about it? And what will you say to history?

Get ALL your books from LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

We specialize in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement and Marxism.

Write for our free book list: all the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky; labor history; socialist fundamentals; economics of capitalism; Stalinism and Stalinist Russia, etc.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street New York 11, New York

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERESTED? Get Acquainted

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

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

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE

STATE TEL.

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:
- Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 - One year (52 issues) at \$2.00
- NEW RENEWAL
- Bill me. Payment enclosed.

NAME

ADDRESS

APT.

CITY STATE

YOU and SCIENCE

U. S. Visa Policy and Foreign Scientists

By CARL DARTON

The *Bulletins of Atomic Scientists* made first page headlines with its special October, 1952, issue on "American Visa Policy and Foreign Scientists." From a socialist point of view the BOAS which terms itself a magazine for science and public affairs is usually quite naive in social matters and the public responsibility of scientists. However, to its credit it does protest against the prevailing tide of scientific and social reaction in a vigorous if often ineffective manner.

In this special issue it has done an excellent job of journalism in gathering together the case histories of numerous scientists who have been deprived of the freedom of travel by the United States. Protests against the McCarran Act for the restriction of foreign travel have been widespread throughout the world. This travesty against individual freedom clearly belies American propaganda of its leadership of the "Free World." It illustrates the contradictions encountered when a government which is inherently reactionary tries to rally the people of the world against an even more reactionary foe. It is the old problem of concealing the iron fist with silk gloves.

E. A. Shils in the lead editorial of the *Bulletin*, "America's Paper Curtain," writes: "While one part of American policy generously [?] and farsightedly has sought to defend the free societies of the West through the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty and other measures, these two [McCarran] Acts—alienate our allies, comfort our enemies, enfeeble our institutions, and traduce the principles of liberty." The question mark above following "generously" is this columnist's insertion and underscores our characterization of naïveté in the BOAS views. However, Shils does point out that when it is a question of attacking the American government and risking giving ammunition to the Communists he chooses the truth as the best means of rallying real democracy throughout the world.

In all, nearly two score of prominent scientists from America and Europe raise their voices in protest against "guilt by association" and restrictions on intellectual freedom. The testimony shows that foreign scientists have been barred from the United States for participating in the United Nations health activities; membership in the Association of Scientific Workers; having spoken, even in opposition, before any organization suspect of a Communist tinge; serving in the Spanish Civil War on the Loyalist side even though forced to do so as a Spanish citizen; and participating in any type of peace organization.

Even those who may have years ago been associated with Communist organizations but who have since been public enemies of the Soviet Union were considered undesirable. Other scientists have been barred who have never shown any political interests but who became bogged down in the red tape of clearance. Since the McCarran Acts have been in force it is estimated that about 50 per cent of the foreign scientists who have sought entry to the United States have encountered some difficulty while from France the figure is 70 to 80 per cent.

Ironic enough is the fact that many foreign scientists as Einstein and Fermi who were of prime importance in the development of the atomic bomb by the United States would have been barred if the McCarran Acts existed at the time of their entry into this country.

Indignation Against Hypocrisy

Most of the scientists' testimonies are filled with indignation against a nation which hypocritically professes concern for the welfare of the world but yet does not permit the common courtesy of visiting which is extended without question in Europe (the Soviet Union excepted) and South America. In addition, to many European intellectuals the interrogation given them by the American consuls differed little in tone and content from that which they suffered under Nazi subjugation.

Though the application of the McCarran Acts appear to have the sole purpose of security control it has many of the aspects of irrational prejudice against foreigners which often shows up in the American character as well as suspicion of higher education and scientific learning in general. This is evidenced by the fact that some scientists known for their opposition to Communism have been rejected. Notorious in this respect is the case of Michael Polanyi, eminent British chemist, who in his reaction against the pseudo-Marxism of the Communist has opposed all planning in science as well as the Communist ideology. He was refused entry apparently because he dared to associate in debate against friends of the Soviet Union.

Unfortunately the protests of the scientists in the BOAS go little beyond regrets that international science is being harmed or mild demands that the McCarran laws be altered or administered more judiciously. Likewise few of the scientists go beyond the restrictions and see them as part of the basic political and social reaction of our times. Only Einstein points out the obvious link of such restraints with the war economy and psychology which has become the "normal" way of life in the United States.

Hearings were held in Washington in the latter part of October toward possible modifications of abuses of the McCarran Act. The November 4th election returns probably have removed what little hope there was for easement of the law. We hope that some day the writers and readers of the BOAS will realize that only a complete change in political and social organization will insure freedom for scientists.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 47

November 24, 1952

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address: Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

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.

Why Vote for Labor — —

(Continued from page 1)

no control over it. In fact, it is clear that they were convinced that too close an identification of the trade union movement with the Democratic Party or its candidates would confer the kiss of death upon them.

Even if this view is highly exaggerated, there is some truth in it. That is, it would be foolish to deny that in the minds of an important section of the electorate "labor," or the "labor bosses," are a negative political factor. And as it is quite evident that in the future the labor movement is going to have to be more active politically rather than less, it is of the utmost importance that the reasons for this be looked straight in the face.

Who Is Responsible?

Are masses of people leary of "labor in politics" just because of the black and distorted picture of the labor movement painted for them by the Republican leadership, or by journalistic jackals like Pegler, Sokolsky or Riesel? Are they victims of blind and unreasoning prejudice engendered by the almost unanimous anti-labor bias of the newspapers in every major strike? Or does the labor leadership itself bear a good deal of the responsibility for the political attitude held by so many people toward the movement which they represent?

The Peglers and the papers have their effect, that is true. Further, no one expects the labor movement, even if it were perfect in every respect, to gain the political allegiance of the employers, or the die-hard conservatives in every class in our society. In fact, the more "perfect" it becomes from our point of view, the more "labor" will be hated and opposed by the basic reactionary forces in the country. That is true in every country where the labor movement has participated openly and successfully in politics under its own name and with its own independent political parties for years.

What aspects of our labor movement give weight to the generally false picture which the anti-labor forces seek to paint of it? Why do so many "little people" whose political interests are actually identical with the interests of the organized workers turn away from it in hostility?

Narrow Interest Groups

The most important single factor is, no doubt, that much of the American labor movement thinks and acts as a narrow special interest group. Its concern is only with the improvement of its own wages and working conditions. Its lobbying activity in city councils, state legislatures and the Congress is directed chiefly toward its own most narrow interests and projects, and not infrequently one section of the labor movement will pursue these to the point at which they clash with the interests of other sections, or even of the community as a whole.

The second factor of importance is the internal regime of a considerable section of the labor movement. Specially in the AFL, there are a number of unions whose relations to the underworld are at least as close as those of the Tammany Democratic machine in New York City. Others have administrations which are about as close to bureaucratic dictatorships as those of our major corporations. Their top officers receive salaries in the 50,000 dollar bracket, and expense accounts which stagger the poor man's imagination. In many unions, where the membership is neither terrorized by gangsters nor gripped in the vise of iron bureaucratic machines, the organizational atmosphere is still such as to repel rather than attract either the membership itself or

the wider public which gets to know it only from a distance.

But these are more or less constant features of the American labor movement, and have been with us for a long time. They are simply applications to the labor movement of practices and organizational principles which are widely accepted in other sectors of our society. In fact, since the rise of the CIO they have been less characteristic of the labor movement as a whole than they were in decades past. They will remain a liability to the labor movement in its political efforts as long as they are permitted to exist, and every effort should be made to eliminate them as rapidly as possible.

Yet even the most enlightened and democratic sections of the labor movement are widely regarded as "special interest" or "special power" groups in the community. And although in their convention resolutions both the AFL and the CIO lay claim to an identity of interest with all the "little people" in America (and even the world), they are not believed when it counts most: during an election campaign.

The chief reason for this, we contend, is that the claim of the labor movement to represent the political interests of all "the people" is pretty much confined to the paper of its resolutions and to the electoral campaigns themselves. It does little, on a year-in year-out basis to educate its own membership to this idea, and to impress it on the minds of the mass of the population. It has not conceived of this as one of its vital functions. And the reason for this is that the labor leadership itself has not really accepted the view that it is the function of their movement to represent and fight for the political interests of the mass of the population.

Champion of Peoples' Needs

Abstractly speaking, or rather, propagandistically speaking, the labor movement is committed, more or less, to such things as public housing, better schools, adequate old age benefits, national medical insurance, price support for farm products, equality for Negroes and other minorities, and all the other progressive reforms identified with the needs of the people. The labor lobbyists in Washington and the state capitals can be counted on to line up for such measures. The trade union papers usually print articles in favor of them. But little if any effort is made to lead the people actively and aggressively in a fight for these things, or even to impress upon them that labor is the champion of their needs.

The labor leadership rarely seeks to dramatize its movement's concern for the welfare of all the people. When the United Automobile Workers sought to do this with their demand for "A Wage Increase Without a Price Increase" in their 1946 fight with General Motors, they were sneered at and left in the lurch by most of the rest of the labor movement. Yet every strike is dramatized by all the organs of public opinion as an assault by labor not only on the employers, but on the pocket-book of the consumers, that is, all the people. Small wonder, then, that when elections roll around "labor" can be portrayed successfully as a menace to the "little people" rather than as their friend and leader.

One way or another, "labor" is in politics and can't get out of it. The exact role which it will play in the future will be determined by many factors. But until the active militants and the leaders of the trade union movement begin to take themselves seriously as representatives of the political interests of all the people, and to conduct themselves accordingly, the enemies of the labor movement and of the people will be able to divide and conquer them both.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

WANT YOUR PICTURE TAKEN?

To the Editor:

We are so used to the "anti-subversive" drive on the University of California campus, that I almost didn't bother to send the following clipping in, thinking "Everyone must know that by now." In fact that seems to be the general attitude today: "Everybody knows they're doing that... why mention it?" Nevertheless here is the clipping.

The Daily Californian (University of California student newspaper, Ed.), Friday, Nov. 7, 1952. "Accent on Campus" column by the city editor, Joan Muller.

... Vincent Hallinan, Independent Progressive Party candidate for president, spoke at West Gate last week. The audience was almost outnumbered by the photographers present. Pictures were

taken from every angle throughout the speech.

"According to one observer, more pictures were taken of the crowd than of Hallinan. And, interestingly enough, photographers seemed to be pushing buttons sometimes without putting in any film.

"At other times, the photographers would work in pairs to prevent missing any member of the crowd. One cameraman would snap from one angle, and if a spectator turned around to avoid having his picture taken, he would be staring into the lens of another camera."

"Everyone also knows" that people addressing questions to the speaker from the crowd are singled out for full front, and left and right profile shots by the

Berkeley Red Squad photographers attached to the Berkeley police department.

Jack WALKER
Nov. 11, Berkeley.

BUNCH OF CROOKS

To the Editor:
I have been a steady reader of socialist weekly papers since the days of the old "Appeal to Reason." For a time I was a member of the old I.W.W., and I have been a reader of your paper LABOR ACTION for a long time.

I see nothing but capitalist lick-spittles all around here. I am high and dry in this capitalist desert. A new set of crooked capitalist politicians have now come to the pie counter. The outrageous high cost of living is the cause of thousands of old people like myself never getting enough to eat.

We are starving. I voted the socialist ticket at the last election, but our votes have been stolen or suppressed by a dirty bunch of crooks.

L. R.
St. Louis, Mo.

The BEST recent book on the labor movement—

"The UAW and Walter Reuther"

by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick
\$3.00 Random House
Order from:
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

WORLD POLITICS

URUGUAY GOVT. ARRESTS SOCIALIST AND LABOR LEADERS

Is Uruguay going the way of the other Latin American dictatorships?

The Uruguayan government has long had the reputation of being the most democratic in Latin America, marked by its boast of being the "Switzerland of the Western Hemisphere." But besides having just sent an ambassador to Franco, the Uruguayan regime has, it seems, entered on a course of repressive acts against the labor movement.

Below we publish an appeal sent last month by the Agrupación Socialista Obrera (Socialist Workers Group) of Uruguay describing the new situation.

The Executive Committee of the Agrupación Socialista Obrera publicly denounces the arrest by the police, on Wednesday, October 17, in the capital, of its general secretary, Comrade Gerardo Cuesta, together with other worker-comrades: Elbio Almiron, Walter Paredes, J. Alonso and Alberto Castillo.

The facts are as follows: The Transport Union called a strike for the collection of arrears in wages. Its leaders were imprisoned, its literature and meetings were banned, and its headquarters were taken over by the military. The majority of the organized workers in Montevideo went out on strike in justified solidarity with the transport workers, in some cases for a fixed time and in others for an indefinite period.

The government, which has been trying to put over a policy of repression and legislative coercion, etc., in the guise of meeting "subversive" took "security measures" which virtually mean a state of siege.

It has brought in troops and police from the interior; the army patrols the streets; it prohibits propaganda and meetings; it has illegalized strikes or lockouts; it has arrested hundreds of trade-union and leftist militants and leaders.

The "crime" of the above-mentioned comrades, and particularly of Gerardo Cuesta, was that they took a leading part in the metalworkers' strike in support of the solidarity struggle against the repressive measures, etc. Cuesta is also responsible editor of the ASO organ *Classe Obrera*.

Cuesta and his comrades were arrested on Wednesday the 17th. The police have given no explanation of any kind; the men remain in jail incommunicado; their authorized lawyers are permitted neither to interview them nor see them; they were not brought to court (in 24 hours) as prescribed by the constitution itself. After more than 40 hours of detention in jail and attempts by three lawyers on separate occasions, they were denied writs of habeas corpus, without justification of any kind.

Now, after a week of arbitrary arrests, all the worker-militants including men of all tendencies in the labor movement—are "interned" in different places in the country, hundreds of kilometers from the capital, without the government giving out any information or explanation about it. The government, which is moving toward a real "legal" dictatorship, is trying to smash the trade-union movement, in order to put across its policies which are becoming more reactionary every day, because in the trade-union movement—in spite of its division and its different tendencies—it sees a barrier against such policies.

We want to emphasize the arbitrary and clearly political persecution which is shown by the arrest of Comrade Gerardo Cuesta, who is accused of being an "agitator" and a "communist." But it is well-known that our Agrupación Socialista Obrera quit the Socialist Party in 1948 as a

left-socialist (Marxist-Leninist) opposition tendency, in disagreement with the SP's orientation. It fights for the formation of a consistent revolutionary workers party, and has fundamental differences with the Communist Parties. We say this in order to clarify, even if very sketchily, its political and programmatic views.

ARGENTINE IMPERIALISM?

La Batalla reports that the Paz Estenssoro government in Bolivia, at the same time that it announced that it was going to nationalize the mines, also signed an agreement with a group of Argentine capitalists for "one of the biggest

financial operations ever carried through independently in Latin America," to quote a Cuban periodical.

The agreement means that the Argentine capitalists—headed by Alino Chacur, a prominent figure in the wealthy Syrian-Lebanese colony of Buenos Aires—will install a new smelting plant in Bolivia, costing some \$8 million. The new finance group will also set up a bank, a phosphorus plant, a sulphuric acid plant and an explosives factory. The contract will run for 25 years and will provide for a monopoly on these products.

Obviously, such an agreement means an open door in Bolivia for the increased influence of Argentine Peronism.

HIGH NOON

By PHILIP COBEN

In a self-styled liberal magazine, a recent movie review damned the picture *High Noon* as anti-democratic in theme. To this movie-goer, who has seen dozens of Hollywood productions which were really anti-democratic in impact or implications, the quoted opinion is a damning indictment—of the critic.

There was, we are sure, something about the picture that made him uneasy, but it was not a matter of democracy.

High Noon—let me say to start with—struck me not only as a good film but as a great film. It is a drama of personal courage in an off-the-beaten-path sense, a sense that has little to do with the war fantasies in which Errol Flynn used to win the war single-handed.

This is not only because the protagonist is not presented as a fearless hero. In *The Red Badge of Courage* the young soldier was also scared; but there is a different element in *High Noon*. Here the story centers about a Western town, threatened by the invasion of a hated gunman, whose good citizens curl up in cowardly capitulation, one after the other. In *The Red Badge of Courage*, the boy eventually gets over his natural fear, and even leads a reckless charge, because he is buoyed up by the intangible force of group morale; he is carried along by the others.

The theme of *High Noon* is the courage of the man who is able to fight alone, when all others cave in, because he believes in what he is fighting for and cannot give up.

No doubt, the reviewer was reacting solely to the depiction of a situation in which the "masses" are portrayed as cowards one and all, while one Hero stands alone. Strangely enough, his reaction is along the lines of the Stalinist aesthetic dogma according to which the "people" must never be portrayed in an unfavorable light; the "people" are always and unfailingly for light and progress, etc.

But the "people" in *High Noon* are not given any broad social connotation along these lines, and it deals with a very short-run situation—a couple of hours in the life of a small community. Even on the broader stage of society, those things happen. If *High Noon* is anti-democratic, then so also is the admiration which socialists hold for the memory of Karl Liebknecht, who had enough iron in his soul to stand up and be counted alone, when necessity arose.

High Noon is not about a Leader—a Fuehrer; the sheriff is able to lead no one, and that is the point. But he was able to be true to himself.

In a way, however, the critic's reaction was probably more honest than that of the average movie-goer, who will feel the glow of emphatic admiration for the laudable goings-on on the screen... and then refuse to sign a petition for fear of sticking his neck out.

That Hollywood's films are chock-full of anti-democratic attitudes is the easiest thing to demonstrate. But with a few exceptions (like *The Fountainhead*), these are rarely explicit, and most typically they are built-in to the very pattern of popular plot construction, with its assumption that while the people must be "done good" to, they must never be shown as winning victories for themselves against Constituted Authority. *Viva Zapata* was outstanding because it not only broke the rule but stressed the democratic impulsion that comes from spontaneous revolt from below.

It is doubtful whether *High Noon* was made with as conscious a social message as John Steinbeck wrote into *Viva Zapata*—in fact there is no internal evidence that there is any conscious social message at all. That is not a complaint. The impact on the individual arises out of the dramatic situation itself, almost unaided, and perhaps every viewer will react to it with some degree of the same uneasiness that afflicted the liberal critic.

For of all the forms of courage, *High Noon* dramatizes the highest and hardest, and we suspect that fewer people can manage to think of themselves in the sheriff's boots than can daydream of emulating Errol Flynn's exploits.

Rosa Luxemburg

REFORM OR REVOLUTION

This historic pamphlet, long out of print in this country, is now available in an edition published in India Price 50 Cents

Order from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14 St., New York 11, N. Y.

A Big Chance for Labor to Break Through South's One-Party System Shaken

By ALBERT GATES

The victory of General Eisenhower and the Republican Party in the South may well mark the beginning of the end of the political monopoly of the Southern Democratic Party machine. Such an event should be hailed by all socialists, militants and progressives. The shortsighted view sees only the victory of the General and the GOP; the long view, the intelligent one, sees progress in the establishment of a two-party system for the first time where a one-party system has dominated for so many decades.

Socialists are against any limitation of political expression, and they are particularly opposed to measures and politics which are designed to prevent the emergence, or activities, of other political parties. The monopolization of politics by one or two parties can only mean the bureaucratization of politics, the preservation of conservatism and reaction—or else the emergence of political struggle within the confines of the monopolizing parties. The present coalition character of the Democratic Party is one example of the way in which conflicting political tendencies in American life find their expression. Thus, we have liberals, labor and the Negroes in one party together, with the presently most reactionary force in American life, the Southern political rulers.

Even though the establishment of the conservative and often reactionary Republican Party in the South would not raise the progressive political barometer there, it would help to clarify the political situation and make possible the loosening-up and opening-up of the political struggle. The South needs open political conflict and an end to the domination of Shivers, Kennon, Talmadge, Russell, Byrnes and Byrd. If the GOP succeeds in the South, it will result in a clearer delineation of political forces and reflect underlying pressures of a social nature now at work. Such a development will provide a wider political arena in general and will make possible the development of new tendencies beyond the horizon of the present two parties. That would make for progress in the nation as a whole.

The Meaning of Republic Victory

The meaning of the Republican victory in the South is pondered by Democrats, Republicans, liberals, unionists and socialists alike. It is inevitable that it should be so. Eisenhower won four states with fifty-seven electoral votes in that section of the country. In the popular vote, he received 3.7 million to a little under 3.9 million for Stevenson. Moreover, the General would have taken South Carolina and Louisiana, too, had it not been for the seemingly paradoxical fact that the Negroes in the South voted overwhelmingly for the Democratic Party in those states as they did in the North.

All comparison to the previous one great Republican Southern invasion of 1928, when Hoover succeeded in taking five Southern States from Governor Al Smith, miss the point entirely. The comparison is made to prove that the vote was essentially an anti-Truman vote. As after the 1928 campaign, it is said, those who crossed over to the Republican column will return to the Democratic fold in post-election years. But the mistake made in this analogy is that the present Southern bolt to the GOP, based on powerful social and economic factors, reflecting an entirely new and different stage of historical development, and justifiably, cannot be compared to the anti-Catholic vote against Smith in 1928. Aside from that issue, no other strong economic and political factors produced the 1928 revolt.

Twenty-four years later the scene has changed drastically. The industrial development of the South during these years, modernizing class relations by creating a more distinct bourgeoisie and proletariat, has transformed the social relations in the South and has driven them along lines more nearly like those which govern in the rest of the country. Although the labor movement has not succeeded in organizing the South, it has made tremendous inroads when compared to the past. The growth of labor consciousness is a factor that we are as yet unable to measure successfully. But an index of its forward march can be seen in the vigorous reaction of the Southern

ruling class to labor's development there. The Southern ruling class, too, has altered considerably. Without exaggerating the phenomenon, it can be said that a new bourgeoisie has emerged alongside the Northern capitalists, and more nearly in the image of its elders. This is particularly true in Texas.

It would, however, be a gross mistake to say that, in view of the overriding historical pressures that have worked so steadily on the South, class and social relations are now identical to those in the North. The centuries-old reactionary and slave-holding tradition militates against such a uniformity in the country. But uniformity is not necessary in order to produce the present political complex in the South. The development of combined historical and economic factors are sufficient to produce similarities in structure and these, in turn, explain the nature of the new political development.

Why Negroes Support Democrats

The most striking aspect of the change in the South, and the one which defies a mechanical application of theory to political questions, is the support which the Democratic Party received from the Negroes. Why should the Negroes in the South, the most exploited and persecuted people in the country, have swarmed to the polls to vote for the party of Jim Crow? Why did they not vote for the Republican Party, the "historic" party of the Negroes, the party of Abe Lincoln? Here, again, we see overriding national experience, a broader understanding of the history of the past twenty years, producing the almost unanimous action of the Negroes. In voting for the Democratic Party in the South, the Negroes there joined hands with the Negroes of the North who supported the party of Roosevelt and Truman, and the Party which sponsored national legislation in its behalf.

The Negroes in the South do not have to be told that the Democratic Party has been their main enemy in the states below the Mason-Dixon line. They understand, too, that much of the Democratic policy on the Negro question is pure "politics." But, they understand even more than this, if only instinctively, that there is something broader involved in the electoral struggle. If the understanding is unclear, it is certain that they see in the GOP the party of "another class," in the broadest possible meaning of the term: it is the party that is against us poor people. It was the party that joined the Southern bloc against FEPC. This understanding does not have to be accompanied by the converse feeling that the Democratic Party is "our" party, the party of the "people."

The increased participation of labor in the Democratic Party, the reformist character of much of that party's program, and its championing of national FEPC legislation are the strongest factors which are responsible for this unusual and normally unexpected political development of the Negroes in the South. Generally speaking, the Negroes realize that their greatest friend is the labor movement. When the labor movement allies itself with one of the two political capitalist parties, the act of adherence must inevitably exert a powerful influence on thousands and thousands of Negroes North and South. Given their class and race position, there is a greater uniformity of political thinking among Negroes in all parts of the country than among any other group. Add to these factors, the strong position taken by President Truman, as the erstwhile leader of the Democratic Party, and you will find another good reason to explain that vote.

There is much that is plebian about the Democratic Party. It is a bourgeois party no less than the Republican. But its composition is different. Its coalition character, uniquely American, embraces both the reactionary South and the labor movement, an "enlightened" and "internationalist" section of the bourgeoisie and the strong adherence of the big city and industrial populations. The plebian character of the party is to be found in this composition; it was strengthened by twenty years of the Roosevelt-Truman administrations.

A Contradictory Development

In the current developments in the South, despite the contradictory aspects that are undoubtedly present, one can see the groundswell of a new plebian movement composed of the poor whites, the Negroes, the labor movement and the Southern liberal, all of these elements mixed up with the traditional Democratic machines and a host of lagging reactionaries, bound by tradition, self-interest and patronage.

A large part of Eisenhower's electoral strength grew up in opposition to this kind of Democratic coalition in the South. The Northern Republicans did not contribute much to the revolt. It was led primarily by the Democratic chieftains in Texas, Louisiana, Florida, South Carolina and Virginia. These party rebels, writes W. S. White in the New York Times, reflected the mood of enormous segments of the Democratic organization where "in thousands of cases (it was) a conscious acceptance of the whole generality of Republican ideas." For, outside of foreign policy, the rebel leaders of the Southern Democratic Party think and act like the Republicans.

The Republican Party, for the first time, believes it has the opportunity of breaking up the Democratic monopoly in the South. As we have already indicated in the beginning, the present schism is no ephemeral anti-Cath-

olic revolt. The factors which produce it are fundamental and stable; they emphasize the increasing community of class interest between the new bourgeoisie in the South and their Northern brothers in a nation where class consciousness has been for many decades the monopoly of the ruling class. (In that respect, the bourgeoisie shows far more perspicacity and general intelligence than is exhibited in the numerous and rather stupid dissertations of sociologists and their co-thinkers about the classless nature of American society).

The old argument that the GOP cannot hope to build a party in the South because it lacked the ability to control patronage in those states, will be overcome, even though not easily by the fact that with the federal government in its control, the more conscious Republican leaders will make a determined effort to encompass the South in their division of the spoils of administration.

The subject of a two-party system in the South is now being discussed at the Southern Governor's conference. Republican Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin of Maryland told his Southern confreres that the election of Eisenhower "presaged a two-party system in the South." He was, of course, challenged by all the Southern governors, including those who bolted the presidential campaign and endorsed the General.

Governor Hugh L. White of Mississippi said that such a development "is no more likely than my flying to heaven." He, was joined in these sentiments by other Southern governors, including Shivers, Byrnes, Kennon and Battle, all of whom supported and campaigned for Eisenhower. These are the men who stand closest to the GOP. But they are not alone by any means. Behind their machines in Texas, South Carolina, Louisiana and Virginia, stand such other stalwarts as Talmadge in Georgia, Fuller in Florida, and the middle-of-the-roads like Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas and Senator Russell of Georgia.

Democrats Will Be Compromised

The position of the Democratic Party in the South, and the North too, will be further compromised by the fact that while the national party machinery is in the hands of the Northern machine men and the liberals, all rallied around Stevenson, the face of the party in the Senate and the House will be the Southerners. How will the Northern liberals square their position and struggle in face of the prospect that the Senate leader of the party will be Senator Johnson of Texas who stands much closer to Shivers than he does to Senator Lehman, for example. His strength in the Senate will be based not on those who control the party machine on the outside, but on his Southern colleagues who control the party's congressional groups.

It has been said that the next four years will be difficult ones for Eisenhower and the GOP. They will be no easier for the Democratic Party. Quite the contrary. The Republican Party has far more ideological unity than the Democratic and while this is no guarantee of peace in the party, the party has the advantage that it will be occupied for some time with the problems of how to organize the victory. The Democrats will be largely concerned with saving their organization and preparing for new elections, in the course of which, the conflict will not be lessened but intensified.

If the Democratic Party is to maintain its hold on its Northern bases of support, it cannot surrender to the demands of the Southern bourgeois. To do so would alienate tens of millions of voters. If the road of compromise is traveled, the result can already be foreseen. The convention compromise to keep Texas, Louisiana, South Carolina and Virginia in the Party showed that clearly. The conflict is unbridgeable and that is to the good.

Political and social events have a habit of lagging far behind the inexorable economic pressures in this country. They make their way slowly, indeed much slower than socialists have often believed. But they make their way nevertheless. The break-up of the two-party system in the South is an event which should be hailed because it can very well be the forerunner of a decisive political change in the country as a whole. History may very well record that before we can have an independent third party of labor of the people it will be necessary to have two parties in the South.

Read about Independent Socialism

in the special pamphlet-issues published by LABOR ACTION

- THE PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM OF INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM
- INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM AND THE WAR
- THE FAIR DEAL: A SOCIALIST CRITICISM

10 cents each Order from: Labor Action, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

Youth and Student Corner

Letter from Brooklyn College Raises Issue:

Is It Possible to Work With Stalinists?

To the Editor:

Paul Germain's coverage of political affairs at Brooklyn College is characterized, intentionally or not, by a blind spot in regard to the meaning of the student reaction to the McCarran Committee's latest extension of thought control to the city's campuses. I should like to clear up the shambles he has made of our protest.

When the McCarran Committee subpoenaed its first Brooklyn victim, a student protest was immediately awakened and took the form of a number of disparate groups which held their own meetings, ran off their own leaflets and so on. Presently, as these groups became aware of each other's existence, the idea of consolidation took shape and a meeting was planned with this purpose in view.

This meeting was covered by Paul Germain and served as the springboard for his virulent attack upon the Committee to Defend Our Teachers—the name of the new group—as a Stalinist dominated affair. The basis of his attack was twofold. First it was an attack upon a Stalinist who was present, a certain Miss Charlotte Goldberg, who, as a particularly diligent CPer has gained a good deal of notoriety off and on the campus. The fact that she introduced a proposal that was accepted indicated, to Germain, that the group itself was Stalinist dominated. Secondly, Germain rested his case upon the proposal itself, which has to do with section 903 of the city charter, and which has become a principle of the organization. The group decided that section 903 (under which invocation of the Fifth Amendment by a city employee before a government investigating committee is grounds for automatic dismissal) was being misapplied in the case of the teachers in question. It did not object to the intrinsic merits of the article per se.

Germain's fulminations, by and large, were based upon the idea that the position taken by the group marks it as Stalinist because it indicates a disregard for principle which is typically Stalinist. He argues that even corrupt politicians have a right to invoke constitutional privileges, and 903, which was instituted originally against city bureaucrats, should therefore be scrapped altogether. What Germain forgets, however, or chooses to ignore, is that *many a liberal* is of the opinion that a city bureaucrat should be punished by loss of his job if he refuses to come clean when asked what he did with the public's money. Whether such a liberal is right or wrong in thinking so is beside the point. The point is that it is not exclusively a Stalinist conclusion. Germain's red-baiting on the basis of the group's position on 903 is therefore perfectly uncalled for, and logically monstrous.

But not only is Germain mistaken in what he said—he is even more at fault in what he left out. The fact is that the group's position on section 903 is one of several principles, and a *minor* one in comparison with the others. Most of the meeting was devoted to an effort to determine the conditions and criteria under which dismissal of a teacher is valid or not valid. And the decision of the group was that competence, behavior in the classroom, was what really mattered—and not the private beliefs and convictions of the teachers in question. Also the group laid a tremendous amount of stress upon the need for making the organization as broadly inclusive as possible, a policy which has been reasonably successful in view of the obvious difficulties which, like any progressive organization, we have had to contend with from the start. Why didn't Germain report this?

Furthermore, the current position of the group on 903 has been the subject of constant discussion and controversy *within* the group. It is by no means accepted by all, and the writer of this letter himself disagrees with it and has criticized the stand time and again at meetings of the organization.

What was Germain trying to accomplish by the line he took in his "report"? To the extent that the article had any influence on campus its effect was to support the rabid contentions of the faculty and scared students alike, who tirelessly insist that any protest against the reactionary drift is ultimately traceable to the Kremlin. He also fosters the wonderful notion that liberals who join such a protest are as puffy in the hands of the Mephistophelian reids, and gleefully refers to them as the "few assorted innocents."

Germain is much more innocent than they are, however, if he thinks that his smear of the Committee to Defend Our Teachers is anything but detrimental to the protest against the McCarran Committee.

An interesting footnote to all this is that Albert Gates, after a recent talk to a group of B C students sponsored by the E. V. Debs Society on the subject of thought control in America, recommended, as a program for campus action, that the students of Brooklyn College take measures which they had already taken and had been smeared for taking in LABOR ACTION! It was plain that Gates had not been briefed on the specific conditions on campus, and it was even more plain that he hadn't read Germain's article. And when he was told by a student that his recommendations (which were, simply and sensibly, to form a protest group and to include as many student elements as possible—even Stalinists!—

in that group) were already history and that LABOR ACTION had slung the fattest mud-bomb at it, he was visibly confused and turned the discussion over to the chairman of the Debs Society meeting who saw fit to reiterate the lame points of Germain's article, and was promptly belabored by a student who considered his attitude a bit too Olympian and negative for comfort.

Presently, Gates, who in the interim had gotten the flavor of student sentiment, came to the aid of his beleaguered fellow and in so doing he involved himself, and quite necessarily so, in a flat contradiction. For now he advised us to be "realistic" and to remember that the Stalinists were "the kiss of death," and that, in the eyes of public opinion they had "disqualified" themselves as a worthy political group and so on. Impressive as Gates' quick adjustment had been, it nevertheless left us with that awful double-think feeling. The question now was: is it only Germain who goes blind everytime the image of a Charlotte Goldberg swims into his ken, or is this blind spot a characteristic of the ISL?

J. C.

(This is a private opinion and is in no way to be connected with the attitude of the Committee to Defend Our Teachers. I am a member of the group, but in this letter am speaking only my own views.)

AND THE REPLY

By PAUL GERMAIN Brooklyn College

To begin with, the "number of disparate groups" which, we are told, became aware of each other's existence, and decided to "consolidate" their so-called broad student support at the first public organizational meeting of the Committee to Defend our Teachers (CDT) were, strangely enough, only able to muster approximately 21 people at this meeting.

These indomitable 21 were, for the most part, familiar faces to those with the slightest knowledge and acquaintanceship with the Labor Youth League and Young Progressives of America crowd at Brooklyn College.

A re-reading of our LABOR ACTION article of October 6 shows that it was due to the predominant Stalinist and Stalinoid-liberal composition of the group, and not necessarily due to its not very surprising acceptance of Miss Goldberg's analysis of Section 903 of the New York City Charter, that led us to consider the organization a Stalinist front group.

In the five weeks that have passed since the appearance of our article, the antics of the CDT with regard to its position on 903 have born out our analysis to the hilt. We shall have more to say about this later on in this reply.

Furthermore, we stated, not as J. C. claims, that the group's position on 903 marked it as Stalinist-controlled because it indicated "a disregard for principle which is typically Stalinist," but the complete inversion of such a statement: "the attitude on the part of the Stalinist elements at Brooklyn College (to 903) . . . give their basically totalitarian and anti-democratic mentality, was to have been expected."

As far as our friends the liberals are concerned, J. C.'s reference to them is, to put it euphemistically, a bit beside the point, for we also made it quite clear that they, because of their own particular state of disorientation, had a hand in the original promulgation of the law.

However, we also remarked that, at the time of the Seabury investigations, liberals and socialists, too, could perhaps be excused for failing to be sensitive to the implications and potentialities of Section 903, "given the fact that it appeared to be a handy weapon against political corruption. Today, and particularly given the uses to which it has been trained, its earlier beneficent motivation can hardly be decisive."

For Complete Elimination of 903

Incidentally, we also expressed the fear that the already sufficiently confused liberals on campus would be further disoriented by the position of the Stalinists on 903. However, though unorganized, a very large percentage of student liberal opinion on the B. C. campus appears to be opposed to the position of the CDT and in favor of complete elimination of the city ordinance.

This impression is reinforced by the appearance in Kingsman of statements by a group of fairly representative liberal students, and by an editorial in Ken, the evening session newspaper, which opposed 903 per se. All of which leads to this conclusion that most of the liberal disorientation on this matter can probably be traced to the—you'll pardon the expression—innocents to be found within the environs of the CDT.

J. C., unlike most of the members of the CDT, agrees with us that even suspected grafting politicians should

not be made second class citizens by denying them the constitutional protection of the Fifth Amendment held, at least nominally, by the rest of the citizenry.

He appears to accept the democratic precept that the burden of proof of wrongdoing must lie with the accuser, even in cases involving the suspected dishonest utilization of public funds by city officials.

But, as far as we can gather from his letter, J. C. has yet to grasp the more immediate and vital consequences of Section 903, as far as the current teacher purge is concerned.

Legal Justification for Purge

The point is that 903 does not limit itself to compelling city officials and employees to testify before certified investigatory committees as to the utilization of public funds. It is enabled to do much more than deny such officials the right of refusal to testify in such matters on grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Because of the wording of this city ordinance, the current teacher purge in New York City has an absolutely "legal" justification—as far as the purges are concerned.

We quote directly from 903 itself: "If any councilman or other officer or employee of the city [including teachers in the municipal school systems—P. G.] shall . . . refuse to testify or to answer any questions regarding the property, government, or affairs of the city . . . or regarding the nomination, election, appointment, or official conduct of any officer or employee of the city . . . on the ground that his answer would tend to incriminate him . . . his term or tenure of office or employment shall terminate." [My emphasis—P. G.]

Lederman-Bucci Exchange

A recent exchange between Abraham Lederman of the Stalinist-controlled Teachers Union and Nicholas Bucci of the Board of Education, that appeared in the New York Times, bears out our fears of the dangerous implications and potentialities of such originally well-intentioned laws.

For, in answering Lederman's contention that the current use of 903—against teachers who refused to answer questions concerning present or past membership in the Communist Party—was a "misapplication" of the law, Bucci made the following telling points:

1. Though the Teachers Union is essentially correct in claiming that 903 was originally intended as a device to root out grafters from City Hall, the wording of the document gives the Board of Education a legal sanction for its current purge activities.

2. Bucci pointed out that past or present membership in the Communist Party on the part of city teachers and other municipal employees, could by this law be considered an "affair of the city."

3. In line with the above, the fact was adduced that complying witnesses before the McCarran Committee—some ex-CPers, including Professor Albaum of the Brooklyn College Department of Biology—had testified that as card-carrying members they were organized into special CP teacher cells, and instructed to slant their teaching to fit the party line whenever possible. Such action (or testimony to that effect) was held to be not only an affair of the city but, in addition, an implication of "improper official conduct" with regard to the teachers involved. Therefore, refusal to testify on such matters automatically disqualified a city teacher from holding his job. This interpretation of 903 has already been upheld by the courts.

Burden of Proof on Accused

It was made evident by Mr. Bucci that the Board of Education was not legally required to prove specific cases of misuse of the classroom by the implicated teachers. Because of the aforementioned testimony, membership in the CP, or refusal to testify as to membership in the CP, constituted prima facie evidence of guilt. The burden of proof was definitely not upon the accuser.

This is why, my dear J. C., we feel that the attitude on the part of the CDI and the Teachers Union of not opposing 903 per se but only attacking its supposed current "misuse," is not only a stupid one, but in addition, is a hindrance in the fight for teacher's rights and academic freedom.

We also can't be too happy about the latest feeble tactic of the Teachers Union—an attempt to prove that the teachers in the municipal school system are not employees of the city but of the state! Oh, what defenders of democracy!

Since the Teachers Union has not, as yet, seen fit to reply to Bucci's letter, either in the Times or other publications, or by public pronouncement, we feel it fairly safe to conclude that even they—if not their echoes in the CDT—have come to the realization that their stupid ultra-legalistic approach has come back to kick them squarely but legally in the teeth.

In the meantime, the antics of the CDT once again prove the validity of our consistent claim that any attempt by students to organize in a fight for academic

(Turn to last page)

"The CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV"

A Novel of Modern Russia by VICTOR SERGE

\$3.00 Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y.

Work With Stalinists? — —

(Continued from page 7)

freedom must, to have any moderate chance of success, completely dissociate itself from the Stalinists.

Not soon after the appearance in Ken of the editorial which opposed 903 per se, a rumor was making the rounds to the effect that the CDT had changed its position on 903 and had now favored its complete abolition. The liberal opposition to their line was, quite obviously, getting to be a bit uncomfortable.

When a group of members of the organization's executive committee—which consists for the most part of a few semi-Stalinoid innocents and some of the less experienced campus Stalinists (the more experienced and recognizable hacks having wisely attempted to stay in the background) were asked how this decision was reached by the CDT, they replied that it had been decided at an executive committee meeting.

When again politely asked how the executive committee by itself could reverse the decision of the "rank and file," the almost incoherent reply came back that well, anyway, the decision wasn't really final as yet, and would soon be taken to the membership for approval.

After being told that this was very good news to hear, and would most probably win over to the group many students who had originally considered it a tool of the Stalinists—for now the executive committee's position was completely antithetical to that of the Teachers Union—a sudden aura of gloom was visibly perceived to drop over the group.

After about two weeks of strange silence, the last act of this little farce took place at another off-campus organizational meeting at which, despite opposition from some of the more independent members of the CDT, the original hewing to the Teachers Union line was upheld.

Are we "red baiting" when we claim that this is just one more indication that the Stalinist controlling elements of the CDT are willing to subvert a clear-cut fight for teachers rights and academic freedom to a defense of and saving of face for the Teachers Union?

And as far as uncalled for and logically monstrous remarks are concerned, can we be permitted to get our

ire up a bit when we are informed by J. C. and some executive committee members, that the organization's line on 903—which was discussed quite lengthily at the first organizational meeting of the group, which has consistently been given very prominent position in whatever publicity and agitational material the group has issued, and which has been the topic of heated discussion for over a month—is only a *minor* concern?

Before we conclude, we feel that we should say a few words about J. C.'s analysis of Albert Gates' talk before the Eugene V. Debs Society of Brooklyn College.

Gates, while advocating the formation of a student protest group to include as many elements as possible—even Stalinists, if they desired to join and ally themselves with the program and statement of principles of the organization—was not contradicting himself or LABOR ACTION in the least by also proposing that such an organization should programmatically dissociate itself from both right wing and Stalinist reaction.

As Gates stated at the meeting, and as has been amply proved by their most recent antics, when such dissociation is not accomplished, and the Stalinists are able to function organizationally within such a group, they defile everything they put their hands on and are able to do their utmost to subordinate the group as a sounding board for their own propaganda purposes.

CDT Broadly Inclusive?

Too, J. C.'s claim that the CDT has been reasonably successful in making the organization as broadly inclusive as possible is quite puzzling.

As far as we can see the overwhelming majority of those liberal students who oppose 903 and the teacher purge have had absolutely nothing to do with the CDT, which appears to be another indication of what Gates accurately called the Stalinist "kiss of death."

Though we of the Socialist Youth League may disagree with these liberals on many other problems, on one issue we are in essential agreement. That is that these students are correct in believing the LYL and YPA elements to be defenders and apologists for a world power and social

system whose principles and acts are completely antithetical to those democratic precepts that they espouse for home consumption.

These liberal students are correct in believing that any organization that is crawling with such elements, and that does not even make an attempt to programmatically dissociate itself from them, cannot seriously, effectively, or honestly claim to fight for and espouse democratic principles. Therefore they shall, as they have, keep a hands off policy as far as such organizations are concerned.

If, however, such an organization were to take the necessary ideological steps proposed by Gates, we do not believe that there would be much, if any, difficulty from any daredevil Stalinists that would care to associate themselves with it.

This, in essence, was what Gates was referring to in his remarks. In such a situation, any banning of the Stalinists would be completely superfluous.

We again submit that there was no contradiction in Gates' remarks.

Our Last Word

One last word, concerning our student friend who considered the attitude of the chairman of the Debs Society meeting "too Olympian and negative for comfort."

Our student friend, it is true, had a point of view that was quite at variance with that of our article. His un-Olympian positive approach mainly consisted of the feeling that in the controversy over the purge of teachers the whole argument—pro and con—over 903 was of miniscule importance, and that we must all put aside our "superficial" differences and unite for a fight against the forces of reaction.

We are for "unity" too. And despite our strong feelings on 903 we would even be willing to unite in the struggle for academic freedom with people who disagree with us on this particular issue. But we are not and will not be willing to lend our support to organizations dominated by the Stalinists, for the reasons listed above. That is the real question.

H-Bomb and Third Camp — —

(Continued from page 1)

exact meaning is vague). Said he, "The USSR will be restrained more by effective governmental organization than by bombs."

POLITICAL ANSWERS

What is the political answer to this weird path the ruling classes of the world have us moving in? Official U. S. sources believe that the Russians have long been working on the H-Bomb but some of them don't think the Stalinist scientists will achieve success before 1954. Since several scientists have stated that the H-Bomb is the last step possible and the rest is only a question of "refinement of techniques" the logical answer of the capitalist ruling class (and alas of many of their liberal and "socialist" supporters) can only be to start the war now when our weapon advantage is so obviously superior.

This argument comes not only from the lunatic fringe but is considered, and voiced by experts, as a sound military one. So why do

they hesitate? Before this the Russians had the A-bomb and the airplanes to deliver them so that the capitalist "liberation" would be answered by Stalinist retaliation. But now the capitalist ruling class again has what it believes to be the clear margin of safety.

Will Ike use it? Probably not, for the international stage is still not set even though it is now held that war must come. Even more important, self-destruction is only a method of last resort and it certainly would be self-destruction for the type of industrial society American capitalism represents. Thus our ruling class will continue to make bombs and experiment with better ones which destroy in seconds more dollars than were spent in the last year in the entire Point Four program.

FRENZIED DRIVE

It should be abundantly clear not only to independent socialists but to everyone that this frenzied drive to pyramid arms, each more powerful than the former, can

lead only to wide-spread destruction of both the liberators and the liberated. Man and the mechanical arts are not in peril but our civilization and its two opposing imperialist rivals are. The socialist answer must be to prevent war—for once the war has been fought and has exhausted the world the material requirements and social organization for a successful socialist state will not be available for many decades. Socialists will not prevent this war on the one hand by giving their all-out support to the American ruling class nor on the other hand by supporting Stalinism and baring from within "the degenerate workers' state."

Our only hope is the formation by the peoples of the world of a third camp—a third camp based upon meeting the needs of all of these peoples—based upon our very old principle: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs, and this on an international plane. The need is not for H-Bombs or better, or for a miserable Point Four (even though here a little is better than nothing). If there is indeed no cohesive and conscious third force,

then it will surely arise and grow as the need for it becomes ever more pressing.

"USE 'EM QUICK"

Finally, I should like to point out the tremendous economic loss arising from the natural limitations of the explosive material in the H-bomb (a fact not discussed in the capitalist press). Tritium (or this special explosive, heavy hydrogen) is naturally radioactive and half of it decays to a harmless element in about 30 years. Thus the bomb slowly begins to become diluted with a harmless element and its potency decreases. This, of course, will never do. These bombs must be

periodically taken apart and rebuilt but the repair job is an atomic one. If the military does as the late Senator McMahon suggested and stockpiles these bombs to four figure quantities then the cost to the nation in manpower and resources will be tremendous just to keep them active. This will no doubt be another reason to "use 'em quick" before the overhead ruins us.

Such is the capitalist answer—vast sums to pose it—uncomprehensible destruction (and self-destruction at that) to use it. Humanity's mere survival does not depend upon the socialist answer, but its continued well-being and our present civilization do.

STATESMEN DEBATE RUSSIAN MENACE IN L.A.

The following news item from the Los Angeles Mirror of October 30, describes a day in the weighty deliberations of the statesmen who govern the Great City of the Angels, as, in their valiant struggle against the Menace of Communism, they leave no witch unturned.

City councilmen today mulled a proposal to set up a resolutions committee as a means of halting the daily torrent of abuse from Councilman Ed Davenport.

The exploratory talks followed defeat of a resolution offered yesterday by Davenport which demanded among other things that all city employees, including the mayor, renew their loyalty oath each January 1.

When Councilman Ed Roybal spoke out against the practice of "McCarthyism," Davenport blew his top, turned on Roybal and

charged him with being "a front for the Communist Party."

Council President Harold Henry, the most conservative councilman of recent years, also was accused by Davenport of being "part of the Communist plot" when he ruled Davenport out of order.

Davenport produced a scrapbook filled with clippings about Roybal which he said had been culled from the Communist Daily People's World.

"You are giving aid and comfort to the enemies of this country," he shouted at Roybal.

Roybal replied that "anyone who believes the People's World is crazy," and he asked the city attorney if it was possible for council to appropriate money for a psychiatric examination and treatment of one of its members if it can be proven the illness is connected with council service.

Berkeley, Calif.

DEBATE

"Can Socialists Support Either Side
In the Present War Alignment?"

Socialist Workers Party says "YES"
Independent Socialist League says "NO"

Friday, December 5 8 PM

BARRINGTON HALL

2315 Dwight Way, Berkeley, Calif.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own Labor
and Socialist Library.

SEND FOR OUR FREE BOOK LIST.
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

MAX SHACHTMAN

A Basic Primer!

\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

In English for the First Time!

Rosa Luxemburg's

THE ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL

Yale University Press • 475 pages • \$5

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City