

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 5, 1953

FIVE CENTS

WIRETAPPING: THE LEGAL CRIME A Police-State Tool Grows Up

... page 6

New Turn for the Socialist Party

... page 2

Stock-Taking in Britain for 1953

... page 3

Looking Back Over 1952's Headlines

GORDON HASKELL

Once again we come to the new year and cast our eyes back over the one which has just ended. The first impression one gets from glancing over the year's headlines in LABOR ACTION is the extent to which 1952 showed a continuation of the trends of 1951, and how frequently events occurring early in the year signaled what was to happen later on.

The main headline for January 14, 1952, reads:
Truman Message: War and Taxes—
Fair Deal on Shelf for the Duration

This is an almost exact repetition of the lead headline of the issue of January 15, 1951. The reason is not that LABOR ACTION headline writers are given to repetition, but that each year Truman's messages on the state of the union had the same political meaning. And everything that happened during the year bore out the prediction of the president's message and of the LA headline.

The Slansky Case: Stalinist Anti-Semitism in Czechoslovakia

(Jan. 14)

The rumblings of anti-Semitism as a major state policy in the satellite countries could be heard last January. It took the Stalinist police almost a year to prepare the "defendants" in their case, and to proclaim their policy of anti-Semitism in unmistakable terms for all the world to understand in the show trial of November. At the year's end, the repercussions of the Czech trials were being felt in the Stalinist parties and among their sympathizers all over the world.

Uprising in Tunisia: The Fight Has Just Begun

(Feb. 4)

The general heading on a series of articles in this issue of LABOR ACTION reads: "The Revolt Against Imperialism From Gibraltar to Mexico." The articles discuss the background of the struggle in Tunisia, and its relation to events in Libya, Egypt and countries of the Middle East. Although the struggle for national liberation seemed to fall into full swing during the year in this area, in December it broke out anew in Morocco and Tunisia in the most bloody fighting in recent times. The LA article had predicted a new peak of struggle in Tunisia within six months or a year.

The United Nations was rocked by the insistence of the Arab states that the colonial struggle in this area is a matter of international concern. France, backed by the United States and Britain, has shown a determination to maintain its power in this area by the ancient and brutal methods of colonial rule.

Franco Regime Starts New Wave of Terror in Spain

(March 3)

Early in 1952 the Franco government started a new wave of terror against labor and left-wing political enemies of the fascist government. Large numbers of leaders and members of the syndicalist National Confederation of Labor (CNT) and the socialist POUM were rounded up and thrown in jail. This took place in the context of continuing negotiations between Franco and the United States government for financial and military support of the Franco regime.

All over the world the labor movement protested the fascist terror in Spain. In the United States labor and radical groups joined together to form a Committee to Aid Franco's Labor Victims. Although later in the year a number of the anti-fascist fighters were released, the Franco regime remains as a constant oppressor of the Spanish people. And as this is written, Madrid has been giving out announcements of the early consummation of the cynical deal between Washington and Franco over the backs of the exploited Spanish people.

The Shadow of the Police State: Witchhunt System Grows on Three Fronts

(March 10)

This headline appeared over three articles on the general and continuing attack on civil liberties in the country. One dealt with a report

(Turn to last page)

Christmas Present—I McCarranizing the Seamen: Or—A Witchhunt in Every Port

By LARRY O'CONNOR

Some of the first bitter fruits of the McCarran Act, covering immigration and the status of aliens in this country, have started dropping off the Christmas tree. The particular section of the act which seems to have come most dramatically into effect exactly on Christmas Eve was that covering the screening of foreign seamen entering American ports.

Under the act, all seamen must pass a special screening before they can come ashore even for a few hours while their ship is being serviced. In order to facilitate the operation of the act with regard to the large crews of passenger liners, the United States Immigration Service made an arrangement with foreign ship lines which permits inspectors to ride for a round-trip before arrival in this country and thus screen the foreign seamen on the high seas.

The first to raise a serious protest about this procedure was the French seaman's union. Not only did they protest this highhanded action to the French government, but the men on the liner *Liberté* agreed not to submit to the questioning of the immigration inspector. As a result, 269 of them had to spend Christmas

day on board the ship.

The provisions of the McCarran Act, which seek to extend the American "loyalty" craze to foreign seamen, have already been protested by the governments of Great Britain, Sweden, Norway, Holland, France and Italy. They contend that although all countries have procedures which apply to seamen who are suspected of engaging in illegal activities (such as smuggling), the American law is discriminatory in that it subjects seamen to penalties for ac-

tions, past or present, which are not in themselves illegal either in their home countries or in the United States itself.

ANTI-NAZI CHEF

One of the sea-faring groups most strongly affected by the act has been the fisherman in the tuna fleet working out of California ports. Large numbers of these are Mexican, Portuguese, Costa Ricans and Italians. They are highly skilled fishermen, but many of them have not become American citizens. The McCarran Act does not permit such seamen to stay in this country more than 29 days between voyages, while in the fishing fleet a longer stay is often essential.

The plight of many seamen, as well as of other aliens seeking entry into the country, can perhaps be illustrated by the experience of René Girondel, head pastry chef on the French liner *Liberté*. He was willing to submit to the screening of the American inspector on the ship. But the screening turned out to be some-

(Continued on page 4)

Christmas Present—II Good Will Toward Men—Provided They're Not for Peace on Earth

By BERNARD CRAMER

Each year on Christmas Eve, the burgeoning Yuletide spirit wells up on schedule in the bosom of the president of the United States and, moved irresistibly by the sentiment of good will toward men, he exercises his constitutional privilege to "grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses Against the United States." Erring sons and daughters who have committed crimes against federal law are shown that stern justice is tempered by loving mercy in this happy democracy.

That is, provided they have committed the right kind of crime.

This time, the crime judged Most Likely to Be Pardoned

Another Kutcher Case Comes Up

James Kutcher, the "Legless Veteran" who won a Supreme Court victory in October when the court ruled that his membership in the Socialist Workers Party was not in itself sufficient to get him fired from his job as a file clerk with the Veterans Bureau, has again been hit by the witchhunters—through his father.

His father, who lives in a Newark housing project, is willing to sign the new loyalty oath required

of tenants, but his son, who lost both legs in the war, also lives with him. Both therefore face the prospect of being evicted, solely because the veteran belongs to an organization arbitrarily proscribed by the attorney general's "subversive list."

James Kutcher has announced that he is filing suit against the oath requirement, with the American Civil Liberties Union as representative.

by the President was that of congressmen who use their office to dip their hands into the billions of war dollars flowing freely out of the Treasury.

While Immigration officials had some trouble making up their minds to the effect that a French seaman who had stolen bread from the Nazis had not committed a crime, the president exhibited no public pangs of conscience in deciding that the only two federal criminals worthy of seasonal clemency on their individual cases were the two who had stolen from the whole people of the United States, in a position of public trust rather than some poor devil whose case was less spectacular.

BIPARTISAN

These fortunates were Democratic ex-Congressman Andrew J. May, who was convicted in 1947 of taking \$53,000 worth of bribes to get millions in munitions contracts for the notorious Garsson brothers, using his influence as wartime chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee; and Republican ex-Congressman J.

(Continued on page 3)

Stellato Gets a Vote Of Confidence by Local

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Dec. 21—For the first time in its history, Ford Local 600 of the UAW (CIO) was on record through an overwhelming vote of its General Council to back a candidate for regional director. This vote of confidence in Carl Stellato, incumbent president, was cast 182 to 7, a remarkable decision.

Stellato is expected to run against Joe McCusker, present co-director of Region 1-A. He is also a member of Ford Local 600, and the action of the General Council is quite a blow to his hopes of re-election.

Since Walter P. Reuther, president of the UAW and the CIO, recently told an East Side caucus that the union leadership expects no changes at the forthcoming convention, the bid of Stellato has interesting possibilities.

Stellato recently demanded that the UAW hold a joint General Motors, Ford and Chrysler conference to place nation-wide demands on the big corporations, rather than the current strategy of holding separate negotiations. Each major corporation has thus far been adamant in its refusal to change the contract, and improve it along lines suggested by the union.

The Michigan CIO News this week carried an important news story from Evansville, Indiana,

that suggests the kind of campaign against which the UAW and the CIO must contend in the coming period, since Walter Reuther won the presidency of the CIO.

The story in full (it speaks for itself) says:

"EVANSVILLE, Ind.—A last minute smear of President Walter Reuther, following an intensive anti-union campaign, cost the CIO auto workers union an NLRB election here last week at the Kent plant, 614 to 166.

"The company circulated a letter supposedly written by Walter and Victor Reuther from Russia in 1934, praising the Soviet Union. The letter is a phony, having been repudiated by the Reuthers hundreds of times. In fact, the same letter was used by the Communists within the UAW in fighting Reuther.

"The phony letter was published in an anti-labor Labor Digest published in behalf of anti-union employers.

"Frank Kavanaugh, UAW-CIO representative, said the election will be protested to the NLRB on charges of: captive-audience meetings with union representatives refused permission to attend; promises of the usual Christmas bonus and a wage increase two days before the election, for votes against the union; questioning of employees about union sympathies; coercion and intimidation of union leaders."

Thomas Calls on Reporter To Tell All on Tresca Case

NEW YORK, Dec. 23—Failure of Ed Reid, Brooklyn Eagle reporter and author, to back up a charge by him that Italian Fascists paid \$500,000 for the murder of Carlo Tresca, anti-totalitarian editor, in 1943, was sharply criticized today by Norman Thomas, chairman of the Tresca Memorial Committee.

Reid has twice made that statement in print—originally in the daily Eagle, and lately in his current book, Mafia. He declared that the money for the killing was paid to a crime syndicate here. But when questioned by the district attorney's office he failed to substantiate his allegation.

Thomas made public an open letter to Reid as he announced plans for commemorating Tresca's death on Saturday, January 10, one day ahead of the anniversary date. Flowers will be laid at the northwest corner of Fifth Avenue and 15th Street, where he was shot down in the dim-out ten years ago. There will be a short and simple ceremony, in tribute to Tresca, beginning at 1 p.m., with Joseph G. Glass, Socialist attorney, as the speaker. In case of bad weather, the speaking will be held in Rand School, 7 East 15 Street.

Following issuance of the Mafia book, Thomas wrote District Attorney Frank S. Hogan, urging that he question Reid, as the former did when the Eagle published the original statement. Hogan replied that Reid was recently questioned anew by one of his assistants. But again, as in 1950—so Hogan advised Thomas—Reid failed to supply the prosecutor with any facts in support of his sensational charge.

"This seems strange to us," Thomas wrote Reid. "It strikes me that you have a bounden duty as a citizen to back up a charge thus made publicly, with tangible information which would enable the authorities to act against those who instigated and perpetrated that unpunished crime. My belief, too, is that the publisher of your book (Random House) and the publisher of the Brooklyn Eagle have both a moral and a legal responsibility to the public and to

the institution known as American justice, to prevail upon you to convey to Mr. Hogan's office any vital data that you may have on the Tresca killing.

"If individuals who profess to be decent and law-abiding citizens withhold information of this kind from the authorities, are they not in effect condoning murder?"

"I am curious to know how you can possibly justify continuing silent on this momentous issue."

Reid appeared on the Author Meets the Critics radio program last Thursday evening, with pointed questions about the same issue being asked of him by Vanni Montana, educational director for the Italian Dressmakers' Local 89 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. But there, too, he maintained the same silence about the "facts" behind his charge.

Reid is quoted as contending that the Communists had no reason to hate Tresca. But, as Norman Thomas pointed out today, Tresca long fought both the Fascists and the Communists, and had numerous enemies in both camps. After his death fingers of suspicion pointed in both directions.

Tresca was editor of the Italian journal Il Martello (The Hammer.)

A New Turn for the SP: If Not Electoral Work, What?

By HAL DRAPER

The situation in the Socialist Party has taken a new turn with the passage by the SP's national committee of a new resolution on electoral activity. Adopted on December 6, it made the first page of the N. Y. Times a week later; but the text, now available, shows that an important passage in the resolution was not considered worthy of attention by the capitalist press, which was chiefly interested in merely underlining the indubitable decline of the SP as a movement.

The main point which the SP resolution sought to make was, however, adequately enough reported: this was the perspective it presented of putting a quietus on further electoral participation by the party.

The resolution itself frankly ascribes the new line to the disastrous decline in votes suffered by the SP in the presidential election—disastrous in terms of the SP's pretensions to acting as a mass party and as a practical electoral alternative for the voters. The Socialist Party has not been willing to face up to the fact that it is, and has been for many years, capable of acting as little more than a propaganda group.

NEW RESOLUTION

In previous elections, Norman Thomas as its presidential candidate pulled a vote which, relatively small as it was, was still out of proportion to the real influence of that organization. In 1952, with Thomas not only failing to run again but obviously and publicly giving the most reluctant verbal support to candidates Hoopes and Friedman (and not too much of that), with the special attractiveness which Stevenson showed for some types of socialist supporters who abound in the SP and its periphery, and with the weakened organizational strength of the SP in general, the decline in votes to a new low came as a blow to many of those elements that had previously insisted on running a candidate.

"... the campaign," says the resolution, "has exposed such weakness in the organization that it can no longer cope effectively with problems of getting on the ballot, financing campaign work, and creating a pressure from the left that can have national political influence."

With what may be a note of bitterness, the National Executive Committee continues: "It finds a political situation of absorption in the Democratic Party by labor and liberals which ensures that those people who should be closest to the Socialist Party and the basis of its future strength are most bitterly opposed to the electoral activities of the Party. And it thus reluctantly concludes that in this total situation, Socialist electoral action does not appear to be a fruitful activity for the Party."

The NEC then asks for discussion of "alternative resources" for party work, "putting emphasis on the educational work that we can do."

DIVIDED VOTE

In conclusion, it again quite clearly points away from electoral action, almost with the implication of excluding it: "We should continue to suggest . . . types of political, though not electoral, action which can influence the direction of this country and the world."

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 7-3, the minority, including vice-presidential candidate Samuel Friedman. It was, however, supported not only by Darlington Hoopes, the late presidential candidate, but also by members of the NEC who were elected as left-wing spokesmen, including the representative of the youth group (Young Socialists or YPSL).

The resolution would seem to be

quite clear in rejecting further electoral activity, nor is its language limited to national elections. Yet it must be noted that one of the NEC members who voted for it, Elwood Keppley, editor of the Reading (Pa.) Labor Advocate, writes in that official SP organ as if no definite conclusion has been arrived at. He says that "Darlington Hoopes, national chairman of the Socialist Party, has pointed out in a press statement, that at this moment nothing has been changed; we are simply going to discuss the entire question of electoral action and the wisdom of running what appear to be futile campaigns." (A peculiarly loaded way of disclaiming a definite decision, it would seem.)

In point of fact, however, the only discussion invited in the NEC resolution is on "alternative resources" to electoral action.

INTERPRETATIONS

Keppley also claims that "the discussion will affect only the national campaign" and electoral relations with the Democratic Party and will affect state and local decisions only indirectly. This distinction is not made in the resolution itself; as we have pointed out.

What this may indicate is that, as often happens in the SP, the resolution is being reinterpreted by a section of the majority of 7 in accordance with their own views, which may be more hesitant about outright rejection of electoral action than is the Norman Thomas wing—even though they all voted together. It is not always possible to tell from an SP vote where anybody stands.

A further pertinent point of information in this regard is supplied by the statement of the minority trio, who declare that they voted against the resolution precisely because it "arrives at the conclusion that continued socialist electoral campaigns in the present situation do not appear to be fruitful."

PARTY CRISIS

It would be inaccurate to say that the low vote in the campaign has thrown the SP into a state of crisis. It would be inaccurate only because the SP has been in a state of crisis for some time now. Up to now this has been most clearly and consistently understood only by the right wing, led by and reflecting the views of Norman Thomas.

For some time now, the Thomas wing has advocated the abandonment of SP participation in elections with its own candidates, and it was also quite clear that this entailed (at least for them) a perspective of support by socialists to the Fair Deal wing of the Democrats, in the form of party "permission" for those who wish to do so to get into Fair Deal politics. At the same time this right wing has stood for a clear position by the SP in favor of supporting the camp of Western imperialism in the world situation and no truck with "Third Camp" views.

Impatient elements of this right wing, like Maynard Krueger, of

Chicago, have openly quit the party to put this policy into personal practice.

At last year's convention of the SP, the most hotly disputed question (in addition to the war issue) was whether to run a national ticket in the election. At the convention, the Thomas right wing made no strong fight against the decision to run a slate; its statements, as we explained at the time, meant that it took an attitude which can be expressed—not their own words—as: Let em a ticket without Thomas if they so anxious to do so, and see if for they get; that'll teach 'em.

VICTORY FOR THOMAS?

We wrote to that effect on July 14: "One may guess that the right-wingers were all the more willing to forgo standing up for their position on this point because they believe that another experience with presidential campaigns—and one without Norman Thomas to bear the party banner—will put the quietus on any lingering illusions about the SP's ability to act as an electoral instrument."

The convention majority did decide to run Hoopes and Friedman in the campaign. This majority was by no means even a proximately homogeneous. It consisted in part of left-wingers who were also for the Third Camp position on war and who were fervently for a national ticket because they wanted to combat the liquidationist tendency which they rightly saw in the Thomas group and in larger part it consisted of elements not politically distinguishable from the right-wingers, who cannot think of the SP as anything but a socialist electoral machine and who cannot give up the good old party practice of running candidates.

The calculation of the Thomasites was correct, and the coalition of elements for electoral action has collapsed. If this operates within the SP as a victory for the Thomasites in any way, it is only because of the inflated importance which was taken on by the electoral question for the reasons we described.

THE ELECTORAL ISSUE

But taken by itself, it is not the mere decision to give up electoral campaigns which properly is a victory for the Thomasites, which marks a right wing. Again, even last July we already pointed out that there was nothing specifically "left-wing" about being in favor of running electoral tickets:

"The fact that the debate over liquidation of the party takes this particular form in the SP is peculiar to that party. Electoral action becomes the central question in this regard because so many of the party members (including those who consider themselves left-wingers in the present conjuncture) think of the Socialist Party as primarily an electoral device for pushing socialism. . . ."

"This view of a socialist party as being nothing if not an electoral machine, albeit a socialist electoral machine, is one of the hallmarks of social-democratic reformism. Abstractly, there is a reason why a genuine left-wing in the Socialist Party might also be of the opinion that a presidential campaign should not be run; this truly is a matter of tactics and not of principle, the justice of the view depending on a concrete examination of what is to be gained in either case."

Obviously, now that the left-wingers on the SP committee have voted for the new resolution, the above stands with full force.

But there is another passage in the resolution, which we have not yet quoted, which raises an

(Continued on page 5)

Next —
A Labor Party!
 by Jack Ranger
A Hard-Hitting, Meaty Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party
 25-cents Order from:
 Labor Action Book Service
 114 West 14 Street
 New York 11, N. Y.

LONDON LETTER

Stock-Taking in Britain for the Year Ahead

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Dec. 22—With the end of the parliamentary session last week and the proximity of the Christmas holidays, political activities have been largely suspended. Both the Tory party and the Labor Party are stock-taking after the hectic months of late-night sittings and intra-party strife.

Notwithstanding the great efforts on the side of both the Tories and of Labor to dampen the class struggle, to ease over the fundamental conflict between the classes in British society, Toryism is being pulled to the right and Laborism is being pulled to the left.

It is untrue to say that the Tory party has, over the last year, put into effect Tory policy that is, classical Tory policy. It is certainly not due to any

Mountains of literature have been written to prove that Marx is wrong. If that be the case, there never was error more fertile than Marx's. —Aneurin Bevan, in *Place of Fear*.

... in the makeup of Toryism. The Tory party, as the expression of the interests of the ruling class, cannot change its basic characteristics. The leopard never changes its spots, nor does the Tory party. All that has happened over the last year confirms this. The iron fist of Oliver Lyttleton's colonial policy in Kenya is a timely reminder of what Tory policy really is.

The fact that the Labor Party has a larger popular vote than the Tories; the fact that the Labor trade-union and cooperative movements remain intact despite the "technical" defeat in the general election of November 1951; the fact that the Labor Party began a basic transformation of capitalist society—all have contributed to the "madness" of Toryism in Britain. What the Labor government accomplished in its six-odd years of office (1945-51) is more or less an irreversible fact.

ANALOGY

True, the Tory party is denationalizing road-haulage and steel, but even these measures have run into almost insuperable difficulties. The volume of public protest not only from the ranks of the Labor movement proper but from Liberal and even Tory ranks puts a bow relief the obstacles facing any Tory government bent on dismantling the "Welfare State." The situation is rather remote-analogous to the situation in the U. S., with the Eisenhower publican administration ready to do the New Deal and Fair Deal together with the war economy as accomplished facts. The "backwoodsmen," like the Tory right wing, are temporarily blind to the picture. The trade-union leadership (CIO, AFL and UMW) is a necessary component of the American industrial setup. The Democrat, come Republican administration) in the same broad way that the General Council of the Trade Union Congress (the Deakins, Lawthers and Willemsons) are a necessary component of industrial relations in Great Britain (come official Labor, come Tory administration). Of course, these analogies have to be qualified. Given comparatively stable economic relations, and consequently comparatively stable class relations, in the framework of a war economy, this partnership can continue. However, the pressure of the arms program and the drain on new materials make this situation untenable.

Despite the incorporation of the reforms (at least, most of them) made possible by Roosevelt's New

Deal and Truman's Fair Deal into the cold-war economy of the United States, despite the acceptance of the basic transformations of British capitalism made possible by Labor's 1945-51 term of office into the structure of the cold-war economy in this country, both Eisenhower and Churchill are incapable of freezing the class struggle for any length of time.

TEST AHEAD

In Britain, for instance, the *Bevanites' Tribune* reports a meeting of the unofficial Nationalized Road Transport Shop Stewards' Association, which overwhelmingly carried a resolution in support of strike action beginning January 19 unless the Tory government withdraws its bill for the denationalization of road transport. The transport workers realize that these denationalization measures are not simply structural alterations of an abstraction "British capitalism"; they realize that it is a bread-and-butter issue. They know that denationalization means a return to the days of private enterprise, of unemployment, of hunger.

Above all, they realize that this is a test case for the Tory administration. Because road-haulage and steel are profitable industries, the Tory party wants to hand them back to private enterprise. The other nationalized industries, as yet, have not yielded a profit. Once they do—a far from certain proposition—the Tory party will begin the work of demolishing the structure of nationalized industry.

TORIES' REPRIEVE

Unfortunately for the Tory government, even the denationalized industries will find it difficult to stand on their own feet. Which sane capitalist will invest money, or buy shares, in the denationalized industries, knowing full well that the Labor Party will renationalize them without further compensation? And again, which sane Tory will think it worthwhile to upset the class equilibrium just for a paltry few months of "free" enterprise?

This is not to say that the capitalist class is completely finished. It is not. Although its area of maneuver is small, it is able to draw upon its profound and long experience of dealing with difficult situations, like the one confronting it at the moment. Only the lack of policy, the lack of a bold perspective, on the part of the Labor Party leadership over the last year has given the Tory party the breathing space it so desperately needs.

The council elections in the spring revealed the overwhelmingly strong anti-Tory feeling throughout the country. But this was a negative reaction. The great Labor vote piled up was an anti-Tory vote rather than a pro-Labor vote.

PUNCTURED

The voters were disillusioned with the Tory promises of red meat and a lower cost of living, rather than enamored with Labor's policy of a return to the status quo (1945-51). The right-wing Labor leaders fondly imagined that all that was needed was a policy of sitting back, a policy of reiteration of the old shibboleths, and of course a firm hand against the left, against Bevan.

The High Wycombe by-election rudely punctured this complacent balloon of expectations. The Tory

party won the seat; the Tory vote went up, and Labor's vote went down. The electorate served notice on the Labor Party that they wanted a policy, that they were unimpressed with the slanging match between the Gaitskell wing and the Bevan wing of the party.

Perhaps this shock more than anything else brought the party leadership as a whole to its senses. It dawned on even the most die-hard leaders that a program of the type of 1945 was required, not a program of the character of 1950 and 1951. It was realized that British capitalism had to undergo a "New Deal" in order to survive.

WARNING

It became equally clear that the Tory party, representing as it does the collective interests of the capitalist class, was incapable of reshaping the entire economy. The *Observer's* articles, "Rethinking Our Future," placed the dilemma of the capitalist class in their true proportions. The long-term interests of British capitalism were in conflict with the short-term interests of British capitalism. British capitalism had to plan, to rationalize itself. More, this planning and this rationalization could not be made effective with the acquiescence of the capitalist class as a whole.

The *Observer* was trying to warn the British capitalist class that unless it submerged the conflict between its various sections, the economy would be incapable of surviving the competition of Germany and Japan. This utopian vision of the capitalist class introducing "state capitalism" was understood to be such by the formulators of Labor's new policy.

It is almost certain that heavy chemicals, engineering, aircraft and rented land will be inscribed into Labor's new election program. And this program is not considered

radical enough by Harold Wilson and, surprisingly enough, by Douglas Jay (former financial secretary to the Treasury and hitherto solid supporter of the right wing).

This means, in effect, that the Labor Party will be setting before the electorate by next spring (when the policy of the party is finally drawn up) a program looking toward the effective transformation of the economy of this country from a predominantly capitalist economy to a predominantly planned economy.

All in all, then, we have a fair picture of the likely course of events in 1953-54.

Parallel to the increasing antagonism between the exhausted European capitalist class and the U. S., burdened by an impossible arms program, there can be expected a powerful push within the socialist movements for the effective control of the various units of the national economies. Britain and Europe can withstand the pressure of American imperialism only if the commanding heights of the economy are placed firmly in the hands of workers' governments.

In this strictly limited sense, Stalin's talk about a coming schism in the Western camp takes on some color—though it is not the sense which he had in mind.

FAVORABLE OUTLOOK

From the standpoint of British socialists, the national situation is very favorable for the following good reasons:

(1) The main brunt of the struggle against British capitalism and U. S. imperialism will be borne by the British Labor Party. A herculean effort on the part of the Labor left can lay the foundations of a workers' state, a planned economy infused with democracy at all its levels.

(2) The assertion of the authority of the rank and file at

both the Margate Trade Union Congress and Morecambe Labor Party conference has broken once and for all that psychological advantage which the right wing has had for the last six or more years at each succeeding conference.

(3) Ideological aid, though far from perfect, was contributed by Aneurin Bevan's book *In Place of Fear*. In the same way as Harold J. Laski's *Reflections on the Revolution of Our Times* (1943) provided the theoretical justification for Labor's surge forward to power in 1945, so today Bevan's book provides the Labor left with argument for Labor's next thrust to power.

(4) In Britain, the only alternative to the solution by the socialist left of the problems facing the rank and file of the Labor movement, namely, the Stalinist solution, is fast becoming a thing of the past. The Kremlin has inflicted blow after blow upon British Stalinism with its cynical international diplomacy. The Tito and Lysenko affairs, and now the Siansky affair, have completely isolated the Stalinist party proper. Only blind stupidity on the part of the Bevan leadership could possibly restore Stalinism as a key factor, and then it would be only by default. The succeeding months may well see the crumbling of the still not inconsiderable Stalinist trade-union apparatus.

More than ever before, the power of Marxist ideas has been brought to the fore by events. The class struggle goes on. And it must never be forgotten, as Bevan rightly says, that "Marx, and the school which he founded, put into the hands of the working class movement of the late 19th and the first part of the 20th centuries the most complete blueprints for political action the world has ever seen."

Good Will Toward Men---

(Continued from page 1)

Parnell Thomas, once chairman of the House Un-American Committee, who was caught redhanded taking kickbacks from well-padded employees on his well-padded payroll.

One can only rejoice to see that Truman's quality of mercy is bipartisan in the spirit of the season, especially for a Republican who had stored up credit with the Angels by defending them valiantly against the Witches, as Congress's chief witchhunter before the advent of McCarthy and McCarran.

NO MERCY FOR SOME

Both May and Thomas have been out of jail, but the president's action served to restore them to full citizenship rights. That means that they are no longer deprived of the right to vote for upstanding public servants of the commonweal or even to aspire again to serve their country as faithfully as they once did.

The Angel at Truman's right shoulder, however, has consistently frowned upon the appeal for restoration to citizenship that has been made to him by the VICTIMS of the witchhunt in the wartime Minneapolis trial of the 18 Socialist Workers Party men and trade-unionists. The congressional jailbirds were judged more worthy.

Also benefiting from the president's clemency were (1) deserters from the armed services between V-J Day and the beginning of the Korean war, and (2) federal convicts who had washed their sins clean by serving in the armed forces during the Korean war.

Not benefiting from this Christmas amnesty, however, were a group of people in federal jails who had never committed a "legitimate crime" (to use the peculiar term invented by the Immigration officials in the case of the French seaman). These are the conscientious objectors still languishing in the prisons under the 1948 draft act. No mercy for them!

Some crimes are just too horrible. . . . One of these is that of COs, who cannot get a portion of Truman's good-will-toward-men because they believe too well in peace-on-earth.

Only once has Truman amnestied conscientious objectors, in 1948, and that act was limited to certain classifications of them.

Nor did the merciful president find encouragement from the Angels to commute the death sentence against Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, convicted of espionage on behalf of the Russians. Some hundreds of liberals, including the virulently anti-Communist JEWISH DAILY FORWARD and DAY of New York, have protested the harshness of the sentence. But, though the Christmas upsurge of indulgence and compassion has swirled in and out of the White House, the Rosenbergs are scheduled to die on January 12.

Perhaps the president is afraid of what patriotic people like Andrew J. May and J. Parnell Thomas might say if he showed leniency toward convicted Russian spies. The Angels showed more partiality for pro-Japanese traitors like Tokyo Rose and Axis Sally, who got off with prison sentences.

This national distinction in the

quality of mercy shows up another way in the case of another May, not Andrew J. While the United States, so proud of its Way of Life as an article of export that its spokesmen cannot even understand why other peoples do not jump at the chance of coming under its tutelage, has insisted on the execution of the Rosenbergs, Britain's first atomic spy has been released from jail. Scientist Alan Nunn May has served 6 years and 8 months of his ten-year sentence.

WHO'S CIVILIZED?

Andrew J. and J. Parnell no doubt believe that this shows that the British are incorrigibly soft-headed (though somehow this does not manifest itself in Kenya), but the British take the very peculiar view "that Nunn May has expiated his crime and should not be penalized further." The British Home Office even made it possible for Dr. May to get out of prison without being exhibited in the public press; and the American press notes that he can even get a passport now if he wants one.

A Home Office spokesman said, "It would not be right and it would not be civilized to let him be hounded by the press." This clearly demonstrates that the British know nothing about true civilization, since everyone knows that it is the U. S. which is defending Civilization against the barbarous Russians who go about executing people at the drop of a state secret.

Get it EVERY week!
An L.A. sub is \$2 a year

YOU and SCIENCE

About ESP and Scientific Method

By CARL DARTON

Mysticism, belief in the supernatural and the magic power of the self dies hard in human experience. This is no more evidenced than in the hard-to-avoid feeling that we may have some mysterious power of communications not apparent to our senses.

Precognition, the ability to predict the future; telepathy, the ability to communicate with others at long distance without normal means of communication; clairvoyance, the ability to "see" objects at a distance without the use of sense organs; and psychokinesis, the ability to exert mental influence on physical objects—these are illustrations of this trend.

Men of intelligence normally would dismiss such efforts as fit only for the feeble-minded and beneath their consideration even in refutation. But when claims for such extra-sensory powers are put forth in the name of science and originate in the laboratories of a recognized university they cannot be completely ignored.

We are now referring to the research of Dr. J. B. Rhine of the Parapsychological Laboratory of Duke University and his work in ESP, "extra-sensory perception."

This type of study is not new. Dr. Rhine began his work nearly twenty years ago. In 1937, his *New Frontiers of the Mind* was a Book of the Month Club selection. More recently dianetics has tended to replace ESP on the pseudo-intellectual circuit, but Dr. Rhine and his followers still carry on and publish their studies in the name of science. In fact, they claim to have obtained final scientific proof of the existence of these mysterious human powers.

RHINE'S CRITIC

What is the feeling in general scientific circles regarding the validity of such research? It is true that such famous people as Arthur Conan Doyle, Olive Lodge and William McDougall have expressed their belief in the truth of such experiments. Even today, the well-known psychologist, Gardner Murphy, takes a lenient if not favorable view of the scientific validity of ESP. These facts are somewhat disturbing to such as the writer who believe in the rationalism of science but are not technically trained to pass upon the validity of psychological experiments.

Because of this, it was interesting to read an "Evaluation of Extra-Sensory Perception" by John L. Kennedy in the October 15, 1952 *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association*. Dr. Kennedy is concerned with whether the experiments in ESP stand the test of scientific requirements.

As is well known, the typical ESP experiment is based upon card-guessing or dice-throwing tests. Such experiments purport

to have eliminated the element of chance as a satisfactory explanation of success in such guessing. Not that the practitioners of ESP can guess the throw of the cards every time or even in overwhelmingly large percentages of the total chances. Thus in a series of tests where the chance success of such guesses was 200 the ESP result was 229 successes, somewhat above the quantity to be expected statistically by the rule of chance. The practitioners excuse the lack of greater success by the explanation that theirs is yet a new, not fully developed art.

When the means of running such guessing tests is examined, however, it is apparent that the procedure does not conform to good scientific control of possible error. This is explained by Dr. Kennedy in describing such ESP experiments in his own laboratory.

VALID METHOD?

In running the tests the "receiver" is placed in one room and the "sender" in an adjoining room with an open door between. Instead of actually using shuffled cards the sender uses recorded sheets in which the order of the symbols from shuffled decks are listed before the experiments. The sender concentrates on the card and indicates that she is so doing by pressing a telegraph key; the receiver calls out the guessed symbol, which the sender records in the column of the record sheet adjacent to the symbol on which she is concentrating. After the series of tests the correct guesses are circled and tabulated. The greater-than-statistically-expected successes would tend to prove the passage of "thought waves" between the sender and receiver.

To the untrained observer these conditions of experiment would appear to be objective enough and of a valid scientific nature. However, on careful examination this method, which is representative of ESP experiments, has a serious defect. This is that under conditions of excitement and strong belief the sender would record the symbol on which she was concentrating rather than the one guessed by the receiver.

To check on the possibility of

this happening Dr. Kennedy, in a series of tests, stationed an independent recorder in the same room as the receiver or guesser. In one series this second recorder was present unknown to the sender or original recorder. In this case a comparison of the two records showed a large number of misrecorded "successful" guesses by the sender. In a second similar series with the sender having knowledge that she was being checked, her mistakes were negligible, with the results remaining within the limits of chance expectancy.

BIAS TEST

These tests confirm a common failing of human beings; it is well recognized by practically all science, that humans are not trustworthy recording devices. In order to further check the influence of bias on ESP Dr. Kennedy ran a series of telepathy card tests on both "believers" and "non-believers" in Extra-Sensory Perception. The college students used were so divided but were unaware of the purpose of the tests.

In both groups errors, as noted by mechanical recording devices, were observed in about equal number. However, the significant fact was that the believers tended to make errors in recording that increased the score of successes while the non-believers tended to make errors which decreased the score.

Since science is based upon the authenticity of facts regardless of the feelings of the observer these double-checked tests cast extreme doubt on the validity of ESP.

VERDICT

In conclusion Dr. Kennedy writes that whenever official science has examined the possibility of telepathy, clairvoyance and other psychic phenomena they have found that "proof" depends on personal experience. Science deals only with public information on which general agreement of competent observers, using devices free from psychological sources of error, is obtained. Data which is sensitive to the preconceived conviction of the experimenter is suspect.

Dr. Kennedy feels that the burden of proof of ESP rests with the self-labeled scientists who are its advocates to bring forth data and evidence which will convince recognized science. New scientific theories have to establish themselves by acceptable evidence before the whole family of scientists.

The verdict on ESP and other psychic research is "Still Unproved" scientifically.

Why should a socialist be interested in exploding ESP or other pseudo-scientific trends? The answer is that socialism is based upon the rational analysis of society and any form of irrationalism which tends to obtain social acceptance must be exposed.

A Note for Curious Readers

Our readers will note that with this first issue of the new year, the format of pages 4-5 has been changed to eliminate the "center spread" arrangement. We liked that arrangement ourselves; but we have had to decide that priority should be given to another consideration, having to do with the bound volumes of LABOR ACTION. Obviously the middle columns of the "center spread," being bound into the spines of the bound volume, became inaccessible. As before, however, pages 4-5 will continue to be devoted to special columns and features—Ed.

Another Angle On the Matter

By PHILIP COBEN

I would take issue with one aspect of Comrade Darton's approach in the above column, bearing particularly on his beginning and concluding remarks, namely the methodological connection between the socialist-scientific spirit and the Rhine experiment in telepathy. Otherwise, no more than he do I know any reason to be convinced of the reality of ESP; and it is even more certain that the present judgment on such phenomena must be "still unproved," as he says.

It is one thing to say this, however, and quite another to dismiss serious efforts to investigate the question as "normally . . . fit only for the feeble-minded" and beneath the consideration of men of intelligence, or to condemn the attempt as itself an evidence of irrationalism which has only to be "exposed" by socialists and scientists.

In the first place, I think Comrade Darton throws too many things into the same bag. The most obvious case in point is his apparent belief that the Duke University experiments belong in the same category with the pseudo-scientific charlatany of the Dianetics faddists. There is simply no comparison.

A CAUTION

That is quite apart from the validity of criticisms, by scientists such as Dr. Kennedy, of Dr. Rhine's procedures.

The same thing is also partially true of Darton's lumping together of telepathy, precognition, clairvoyance and psychokinesis. It is true, if I am not mistaken, that the Rhine laboratory has taken a fling at all four. The results, however, have by no means been equally interesting, even from Dr. Rhine's standpoint, and in any case it is quite possible to regard them with different degrees of favor or suspicion.

One's caution in this field will also be reinforced if one remembers that there was a time when

"official science" would have added another to this proscribed list: hypnosis.

The main point, however, is that it is entirely unscientific—and not at all necessary from the point of view of scientific materialism—to reject in advance the possibility of real telepathic phenomena, or a piece with mysticism, irrationalism, etc. While there is no proved reason to believe that such phenomena exist, there is also no a-priori reason to believe that the very existence of telepathy would call in question either the materialism or rationalism of the scientific understanding of the world.

MYSTICISM?

It is not accurate to say that proof of positive results in the Rhine experiments "would tend to prove the passage of 'thought waves' between the sender and receiver." Such positive results would merely raise the question of establishing the material basis for such telepathic phenomena, and the existence of "thought waves" (or of any other hypothesis to account for the results) would have to be separately investigated. Indeed, phenomena in this field (which the Sunday supplements—or for that matter Dr. Rhine—may call "thought waves") were partially investigated quite apart from ESP by the brilliant scientist Dr. Calkin.

Dr. Rhine's merit has been that he set out to take the investigation of telepathy out of the sole province of the spiritualist charlatans and mystic fakers; and it is the latter who have tied it up in one package with anti-scientific irrationalism. That was also true of "mesmerism" until it was officially welcomed into the family as hypnosis. There is no scientific reason to concede to the fakers that if telepathic phenomena can be established, their mystic machinery is thereby validated also in a package deal as it were.

In sum, socialists, like everybody else, should be cautious about identifying the scientific method with conservative prejudices of "official science," or rather with the conservative prejudices of many official scientists. There can be no special "socialist" attitude on the possibility of ESP, either for or against.

McCarranizing the Seamen

(Continued from page 1)

what unfortunate for Girondel. It appears that when the Nazis entered Paris they put him to work in a bakery producing bread for the Wehrmacht. As his wife and child were hungry, he took some bread home to feed them. He had the misfortune to be apprehended by the Nazis, and to this day his body bears the scars of beatings he received in one of their concentration camps.

TOUGH PROBLEM

Under the McCarran Act, no foreigner with a criminal record may enter the United States. During his questioning by the inspector, Girondel confessed his "crime" against the Nazi occupation and the fact that he had been sentenced for it. As a result he was detained for five hours on the ship while, according to the New York Times, "Washington authorities decided whether stealing bread from the Nazis constituted a criminal record" within the meaning of the McCarran Act.

Fortunately for him, the French Line protested in his behalf and

he was finally cleared. Immigration and Naturalization headquarters in Washington had decided that Girondel's theft "was not what we would consider a conviction under a recognized, legitimate code of law." It was, perhaps, Girondel's good luck that unlike that other famous French pilferer of bread, Jean Valjean, he had been driven to take a crust from the defeated Germans and not from one of his own countrymen.

NEW CURTAIN

It is not at all an accident that a conviction by a Nazi court should be one of the first "test cases" under the McCarran Act, even though we can all rejoice that it finally worked out with only minor damage. While the law was being considered in Congress, its opponents pointed out vigorously that precisely such victims of the Nazis and the Stalinists would be barred by the loose and vicious language of this act. Not every seaman is a chief pastry chef, and not every foreigner seeking to enter this country will have the French Line to intercede for

him with the authorities.

The Europeans who have protested the new U. S. curtain seamen have not failed to point out that NOT EVEN RUSSIA imposes the practices laid down in American McCarranism. Will everyone know, of course, that the Russian tyranny practices usual totalitarian surveillance and restrictions against seamen of ships, as it does against all foreigners as well as its own people. It does permit them to get off ships and get around without special "subversive screening." That has long been recognized as the worldwide and established right of seamen, within the framework of the usual safeguards against smuggling, etc.

You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of LA. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of class. Keep them to 500 words.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism.

A sub is only \$2 a year!



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 17, No. 1

January 5, 1953

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, 1879.

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.

Youth and Student Corner

A Letter and a Reply: In Which We Are Given a Lesson in Cooperative Relations

To the Editor:

Your issue of this week contained what I had hoped never to see, a slanderous, vicious, sterile and sectarian article about a debate with a friendly organization. I am not referring to the political analysis of the YS "Coexistence" resolution by Feliks which despite its limitations presented an honest attempt to discuss differences in a comradely manner proper among organizations which are both anti-war and both Third Camp; nor am I questioning the propriety of continuing the "debate" in LABOR ACTION without any attempt to present the YS resolution in its entirety. I am concerned about the Hart article which appeared in the Youth and Student Corner—which gave it the appearance of being an "official" view of the debate, and I am most of all concerned about the effect of such an article on the relations between the YS and the SYL members who are at the present cooperating on a number of campuses.

I had hoped that the SYL had matured enough not to continue the tradition of vilifying the people who held dissimilar views rather than discuss their ideas. I had hoped that it was not necessary in debates among presumably friendly organizations, to present the other side so totally ignorant and devoid of principles in order to bolster one's faith in the absolute "correctness" of the line. In our movement we do not necessarily assume that any departure from the present program is a betrayal of principles.

What I most resent is the dishonest implication in the Hart article about "a series of preliminary maneuvers which did them no credit (sic) . . . the YS agreed to the terms of the debate. . . ." Either Hart knows that the YS accepted the terms as proposed with minor modifications about time or I must assume that the "maneuvering" consisted of the written request by the YS that SYLers of national caliber debate this question. Whether this is a maneuver or a simple assumption by the YS that the question was of sufficient importance to require serious consideration is for the people concerned to decide. There was certainly nothing discreditable about it. Incidentally, the SYL confirmed our estimate of the importance of the debate by devoting over a page and a half to the topic in LA.

I don't know whether Hart understood the resolution in question. If he did, then he deliberately misrepresented the nature of the debate in his article. As a speaker for the YS I had maintained that because of the psychological mobilization for war and because the "liberals" were an integral part of the war drive, if not the ideological leaders of U. S. interventionism, it was unlikely that liberals could be attracted to the socialist movement; on the other hand I maintained that the ex-Stalinist and ex-Stalinoid had made the emotional and personal break with capitalism and was more accessible to a radical organization. Hart used this point to "prove" that the YS was now primarily if not solely interested in approaching the Stalinoids! But that's nonsense—and Hart knows it. The YS always got the primary source of its recruitment from people who have had no previous political affiliation. We analyze the possibilities of approaching the various shades of political; this does not mean that we are happy about the results as we see them, but it does mean that must take these factors into consideration. Or did Hart forget that, for example, socialists don't advocate the class-struggle but simply describe its existence and take sides?

The last distortion was stupid. Hart assumed that the basic argu-

ment of the YS was the new "line" would result in great organizational increases. This is not what I said. I did say that the less sectarian approach of the YS has already been shown in the increases of our organizations; I further cited the example of New York where I pointed out that in the period that SYL got two new people the YS doubled in size. These are facts, not assumptions.

Finally, it has always been our contention that socialist organizations do not exist for the purpose of bolstering the egos of the select few but rather as instruments for mass propaganda. Therefore we have always considered that tactical slogans were of major importance in selling our program. We consider that creating pressure in USA for negotiations serves the double purpose of building anti-war sentiment and reaching the people, showing them that socialists do not content themselves in shouting that war is inevitable but do whatever can be done to delay the catastrophe. Objective facts show that the main threat of war cannot come from the USSR today since the USSR is too busy trying to absorb its new colonial empire; therefore it is absolutely essential that anti-war pressures be created in the West. This in no way affects our basic Third Camp analysis; this in no way implies any support of either of the war camps. The problem, as we see it, is to translate our analysis into bases for action today, not after World War III. Perhaps the comrades of the SYL think that we did not properly evaluate the facts—but for God's sake, does this mean that they have to

promptly begin vilifying one of the few, very few, organizations that has been willing to cooperate with them?

Fraternally,
Bogdan DENITCH,
Member, YS Nat'l Exec. Com.

P. S.—At this point I would like to request space to answer the political attack on the Coexistence resolution in a future issue of LA.

Reply By Arthur Hart

The letter by Comrade Bogdan Denitch calls my article the following names: (1) "slanderous"; (2) "vicious"; (3) "sterile," (4) "sectarian," (5) "dishonest," (6) "stupid," and does not omit the phrases (7) "bolstering egos," and (8) "deliberately misrepresenting."

This is written by Comrade Denitch in order to object, in the comradely manner which he believes in, to . . . "vilification."

It is unnecessary for me to point out that my article employed no such language.

In view of Comrade Denitch's heated words, which I do hope he is not too proud to see embodied in cold type, I find it hard to imagine what kind of epistle he would have indited if I had used any terms remotely resembling those in his letter—which he sends in, he says, in the interests of cooperative relations.

I find on reading his letter carefully that the alleged "vilifica-

tion"—that is, the alleged vilification by me—consists solely in my reference to "maneuvers which did them [the YS] no credit." I find this so because the rest of his specific points raise the quite different question of "whether Hart understood the resolution in question" or properly interpreted the YS speakers in the debate.

I am quite willing to give Comrade Denitch free rein to believe that my political analysis of the YS side in the debate was "sterile," "sectarian," and "stupid," if he wishes to be really excited about it, but I would suggest to him in the most cooperative spirit that he be more cautious about the rest of the vocabulary.

AND WE QUOTE

As for the unforgivable "vilification" itself, Comrade Denitch writes that the YS simply requested "that SYLers of national caliber" be designated to debate them, because the question was of sufficient importance.

This is not accurate. The YS letter to which Comrade Denitch refers—signed by him, incidentally—said something a little more than that. It indicated that if the SYL did not choose representatives satisfactory to YS, the YS might withdraw from the debate.

I hasten to add: so at least we understood the following statement in the YS letter, which I quote in full: "I understand that there is a possibility that the SYL might put up relatively unknown speakers. If this is the case please let us know, it would affect the arrangements. While we are willing to debate the SYL we are not necessarily willing to debate anyone, we suggest that you take this

into consideration." (Emphasis in original.)

Very frankly, what thus appeared to be a threat to withdraw unless the SYL-chosen speakers for a debate passed YS inspection, was and is resented. Readers may decide for themselves whether it merited the remark that it does the YS no credit.

I am entirely willing to admit that even this side comment of my own—which did not call the YS either stupid, sectarian, vicious, slanderous, or sterile—may have been too harsh. I am also entirely willing to give Comrade Denitch due credence if he were to tell us that we misunderstood the statement quoted; however plain it sounded to us, or that we were too quick to take offense, and I would not jump to call him "dishonest" therefor. That is said not in the interest of diplomacy, but rather because it is regrettable if any tenth-rate matter like this should get in the way of the discussion of the political questions which are important.

PERSPECTIVE

The rest of Denitch's letter touches upon some of the political discussion and perhaps can be more usefully discussed whenever he sends in his political answer, as indicated in his postscript. Meanwhile however, the reader can compare his remarks with what I actually wrote on two points:

"It became clear that the main concern for YS was how to find a way to the 'Stalinoids and fellow travelers' who are now presumably being 'left in the lurch' by the latest evolution of the Stalinist party proper. How to attract such elements has become the dominant concern for YS. . . ."

"And as a further indication of YS's orientation (though it is undoubtedly not true of the YS as a whole) the audience was told that the YS speaker had 'given up trying to recruit liberals.' And as the climax to this kind of 'argument' the speaker concluded by saying that 'proof' of the correctness of the YS position would be forthcoming in terms of the high level of growth that the YS was about to attain!"

Now Denitch merely replies—as if it were relevant to our point—that this perspective of his flows from an objective analysis of the situation and not from advocacy of such a state of affairs. No doubt. But in making this reply, he is actually confirming the fact that I reported his stated perspective quite accurately. In any case, I shall not expect Comrade Denitch to deny saying that he had "given up trying to recruit liberals."

'DELIBERATE'?

We believe this perspective to be wrong, to be sure, and will expect to discuss it with Denitch further, but what exactly prompts him to make the wild charge of "deliberate misrepresentation"? Most particularly, what makes him so sure that the misrepresentation (which has not been shown) was "deliberate"—especially since I am "stupid" anyway?

Secondly, Denitch writes that, according to me, "the basic argument of the YS was that the new 'line' would result in great organizational increases." (His emphasis on basic.) Now he can easily look back on what I actually wrote and see that here is a gross misrepresentation—which I am sure is not "deliberate," if only because of the agitated character of Denitch's letter generally. And without his unwarranted insertion of the word "basic," his comment on this particular "vilification" loses its point.

I hope that from here on we can get to discuss the political questions.

Arthur HART

New Turn for the SP — —

(Continued from page 2)

entirely different question with regard to the reaction of the left-wingers. After proposing discussion on "alternative resources," it adds:

"We also ask consideration of the proposal which some comrades have made, that in the absence of Socialist electoral activity by the Party, members as individuals should be free to act electorally in accordance with their socialist consciences."

WHAT NOW?

This is the proposal of the Thomasites ("some socialists") that SPers be "free" to support and work for "progressive" capitalist politicians, within the Democratic Party coalition.

Surely, it cannot be represented—except with tongue in cheek—that the NEC is thus "merely" proposing discussion on this idea; and who can vote against merely discussing it? That is only the formal wording. The Thomasite proposal was discussed, before, without an NEC initiation of the discussion, and it does not take an NEC vote to include such a passage in the resolution to legalize such a discussion. The reality is, rather, one has the right to suspect, that it now gets into the NEC resolution because it is being looked on more favorably by people who combated it last year.

This is understandable in SP terms, but not in terms of the left-wingers who voted for it.

For the question is: if not electoral action, what now? If it is not to act as an electoral device, how is the SP to justify its existence—for its own members and sympathizers? It speaks of "education," but education on what and for what? For abstract "socialism"? Only people still mentally living in 1912 can consider this a sufficient answer. A socialist party has to have a clear line on the big issues of the day, and the SP is an organization with one of

the most amorphous political physiognomies in the world.

This political formlessness (to give it its kindest label) is what is helping to disintegrate the SP basically. It is also the reason why a decision against party electoral action confronts the SP with the question of how to exist.

And it is the reason why so many SPers who do not wish to stand with Thomas's tendency are drawn toward his solution: because they STILL cannot think in terms other than electoral action as a center of activity; and if socialist electoral action is deemed fruitless, the only other channel for electoral action is that which has been proposed by the Thomasites.

OUR CONCERN

Therefore, while the state of crisis is not new, the SP people who last year insisted on electoral action are now somewhat adrift with the Thomasite proposal acting as a magnet precisely because it is at least a definite perspective, if nothing else. It would not be surprising to find in the SP now the boiling up of groping moods and disoriented proposals to fill the vacuum which has now been officially declared to exist.

'THE NEW INTERNATIONAL'
is the leading Marxist magazine in the United States,
internationally recognized as among the foremost organs
of Marxist thought and political analysis in the world.

SEND 35 CENTS FOR THE CURRENT ISSUE
OR SUBSCRIBE AT \$2.00 A YEAR

New International, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

Wiretapping—the Legal Crime:

By SAM ADAMS

"In 1934 Congress passed a law providing severe penalties for wiretapping, but only one person has ever been prosecuted and convicted under it, and that was eleven years ago. Wiretapping today is actually the freest of free enterprises, highly expensive, but indulged in with virtual immunity from federal prosecution by government agents, municipal police, political parties, business firms, witchhunters, divorce lawyers, private detectives, shapers, freebooters, and blackmailers of all sorts—all of whom practice it in the serene conviction that there will never be any penalties.

"This boldness stems from the knowledge that the Department of Justice is reluctant to press wiretapping cases to prosecution or even to gather evidence for them. Admittedly sensitive about legality of tapping by its own agents, the Department of Justice hesitates to risk legal action that might focus attention on its own 'extralegal' practices."

—From the "Wiretappers" in
The Reporter, Dec. 1952.

This is the way William S. Fairfield and Charles Cliff describe one of the basic problems connected with the widespread use of wiretapping in their remarkable, even though unavoidably limited, articles which have appeared in *The Reporter's* issues of December 23 and January 6.

Calling for a congressional investigation into the field of wiretapping, the writers point out how limited are the resources of a magazine to do a complete job. Nevertheless, what they have uncovered and written is sufficient to indicate the nature of this dangerous weapon of law enforcement, business competition, labor surveillance, political investigation, witchhunting, stoolpigeoning and a host of other purposes for which it is employed.

Common Practice

We know, of course, that no one who uses a telephone is immune from wiretapping. Detection of wiretapping is extremely difficult for the professional. For the average person, it is impossible.

Thus every person in the country may at one time or another be covered by a tap and have his conversation recorded, since a single wiretap job covers a wide area of extraneous listening.

Despite federal law and a Supreme Court decision (later modified by the characteristic indecision of individual justices motivated by political expediency), there is no restriction on wiretapping. It has, says *The Reporter*, now become "a common practice in almost every troubled area of American life."

The problem has had a long complicated legal history from the time that federal attention was first directed to it.

In 1916, residents of New York City learned that their mayor, John P. Mitchell, had endorsed an investigation of local Catholic charities because they threatened the public Charity Commission. It was learned that with the cooperation of the telephone company the telephone of a Catholic priest was tapped. The company explained that it had so cooperated with city officials since 1895!

Post-War Blossoming

The protests of the people resulted in a demand for a congressional investigation. A bill to outlaw wiretapping was introduced into the New York State legislature. Nothing was done because America's participation in the First World War saw the federal government taking over the operation of the telephone companies, and so for the duration, at least, Congress put a ban on wiretapping.

But when the war ended and the telephone system return to private hands, wiretapping re-

turned. It was used most extensively in the "Palmer raids" when the then attorney general of the United States initiated his illegal drive against radicalism.

Wiretapping flourished even more widely during the prohibition era. As the swell of protest increased, the new attorney general, Harlan F. Stone, issued a directive to the FBI under the heading, "Unethical Tactics," which said that "Wiretapping . . . will not be tolerated. . . ."

This directive, it appeared, applied only to the FBI. The prohibition agents continued their wiretapping, and in 1928 in the case of *Olmstead v. United States*, the Supreme Court of the Nine Old Men finally ruled on the matter. Defense at-

"ARTICLE IV—Persons and houses to secure from unreasonable searches and seizures. The right of people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

torneys demanded the reversal of their client's conviction on a bootlegging charge on the ground that the evidence obtained was illegal and in violation of the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution.

Hoover—Then

But the court held by a 5-4 decision that the amendment held only for "actual physical invasion" and not to "projected voices." (The Founding Fathers, they reasoned, never intended the amendment to apply to telephone conversations because if they had, they would have said so!) Justices Brandeis, Holmes, Butler and Stone dissented because they believed the amendment covered wiretapping.

The public clamor against wiretapping produced a wave of anti-wiretapping bills in Congress even though J. Edgar Hoover advised a House committee that "any employee engaging in wiretapping will be dismissed from the service of the bureau. . . . While it may not be illegal, I think it is unethical, and it is not permitted under the regulations of the attorney general."

Interestingly enough, it was Hoover, who in those years apparently opposed wiretapping. In the conflict between the FBI and the Prohibition Bureau, now under the Department of Justice, the new Attorney General William D. Mitchell supported the wiretappers subject only to the authorization of the director of the bureau.

Section 605

In the beginning of the Roosevelt administration the fight against wiretapping was again picked up in Congress with the introduction of new bills to outlaw the practice. Congress banned its use in prohibition cases in 1933—a gratuitous gesture, since the law was repealed in that year.

But wiretapping picked up during the depression when the labor movement began its big drives and the CIO was being organized. It was used as a union-busting instrument with the giant companies employing wiretapping on a widespread scale.

The first big change in the situation occurred when the Federal Communications Commission was established in 1934. Intending to outlaw wiretapping its Section 605 of the enabling act read in part:

"No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the . . . contents . . . to any person . . . and no person having received such intercepted communication . . . shall . . . use the same or any true cases of wiretapping will be subject to prosecution in the federal courts."

information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another."

Section 605, however, did not stop wiretapping as long as it was not yet legally tested in the Supreme Court. Wiretapping continued unabated until 1937, when the Supreme Court ruled in the case of *Nardone v. United States*. This involved a case of liquor smuggling and the defendants appealed their conviction on the ground that the evidence procured against them was through wiretapping by federal agents, who thus violated Section 605.

The Supreme Court reversed their conviction declaring that Section 605 was designed "to include within its sweep federal officers as well as others." It was held that the evidence collected by the federal agents was inadmissible. The Department of Justice did not prosecute these agents for violating the law.

The Department of Justice was irked by the Supreme Court decision but did not stop its own violations of the law. It never had before, and doesn't to this very day.

Instead, the department also sought to test the legality of Section 605 while it continued to wiretap. It had lost the *Nardone* case when the court ruled against it and Justice Frankfurter said the department's evidence was inadmissible because, even though the wiretap was not used directly in the case, the evidence was the "fruit of a poisonous tree."

For Crooks, He Said

Two tests came in 1939 and again the high court decided against the Department of Justice. In *Weiss v. United States* the court closed two additional potential loopholes when it stated that Section 605 applied to *intra-state* as well as *inter-state* telephone conversations, and that evidence was inadmissible where authorization of the "sender" was obtained *after* the tapping.

In 1940 the Circuit Court of Appeals in *Palkoff v. United States* ruled that one party could not authorize interception of a conversation of his unless the other party concurred. The Supreme Court refused to review this ruling of the lower court.

The result of these rulings was to hinder the "legal" wiretapping activities of federal agencies, but illegal wire tapings continued unabated. The Treasury Department sought special authorization for its agents. Back in 1968, J. Edgar Hoover fought against a Treasury Department-sponsored bill to authorize wiretapping by federal agencies and succeeded in defeating it.

Hoover said "he had men who were expert in tapping wire, but if he let them practice it to any extent [italics by *The Reporter*] they would turn crooks in no time." But the FBI and other agencies continued some wiretapping anyway.

The Department of Justice's attempt to seek new loopholes in Section 605 which would permit it the widest latitude was halted by a Senate Interstate Commerce Committee report calling for a Senate investigation of wiretapping. In presenting this report, Democratic Senator Burton K. Wheeler of Montana said:

"Wiretapping [is] especially dangerous at the present time, because of the recent resurgence of a spy system conducted by government police. Persons who have committed no crime, but whose economic and political views and activities may be obnoxious to the present incumbents of law-enforcement offices, are being investigated and catalogued."

Some Attorneys General

Five days after this blast by Wheeler, the Department of Justice banned wiretapping. Justice Jackson said that court interpretation of Section 605 "is now clear and precise and all tu-

Why, then, was no one apprehended, prosecuted and convicted in the six years that Section 605 existed? To this Justice Jackson added: "I do not feel that the Department of Justice can

A Police-State Tool Grows Up

In good conscience prosecute persons . . . for a practice . . . engaged in by the department itself, and regarded as legal by the department."

Justice Jackson was attorney general in 1940; he was elevated to the Supreme Court shortly thereafter. Justice Tom Clark was attorney general from 1945 to 1949 and he, too, was elevated to the Supreme Court! Wiretapping was the practice of the Department of Justice under them, as it was under practically every other attorney general from the time of President Wilson, at least up to and through the Truman administration.

Only one man was ever convicted for wiretapping in violation of the law. And eight weeks after Jackson declared the practice illegal, the Department of Justice again adopted it as policy.

The outbreak of war guaranteed the resumption of wiretapping on a broad scale in government areas. It was and remained uncontrolled in private affairs, outside of government. A memo from President Roosevelt to the Department of Justice, never mentioned until 1949 and never to this day made public, presumably brought about the resumption of wiretapping. Clark was still attorney general when he stated that the memo "approved . . . wire tapping when necessary in situations involving national defense."

Legal Gimmickry

So the war became the new justification for violation of the law. The Department of Justice found a gimmick when it said that wiretapping itself was no crime, except when the intention is to "intercept and divulge." Its legal eagles discovered that the federal government was an entity, and an agent was not "divulging" when he passed wiretap information to his superior, nor was the superior doing so when he turned the same over to another agency or Congress.

Then, in March 1941, Justice Jackson, still attorney general, beat a retreat when he said "That there is no federal statute that prohibits or punishes wiretapping alone. . . . Any person, with no risk of penalty, may tap telephone wires and eavesdrop on his competitor, employer, workman, or others, and act upon what he hears or make any use of it that does not involve divulging or publication."

Only a legal cretin could find refuge in such reasoning. The opinion itself helps to question the "objectivity" of the legal mind and enforces the truth that it is the "interpretation" that counts, and that is determined by objective economic, political and social factors, and by the political bias of the justices or the attorney generals who are themselves men of politics.

The Supreme Court later provided its own loopholes in Section 605 when it decided in the case of Goldstein v. United States to let a conviction stand since a person who is not party to a tapped conversation cannot object to its use! In addition, permissive wiretapping is allowed; and the Justice Department, in face of contradictory positions taken by the Supreme Court, continues its wiretapping practices.

Technical Side

The study made by *The Reporter's* writers includes a technical section showing how it is all done. This portion of the study describes how simple it is to tap a telephone and how many are engaged in the practice. It emphasizes that the daily rumble one hears on a telephone is not produced by tapping but is common static responses to wire conditions. A tapped phone produces no special sounds that can be detected.

The regulation of the FCC demanding that every operating telephone-recorder machine attachment give a deep warning sound each fifteen seconds is violated all the time, since of the almost hundred thousand such recorders in service (the bulk of them in private industry) less than 10 per cent—about 8,000—give the required beep.

Those employed in wiretapping are skilled and trained electronics men, many of them ex-

telephone-company employees. Employees of the FBI are trained in telephone tapping. Telephone men with an intimate knowledge of local telephone systems, location of feeder cables, bridging points, terminal boxes and wires, company code names and departmental numbers, are lured by the prospect of higher incomes to engage in illegal wiretapping work.

The thing to bear in mind, as *The Reporter* makes clear, is that you cannot trust the law-enforcement officials federally or locally to observe the law and the Fourth Amendment. Some states have legalized wiretapping under court orders. Others do it without any kind of presumption of legal right.

Practically all metropolitan and state police agencies employ wiretapping constantly. Thus stoolpigeoning by wiretapping has become a lucrative profession for private detective agencies as well as public officers. The prospect of financial gain exerts a strong lure for many operatives, particularly in the field of blackmail.

How many phones are tapped in this country? Nobody knows; since the practice is so widespread, it would be impossible to calculate. A couple of years ago, J. Edgar Hoover made a public statement that only 170 phones were tapped at that time by the FBI. *The Reporter* writers, averaging five calls per phone a day, estimated that with only 170 phones tapped, the FBI could tap 300,000 conversations a year.

A Mrs. Sophie Saliba, head of the record-file room of the New York office of the FBI, once stated that 3500 disks were destroyed in 1949. As a disk can hold five average conversations, the writers estimated that at least 17,500 conversations have obviously been recorded by the New York office of the FBI.

Flourishing Industry

We have already indicated that wiretapping followed no selective field but was employed everywhere, anytime and against all manner of enterprises, institutions, movements and men. It is widely used in the business world within great monopolistic firms to check on employees and officers; against business competitors, particularly in the great competitive oil industry in Texas; against unions (even some unions have employed it); in government, in the armed services, by the two political parties against each other and within the precincts of the parties, and most intensively in the field of crime.

The Kefauver committee used wiretap evidence extensively in its hearings. In New York, the evidence against Three-Finger Brown (Luchese) was obtained by wiretap. The same is true of the Costello case. Wiretap was used on ex-Mayor O'Dwyer when his City Hall phone was tapped.

More recently, Mayor Kenny of Jersey City was implicated with the gangsters running the piers in the New York harbor district by a wiretap of Toots Shor's restaurant, where celebrities and mob leaders hang out.

The New York police have wiretapped public telephones around gambling areas and sport centers to obtain evidence against bookies, gamblers and criminals. Pay phones around Ebbets Field, the Polo Grounds, Madison Square Garden, Pennsylvania Station and Dinty Moore's have long been tapped.

Wiretapping for All

It is no longer news that ex-Senator Brewster, senatorial spokesman for Pan American Airways, tapped the wires of Howard Hughes of Trans World Airlines, Pan Am's competitor, his counsel Hugh Fulton, and Thomas Slack, another Hughes' attorney, and Noah Dietrich, a Hughes executive.

The sanctimonious Senator Charles W. Tobey, at a secret meeting of the Senate subcommittee investigating the RFC, admitted that he recorded two conversations he had with President Truman without using a beep or advising the president in any way that the conversation was being recorded.

Judith Coplon's conviction was based largely on evidence obtained through the aid of wiretapping. The FBI tapped her office, apartment, and family's phones, the latter in Brooklyn. They kept a tap on her phone not only from the time of her arrest but for two months after. And following the conviction on July 12, they continued a tap until November 10.

What a wiretapper can get depends on the area tapped. One New York policeman reported that in tapping a private line he recorded calls to the Julliard School of Music, the Brooklyn Law School, the Mercantile Commercial Bank, a health club, a stationery store, a real-estate company, a garage, dentists, taverns, brokers, and a New York police station.

When Kenneth Ryan, the noted wiretapper in New York City, tapped the line of Vito Genovese, under investigation in connection with Murder, Inc., the tappers found that they had cut in on Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt who had rented an apartment in the same Washington Square building that housed Genovese. They overheard Mrs. Roosevelt talking about having a bath readied for the president. Ryan hurriedly tried to break this cut-in on the president and his wife. But upon reaching the phone boxes he saw them guarded by the Secret Service and had to let it go.

The United Auto Worker has proved that its phones were tapped by the FBI; and after the shooting of Walter Reuther, one of the union officials worked out a ruse by planted telephone conversations that caught the FBI agents red-handed in tapping the UAW telephones.

The Right to Privacy

We are certain that this story of the indiscriminate and widespread use of wiretapping will not come as news to most of our readers. Wiretapping is a mean and ugly business, used largely for entrapment. The fact that it is a violation of the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution will impress only true democrats. They do not happen to reside in the Department of Justice, the business world or in the variety of law-enforcement agencies of the country.

We have learned a few lessons in recent years about what the Department of Justice thinks of due process of law and the democratic rights of individuals and movements guaranteed by the Bill of Rights and the Constitution, and we are not too impressed by their holiday declarations on the sanctity of law. We have too often seen the Supreme Court run its contradictory course, making laws and reversing itself periodically as political fortunes in the world and at home change, to rely too strongly on that traditional refuge of lawyers and attorneys general.

The telephone is no longer an instrument of private conversation between people. No person has a right to feel any private safety in using that wonderful invention of communication, even if the Fourth Amendment and some decisions of the Supreme Court guarantee that right to him. Every telephone is a potentially tapped phone, and as the writers in *The Reporter* point out, every conversation is potentially an overheard conversation. The person is wisest who says as little as possible over the telephone and confines himself only to the most indispensable and brief comments. The law-enforcement agencies have made this so.

A basic pamphlet—

"SOCIALISM:
THE HOPE OF HUMANITY"

by Max Shachtman

Read it!

10 cents

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Looking Back on 1952

(Continued from page 1)

on the procedures of the State Department in restricting the use of passports on political grounds; another with the hysteria loosed in Detroit by the visit to that city of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; and the last with the validation by the Supreme Court of the New York Feinberg law, one of the many "loyalty" laws which have become common in the country in recent years.

These were just a sampling of the struggles over civil liberties which continues to be one of the chief issues in American society. Throughout the year LABOR ACTION reported this struggle in every field: the attempt to clamp down on academic freedom in our educational institutions; the passage of the McCarran immigration law; the myriad "investigations" of Stalinist influence in various sectors of American life, with their attendant broad-gauge smearing of innocents and "guilty" alike; the passage of the Trucks Act in Michigan with the support of laborite legislators, etc. At year's end it appears that although the shadow of the police state remains, and although the forces which are fighting to preserve civil liberties are still on the defensive, the wither itself has not been greatly deepened or extended during the year.

Why Can't Truman Clean Up? The New Stage of the Corruption Scandal— And a Muffed Opportunity for Labor

(April 14)

Throughout 1952 one corruption scandal after another rocked the Truman administration. In one department after another scandals broke loose ranging from outright stealing and bribery to all shades of doubtful relations between businessmen and government officials. Despite various investigations conducted by Congress and despite the appointment, at one stage of the game, of Newbold Morris as a special "clean-up" man for the government, the whole nation became convinced that only a tiny part of the actual corruption current in the government had been brought to light.

Truman Denounces Steel Companies But— What Does Steel Seizure Give the Union?

(April 14)

The most dramatic single event on the industrial front during the year was the great strike of the United Steelworkers (CIO). The strike was preceded by a presidential "seizure" of the steel mills, and a Supreme Court condemnation of this seizure as unconstitutional. After a long strike, a settlement was reached in which the steel union made some slight gains, and the steel companies were granted a large increase in prices by the government.

President Truman's speech denouncing the steel barons as almost solely responsible for the fight in steel was most heartening to the steel workers. But in the long run the government took the easy way out of the situation. It permitted the companies to soak the consumer not only for what they had to pay the workers in higher wages but for a nice profit on this expenditure.

The Nationalist "Revolution" in Bolivia

(April 28)

Throughout the year LABOR ACTION carried reports closely following political developments in Bolivia. Although this backward Latin American country has problems which are unique to it, the general tendency of the struggle and of the social classes involved is common to most of the Latin American nations. In the absence of help from the more developed proletariats of other lands, and particularly the United States, the Bolivian workers' movement has fallen more and more under the control of the nationalist petty bourgeoisie of the country, led by the MNR.

The 4th International Closes the Circle Decision on Entry into Communist Parties Marks New Stage in Decay

(June 2)

The 4th International, as a "world movement," came to a new turn in its road when its leading theoreticians announced that the theories in which they had persevered had led them to the conclusion that there is no room for the existence of a revolutionary socialist movement outside the Stalinist organizations in countries where the CP is the mass party, especially France and Italy. Although to what extent this line will be, or has been, swallowed by the membership of the groups which belong to the "Fourth" is not clear, the ideological suicide of this movement is now irrevocable. The first result was that the majority of the French Trotskyists group (the PCI) rejected the CP-entry line and was expelled out of hand.

U.S. Threats to Extend War Arouse Allies' Fears

(June 30)

On the second anniversary of the Korean war, there was a noticeable tendency of the American generals to increase the military pressure with which they were attempting to force a truce, on their terms, on the Stalinists. At the same time, news was first released of the armed conflict with the Stalinist prisoners of war on Koje island. A spate of statements from American military leaders seemed to indicate that the "extend the war" faction was gaining the upper hand in the war councils in Washington.

No extension of the war materialized at that time. During the political campaign which followed, the Korean war became a primary issue, but one which did not lend itself to vigorous action by the Democratic administration. As the year came to a close, however, hints were coming thick and fast from circles surrounding President-elect Eisenhower that "something new" would be tried in Korea. But for the whole of 1952 the Korean war remained a slow, grinding, heart-breaking operation without any end in sight.

South African Resistance Movement Grows

(Sept. 15)

Throughout the year the struggle in South Africa over the attempt of the Malan government to put over its *Apartheid* (segregation) program grew in intensity. Despite the arrest of thousands of leaders and members of the movement for non-violent resistance to the *Apartheid* laws, the movement continued to grow stronger and more solid throughout the year.

Elsewhere in Africa the native peoples were stirring, and struggling in their own way for their emancipation. We have already referred to the fight against French imperialism in North Africa. In Kenya, a terrorist organization, the Mau Mau, was another symptom of the spreading movement for freedom from the rule of the imperialist white man. In both South Africa and Kenya the rulers had only one answer: naked repression.

Bevan Gains; Next Step is Harder

(Oct. 13)

During 1952 the left wing of the British Labor Party, led by Aneurin Bevan, made sizable strides inside its movement. At the Morecambe conference, the Bevanite candidates for the party's executive decisively defeated their right-wing opponents. (This for the seats held by candidates of the constituency parties.) Considerable gains were also made by the Bevanites in some of the trade unions. But as the year came to a close the question still remained: Could the left wing make decisive progress among the trade-unionists and in the Parliamentary Labor Party; and can it proceed further to clarify the ideological bases of the movement?

Back in the U. S., proceeding from two of the most exciting conventions of recent American political history, the presidential campaign proceeded to develop a viciousness and intensity hardly ever seen in this country.

Insofar as headlines can summarize the story, here was the course of the fight, beginning with the two national conventions:

GOP Convention Wallows in Flood of Demagoguery

(July 14)

The Fair Deal Goes Right to Woo the Dixicrats

(Aug. 4)

While Eisenhower Appeases the Taftites— Stevenson Juggles with the Civil-Rights Issue

(Aug. 11)

Labor Leaders Pushing Sparkman Sales Campaign

(Aug. 18)

Storm Over Sparkman: Why the Liberals Are Soul-Searching

(Aug. 25)

After Straddling on McCarthyism— Ike Adopts Rightist Line on Russian 'Crusade'

(Sept. 1)

'Containment' or 'Liberation'? Eisenhower and Stevenson on the Horns of a Dilemma

(Sept. 8)

Liberal Party Nominates Counts

(Sept. 15)

Nixon: The One Who Got Caught

(Sept. 29)

The Most Amazing Political Spectacle in Decades— The Candidates Turn Out Their Pockets . . .

(Oct. 6)

What 1952 Shows: Both Parties Swung Right

(Oct. 27)

Demagogy on Korea and the Witchhunt Features Last Roundup by Dems and GOP

(Nov. 3)

WHY EISENHOWER WON

(Nov. 17)

Among the low-lights, so to speak, was the episode in which was revealed the special political slush-fund of candidate Nixon, and the subsequent publication of income statements by the various candidates. Other low-lights: Stevenson's embracing of all the anti-civil-liberties measures inaugurated or carried out by the preceding Democratic administrations as his "defense" against Republican charges of "pro-Communism"; Eisenhower's demagogic promise to go to Korea and fix up the war there.

For the United States the victory of Eisenhower was the biggest and most important political event of the year. This was the culmination of all that had gone before politically, and it set the stage for the major developments which followed, and which will follow during the ensuing year.

As the year came to a close, several events contributed to the feeling that 1952 marked a turning point in American current history, even if not a decisive one. The return of the Republicans to office after twenty years in opposition was, of course, chief among them. The death of Philip Murray and William Green, heads of the two great labor federations in this country, and the election of Walter Reuther to lead the CIO, helped along the feeling.

But even though the historical perspective from which to view the past year is still lacking, it appears that nothing decisive has happened. The cold war continues as the dominating fact in the world today. Neither side has been able to change the relations of forces in the cold war decisively. And we must likewise record that despite the continuation of the struggles of colonial peoples, the strengthening of the left wing of the British Labor Party, and the increased power shown by the Social-Democrats in Germany, there has also been no decisive turn as yet by the world working class toward achieving the kind of organization and clarity in world politics which would permit it to move decisively toward the formation of a third camp in the war crisis. That is why 1953 opens still under the sign of World War III.

The ISL Program In Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

For information about
The ISL,
write to

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

The Handy Way To Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:
 NEW RENEWAL
 6 months at \$1.00
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME
(please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE APT.

STATE

Payment enclosed
 Bill me.

In English — At Last
The Famed 'Vol. 4' of 'Capital'

KARL MARX'S

"History of Economic Theories"
—From the Physiocrats to A. Smith

The Langland Press 337 pages \$5.00

Order from

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.