

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 30, 1953

FIVE CENTS

**THE HERITAGE OF 25 YEARS:  
Marxism and Proletarian Socialism**

by Max SHACHTMAN

... page 6

**Sad Case of the Labor Temple:  
End of a Free-Speech Center**

by A. J. MUSTE

... page 2

## The Police-State Atmosphere Thickens

### McCarthyism Has Foothold In Labor Too

By BEN HALL

The CIO convention marked the end of the line for all hopes of a friendly compromise between the labor movement and Eisenhower. Possibilities for an amicable adjustment by the unions to the new administration were ruled out in a series of speeches, reports, and resolutions stating and restating one recurrent theme: all-out condemnation of the record, misdeeds and works of the Republican Party.

And just as the CIO turned to travel its own way, it was infuriated by a parting vicious attack, the White-Truman affair.

Strictly speaking the CIO is not listed in the cast of characters of Attorney General Brownell's chilling and thrilling spy-hunt story. It is not accused of appointing spies to government office; Brownell's formula has been worked out only in crude form; the CIO is not yet denounced as an associate of those who supported those who are accused of harboring those who are suspected of holding views which might cause them to help spies. Such infinite permutations are still only future possibilities.

#### RESERVOIR OF REACTION

Still the effect on the labor movement of the desperate Republican gamble to counteract mounting Democratic victories is obvious to the CIO. It is a warning signal that the Republican Party will now more than ever rely upon the backward sentiments and emotions of American life.

The scissorbills, those fascinated by true-love stories and fake patriotism, those who would pound "Americanism" in or on the head of a Stevenson with clubs, readers of Sunday supplements titillated by dire predictions of cellar revolutionists about to dominate America and of insect swarms about to devour the world—this whole community of ignorance and prejudice is the reservoir of anti-democracy and anti-unionism. With the White-Truman affair, the Republican Party mentors announce their intention of appealing to it.

To this, every union-trained worker and every responsible labor leader is sensitive.

#### CONTRAST

For the moment, the Executive Board of the CIO, meeting on the eve of the CIO's recent convention, replied with a defense of Truman's anti-communism, an endorsement of his patriotism, and an attack on Eisenhower and Brownell. "This is McCarthyism on the cabinet level, the surrender of the so-called modern-minded wing of the Republican Party, the Dewey East Coast wing, to the fanatical, reckless, vengeful Midwestern hard core," says CIO News columnist Willard Shelton.

The CIO stubbornly pretends not to notice that the soil for the growth of Mc-

(Continued on page 3)

### FBI Head's Intervention in White Case as McCarthyite Hatchetman Breaks a Myth

By PHILIP COBEN

In the larger picture of the White-Truman case, perhaps the most sinister development has thus far been the intervention of the FBI and its J. Edgar Hoover; the manner of this intervention; and the contrast between its halo-crowned role and the unprecedented harrying of an ex-president as a suspected abettor of "Russian spies."

For the first time the secret-police agency of the government has stepped forth openly, before the whole public, as a partisan political instrument used by one domestic faction to knife another.

The atmosphere in which this took place was a fitting one. Obviously disquieted reporters commented on the awed, reverent, respectfully deferent treatment which the not-quite-venerable presence of the secret-police chief evoked from the star-chamber inquisitors and all others concerned. The commentator in a newsreel matter-of-factly introduces this character with the appellation "the revered head of the FBI"—as if he were saying "the beloved Bing Crosby."

And this "revered" head of the secret police, coming forward as a political-police chief, played the role of a partisan factionalist. Thus was fully confirmed the fears and omens of things-to-come which were expressed in worried accents by the legislators who first saw the FBI created in 1908.

J. Edgar Hoover did not take the stand simply as another government employee called to testify by congressional subpoena.

In the first place, it has been well known—and formally approved by all, up to now—that policy with respect to the FBI has been to keep it out of such affairs. With subpoenas being rejected by



J. EDGAR HOOVER

others (Truman, Clark), backed up by wide public opinion and even President Eisenhower, there cannot be the slightest doubt that Hoover could not have been forced to testify by the congressional inquisitors, unless he willingly agreed to do so. The "revered" secret-police chief

(Turn to last page)

### SP's Organ Rips into Case Of Att'y-Gen. Against ISL

The Socialist Party's national organ, the *Socialist Call* (now appearing in new format as a monthly magazine) carries a vigorous article on the case of the Independent Socialist League versus the Justice Department's "subversive list," in its current (November) issue.

Written by the well-known Chicago attorney, Francis Heisler, the article strongly attacks the Statement of Grounds and Interrogatories issued by the attorney general's office in the case. The author, Heisler, is among the most noted of the country's defense attorneys in cases involving civil rights, free speech and free press. He has represented both the Workers Defense League and the American Civil Liberties Union in such cases, and has argued constitutional issues on behalf of conscientious objectors.

In the same issue, Norman Thomas also reports on his recent conversation in Washington with Attorney General Brownell on a number of matters, among

them the interrogatories sent to the Independent Socialist League "which seem to imply that it is subversive to hold Marxist notions in the field of economics and politics." Thomas adds: "He promised to look into those interrogatories personally before the hearing which the ISL has requested to remove its name from the attorney general's list."

Heisler's article on "The 'Unbalanced' Justice Department: The Attorney General Defines Socialism" presents the main issues and facts of the ISL case with complete clarity and force. As he analyzes the ideas contained and implied in the Justice Department document, he counterposes some of the leading opinions on civil liberties handed down by the most eminent Supreme Court jurists.

"Reading the department's Statement of

(Continued on page 4)

### Trend in U.S. Alarms the Whole World

By L. G. SMITH

The domestic effects of the "White case," the hopped-up witch-hunt which is bound to follow in its wake, will be with us for some time to come. But that is not the whole of the matter. The effects abroad are not so readily felt in the United States, but they are bound to be serious and far-reaching.

All accounts from overseas show the same reaction. In those circles most closely identified with American foreign policy, there is consternation and a rush to apologize and explain it away. That section of the Western European press which is less "pro-American" is openly gleeful, while the Stalinist press has been having a field day.

Foreign correspondents, whose job it is supposed to be to interpret foreign affairs to the American people, have been having a hard time of it. Every article they write on the foreign reactions to the White affair tends to start with an explanation that American politics are really a mystery to most Europeans, that they don't understand "our" way of doing things very well, and that they are hence bewildered by the eruption of the White case on the American scene.

It is quite true that Europeans of all classes and schools of thought have a good deal of difficulty in comprehending the American scene. It is also true that they often tend to underestimate the vitality of democracy in this country, chiefly because its public voice is so quiet compared to the thunderings of the public figures and those sections of the press who insist that where the Stalinists are concerned, the rules of democracy need not or should not apply.

#### THEY'VE SEEN IT BEFORE

Yet Europeans have a long and hard training in politics, and they can easily sense the main drift of it even in such a "puzzling" country as ours. And what they see is that the most powerful forces of American capitalist conservatism have grabbed the issue of Stalinist infiltration into government, and intend to make American political life revolve around it rather than around anything else.

They know as well as anyone else that this country is faced with grave social, political and economic problems. They know that the European Defense Community, on which American foreign policy has based so much of its calculation, is on the rocks. They know that the situation in Korea is in a mess from which America will have the utmost difficulty in extricating itself. And they know, too, that the American economy is entering a very difficult phase of adjustment to the stabilization, if not decline, of military spending.

And when they see a government faced with such problems obviously looking for a side-issue, even a scapegoat, toward which to turn the attention of the Ameri-

(Turn to last page)

## THE SAD CASE OF A FORMER FREE-SPEECH CENTER—

# The Labor Temple Yields Up Its Tradition

By A. J. MUSTE

On November 3, 1953 a pronouncement by the General Council of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. hit the front pages of the New York Times, which also devoted nearly four whole columns on an inside page to a reproduction of the statement in full.

This was accompanied by a photo of President John A. Mackay of Princeton Theological Seminary, who is this year the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church.

The statement in question was addressed to the two and a half million members of the denomination in a manner calculated to give the alarm concerning "a fanatical negativism" being resorted to by prominent individuals and organizations in the fight against communism. It was a strongly worded call for sanity and for the maintenance of democracy in American life.

Such a call was in line with some of the best traditions of Presbyterianism, traditions which naturally have not always been scrupulously observed.

**The Presbyterian Labor Temple at Second Avenue and 14th Street in New York, founded in 1910, was an instance of a sound tradition of defending freedom of utterance. For nearly 40 years no questions were asked about the political views of groups meeting at Labor Temple. The Temple itself maintained a free forum. During the hectic days of World War I Leon Trotsky lectured at Labor Temple during a brief stay in this country.**

Labor Temple was attacked for its practice of free discussion during the hysteria following that war, which is associated with such names as A. Mitchell Palmer (the Democratic Herbert Brownell of those days) and the Lusk Committee of the New York State Legislature.

## This Is How It Was

The Presbytery of New York, and the Board of National Missions which contributed to the Labor Temple budget, stood firm against the hysteria of that day.

**By so doing the Presbyterian Church won respect in unexpected quarters.**

Early in my own three-year term as director of Labor Temple—in the fall of 1937, to be exact—a series of Sunday night forums on the theme "The Russian Revolution After Twenty Years" was held. I

# LABOR SCOPE

## NO PEACE AND QUIET ON THE LABOR FRONT

By BEN HALL

Peace and quiet on the union-corporation front? Not quite.

A month ago, United Automobile Workers (CIO) members in plants of the North American Aviation Company voted to strike; 13,000 walked out of its plant in Columbus, Ohio and 19,000 in two plants in Los Angeles. The strike continues with no report of any prospect of quick settlement.

The company claims that 10,000 men have returned to work and that assembly lines are moving but the union ridicules this contention, explaining that all key divisions are 99 per cent solid and that no new production goes out.

**Aircraft wages have always lagged behind auto wages and the chief union demand is for a 25 cent increase to close the gap. During the war, when aircraft production first began on a mass basis, employing thousands of new workers, the union was hamstrung by its own no-strike pledge and by the wage-freeze policies of the War Labor Board.**

Production soared during the Korean war after a post-war dip. Last year, the UAW threatened to strike the North American plants but cancelled its strike plans after an appeal from the Truman administration; the case went to the Wage Stabilization Board where a panel listened very sympathetically to the union's demand to close the aircraft-auto gap and issued a report expressing heartfelt endorsement of the UAW objective. But, it explained, because of wage-stabilization policies it could recommend only a 5 cent hourly increase.

**The UAW was patient and cooperative and now it gets the rewards that always grace these virtues. Its appeals to the present administration have been answered politely in notes informing the union that the government is totally uninterested in the events.**

## INJUNCTION CLUB

The courts, however, are interested. In Los Angeles a court order sharply limits the number of pickets and decrees that they must walk single-file only, a space of at least twenty feet between each picket. They are directed to permit all persons and vehicles free access to and from the plants.

In Columbus, another court order cut

down the number of pickets; when a fight broke out in front of the plant on November 17, UAW Local 927 was fined \$20,000, payment suspended on condition that the local make total and complete compliance with the court order. Thus the imposition of fines seems to be becoming a standard weapon in strikebreaking.

It is a great year for injunctions. On November 12, the National Agricultural Workers Union (AFL), called off its strike of 1,100 Louisiana plantation workers against four sugar corporations. The strike, a month old, followed a pattern familiar in the early thirties.

**Union men were fired and blacklisted during organizing campaigns; strikers were evicted, and finally, a Louisiana district court granted an injunction forbidding picketing, inducing others to strike, or supporting the strike with printed literature. The strike was called off pending an appeal to the U. S. Supreme Court.**

Cane-sugar employers receive subsidies from the U. S. government and in return must agree to pay wage rates established by the Department of Agriculture. Present rates call for \$3.85½ for a 9-hour day!

## THEY LISTEN TO CAPITAL

**H. L. Mitchell, union president, said, "Regardless of whether there has been a Democratic or Republican administration, the department considers only the recommendations made by the corporate farmers when they set wages of workers employed in the sugar-cane fields."**

1,500 members of the Hatters Union (AFL) have been on strike for 19 weeks against the Hat Corporation of America in Norwalk, Conn. The company wants to transfer most of its production to new low-wage plants in the South and the union insists that any new contract protect the rights of workers in the Connecticut plant. The union must win its demands now, before the company can build new facilities and while it needs Connecticut production to protect its markets.

Union members throughout the nation paid out \$250,000 for special union strike bonds (repayable with interest) to raise funds for the support of the strikers. The strike fund now totals over \$450,000. Meanwhile, the company is pressing heavily in the state court for an injunction to bar all picketing.

## A VICTIM OF THE WITCHHUNT SURRENDERS

*New York's Labor Temple, long a landmark of free speech and assembly in the city, has yielded to the current reaction and witch-hunt climate. Its directors have refused to permit the Third Camp Conference to meet there.*

*As announced in LABOR ACTION two weeks ago, the "Third Camp Conference" on the fight against war, sponsored by a number of socialist and pacifist groups, will hold its sessions over the Thanksgiving weekend. As a result of Labor*

*Temple's decision, the conference will be held instead at Adelphi Hall, 74 Fifth Avenue.*

*The accompanying article on the sad case of the Labor Temple is written by the man best fitted to discuss the change that has taken place in this Presbyterian Church institution. A. J. Muste is the chairman of the planning committee for the conference and also a former director of Labor Temple itself.—Ed.*

recall that on one evening M. J. Olgin presented the official CP viewpoint. In line with the practice at Labor Temple, on another evening Eugene Lyons, who had then recently written his *Assignment in Utopia*, a smashing criticism of the Soviet regime, held the platform.

The hall was jammed with an audience about equally divided between rabidly pro- and rabidly anti-CP elements. Lyons was in an irritable mood and taunted the pro-CPers. Before he had talked five minutes the place was in an uproar.

As chairman, I sought to restore order. I reminded the audience, during brief lulls in the storm, that they would have a full chance to come back at Lyons, and so on. Nothing helped much until it occurred to me to say:

**"Here is the Presbyterian Church which for nearly thirty years has unequivocally guarded free speech on this corner. You have been permitted night after night to say what you think despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of Presbyterians disagree with perhaps 90 per cent of what you say."**

At that there was a spontaneous burst of applause from all parts of what might be described as an unsentimental if not hard-boiled crowd. After that evidence of the impact a steadfast witness for free speech had made, the meeting went on—without benefit of police and in spite of the fact that Lyons continued to bait a large section of the audience—for several hours.

**This is an introduction to an event involving Labor Temple which occurred on November 20, 1953.**

## "A Terrible and Shocking Time"

Several weeks before, the present director's secretary, after conferring with him, told me we could have the use of the Temple auditorium for the Third Camp Conference, November 27-9, under the sponsorship of Peacemakers, a Gandhian group, and several socialist groups including the Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League. On the 19th the director told me that some question had arisen and that the decision would have to be made by the executive officer of the Presbytery of New York.

On the 20th this executive, Dr. Theodore F. Savage, a personal friend of long standing whom as a person I respect, told me that the Third Camp Conference could not be held at Labor Temple.

**He made no attempt to camouflage the reason for the decision. Labor Temple for some years has not held its open forum on the old broad basis. It has not been open on the old basis to all groups, thus serving as a free-speech center. Admittedly, a fine service had been rendered under the former policy, but we are living in another day, "a terrible and shocking time."**

Reminded that it was contrary to the spirit of the pronouncement so recently made by Moderator Mackay and the General Council of the Church not to stem the flood of hysteria, not vigorously and positively to defend the rights of minorities in specific situations, Dr. Savage confirmed what I had suspected, namely, that the National Council's pronouncement was having terrific repercussions in the denomination. (Let me observe parenthetically that experience in other lands indicates that it is by no means impossible that some day the General Council will have to defend itself against the charge of being Communist and subversive.)

The very next day, indeed, I saw a report in the press to the effect that one of the organs of the Southern Presbyterian Church had said that all prospects of unity between it and the larger Presbyterian body had been "shattered" by the recent pronouncement.

**So another banner, that of the old Labor Temple, has been lowered, we have another significant bit of evidence that this is a "terrible, shocking time," a time in which it's desperately important to explore the possibility of a Third Camp—which among other things stands unequivocally for the defense of civil liberties, including those of Communists and, if need be, of Presbyterians.**

## '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

## LONDON LETTER

# Labor Party Ranks Resent the Gag Rule

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Nov. 18—The most important news of the week comes from the Amalgamated Engineering Union. The national committee of this key union has voted in favor of a twenty-four-hour nation-wide token strike before the Christmas holidays.

The AEU is the most powerful body of the 3-million-strong Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions. Despite the counsels for moderation of Jack Tanner, who is president of both the AEU and the Trade Union Congress, the national committee has decided to take this very serious step. It can only be a prelude to further unrest on the industrial front.

The 15 per cent wage increase demanded by the AEU has been rejected by the employers again and again. Only two courses are thus open now. One is to submit the wage claims to a Ministry of Labor Court of Inquiry, that is, to submit the wage claim to arbitration. The other is to organize strike action.

It is the latter, more drastic, course that has been agreed on—but not without considerable opposition from the other major unions involved in the confederation.

The two general workers' unions—the Transport and General Workers Union (its engineers' section) and the Municipal Workers Union, which are dominated respectively by the right-wing leadership of Nicholas and Mathews, have already denounced the decision as Communist-inspired. That the Stalinists are fishing in troubled waters goes without saying but to imply that the Stalinists are artificially stimulating a wage claim is just not true.

Ian Mikardo, one of the leaders of the Bevan group, in his hard-hitting column in the *Tribune*, makes it quite clear where his sympathies lie in the matter of this wage claim. However, it must be said that the *Tribune* is careful—all too careful—not to express any opinion about the wisdom or unwisdom of the AEU's position in favor of a nationwide token strike. This would be interfering in the preserve of the big trade-union leaders, and would lead to the reopening of the "plaster unity"—to use Tom O'Brien's own phrase—which was achieved at the Margate conference of the Labor Party.

## PARTY RANKS REVOLT AGAINST THE GAG

This brings us to one of the great democratic issues that have faced the British Labor Movement, the question of the right of the ousted Guiana PPP leaders, Jagan and Burnham, to address Labor Party meetings and affiliated organizations.

The National Executive Committee of the party has put it in an unenviable position, with this action which—as far as one can gather from talking to members—has no support in the movement. The NEC, presumably its right-wing members urged on by the General Council of the TUC, has "advised" constituency members not to allow Cheddi Jagan and Linden Burnham to speak on Labor platforms.

This "major scandal"—as *Tribune* rightly calls this piece of "advice"—has had the very opposite effect to that intended. Up and down the country, local Labor Parties have either accepted the circular under protest or, in some cases, have actually flouted Transport House (as in the case of the Newcastle Division Labor Party).

It is just this Transport House policy which consolidates the links between the PPP and British Stalinism—and it can only be a matter of great satisfaction that the rank and file of the movement have expressed in no uncertain terms—through official and unofficial channels—their solidarity with the PPP against Oliver Lyttelton's police action.

The liberal and democratic traditions of the Labor Party have once again broken through the framework of the Labor bureaucracy.

Giant meetings have been held all over Great Britain and Ireland, where Jagan and Burnham exposed the sham constitution imposed on the Guianese people. That their policies were Stalinoid goes without saying, but significantly they carefully avoided any open show of solidarity with the British CP.

They identified themselves with the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism, *Tribune* and the *Socialist Outlook*, but at no time did they appear on a CP platform. There were, therefore, many

opportunities for left-wingers inside the Labor Party to present the socialist alternative to Stalinism at the many Jagan-Burnham meetings that were held.

An interesting pointer on the general attitude of young people (in this particular case, young students) to the PPP case was afforded when Jagan spoke to one of the biggest meetings ever held in University College, London, on Monday. In general students, like the rest of the population, are apathetic about politics. But here was an issue which drew a huge crowd, perhaps a thousand.

The meeting was organized by the University College Labor Society in conjunction with the Socialist Society (which the CP uses as its respectable cover). Much to the annoyance of the chairman of the Socialist Society, the chairman of the Labor Society, Jeremy

Beckett, had a statement read out which made it clear that there was no question of a united front with the Socialist Society but only an administrative "united front."

Dr. Jagan, a slick speaker, had a perfect case against the government's White Paper on Guiana, and he won over the main section of the student body. A large Tory minority did, however, try to outsmart Jagan but failed lamentably.

What was most interesting to note was the strong Labor sympathies of the meeting. The Guiana affair has shocked the complacent and driven serious thinking people away from Toryism. This can only be welcomed.

The pity is that the Labor Party has very little to offer—on British Guiana—that is substantially different from the Tories.

## ROLE OF THE PRESS

It looks very much as if the British Guiana affair is a dress rehearsal for general police action against the other colonies and semi-colonies in the fast waning British empire. The *Daily Mail*, the paper of the extreme right wing of Toryism, only recently had an article on the "perilous situation" in British Honduras. It appears that this tiny colony has a People's Union Party which is financed and supported from across the Guatemalan border. This sinister "conspiracy" is to be nipped in the bud before the party can even contest the elections scheduled for next year!

Dr. Nkrumah of the Gold Coast has

himself seen the red light. He has expelled a few avowed Stalinists in the Convention People's Party, so that Oliver Lyttelton will have no excuse to bring "democracy" to the Gold Coast at the point of the bayonet.

There is still a radical current in the press which occasionally makes its voice heard. The *News Chronicle*, officially a Liberal paper, takes a rare stand on a colonial question. The *Sunday Observer*, whose chairman is Dinglefoot, the radical Liberal leader, takes by far the most radical attitude of any of the well-known newspapers on colonial questions.

The Labor Party's *Daily Herald* is sanctimonious and patronizing; and it is not much better than the avowedly imperialist Tory press, except that it is more hypocritical.

And when we describe the *News Chronicle* and the *Observer* as the most radical of the well-known journals on these democratic issues, this shows less their radicalism than the reactionary nature of the more "sober" journals, for example, the *Daily Telegraph* (Tory), the *Daily Express* (Empire-Tory), the *Daily Mirror* (right-wing Labor, and the Labor part is a bit questionable at times) and the *Daily Herald* (right-wing Labor).

And yet all this imperialist propaganda did not overwhelm our party's rank and file. It is for these reasons that socialists in the Labor Party can take heart at the revolt in the Labor movement against Transport House, in favor of the democratic rights of the PPP.

# McCarthyism in Labor Too — —

(Continued from page 1)

Carthyism was fertilized by Truman's "list" and loyalty program. The nature of its defense of Truman came as no surprise, and its attack on Brownell was just as expected. Nevertheless, its action is a welcome restatement of CIO policy, welcome because it stands in sharp contrast to other moods that waft through some sections of the labor movement. For example:

## CRINGING HEROES

In July, the *Bulletin of the AFL Building and Construction Trades Department*, under the signature of its president, Richard J. Gray, deplored the undiluted critical attitude of the labor press toward McCarthy who, it said, was doing an "impressive" job of exposing the "tremendous extent" of Communist infiltration in this country. Because of labor denunciations of his methods, the *Bulletin* argued, "the results are being overlooked by the American public."

Such a blatant expression of sympathy in the labor movement for McCarthy is rare indeed. Not so rare is a timid retreat in advance for fear of criticism and attack by McCarthyites.

The AFL Meat Cutters Union offers a typically nauseating example of whining and cringing. The late Lewis Corey was hired as its educational director. Since the informal loyalty investigations of applications for such jobs conducted by unions are as extensive as those conducted by the government, we may assume that Corey's employers knew all about him in advance and consequently had no objection in principle to hiring him. But without warning he was fired. Reason? Corey had come under the fire of McCarthyite types in the immigration department and was fighting against deportation proceedings.

It was at this critical juncture that the democratic heroes who hired him cast him out.

## TWO LINES

An action of the June convention of the CIO Marine Engineers Beneficial Association belongs in the same category. Maritime workers are especially annoyed by the security regulations of the Coast Guard and whatever other government agencies can get into the act. They must carry special cards and are subject to repeated interrogations and investigations.

The MEBA has its own methods of handling such problems. It voted to suspend all inner-union rights of members who have been denied security cards by the government. They are no longer allowed to attend meetings, vote, or take any part in the activities of a local. Free

American unionism, independent of state control?

But such undignified, cowardly crawling is not, fortunately, characteristic of the CIO. In sharp contrast to the Meat Cutters was the action of the CIO Oil Workers Union in defense of its former editor, Harvey O'Connor.

O'Connor has been cited for contempt by the McCarthy committee, and his case is pending in the courts. When called before the committee, he refused to answer all questions on grounds of the First (not the Fifth) Amendment to the Constitution, guaranteeing free press. "My politics is my own business," said O'Connor. "If anybody asks me politely, I am quite willing to state my political beliefs. But when governmental bureaucrats presume to force citizens to state their political beliefs, freedom is dead."

The Oil Workers Union voted to support O'Connor "every inch of the way." "We believe," it said, "more citizens should boldly oppose, as O'Connor has, the McCarthy witchhunt and smear campaign."

## UAW ACTION

In Michigan, UAW leaders are now backing the Committee Against the Trucks Act, a particularly crass state law requiring the registration of all "communists" and the naming by them of all their associates.

The UAW has conducted a campaign in support of Lieutenant Milo J. Radulovich, who was discharged from his commission in the air force because he continued to associate with his father and sister who were suspected, by the air force, of having subversive tendencies. His father, for example, was accused of reading unorthodox newspapers. Such was the sole charge against Radulovich, who was backed by the UAW just as it had supported Air Force Captain Charles Hill Jr. against almost identical charges.

In October, *Political Action of the Week*, a CIO publication, noted for the first time a "general trend" away from democracy in the United States. Commenting on the death of Vinson and the appointment of Warren as chief justice, it cites an article in the *Harvard Law Review* by John Lord O'Brian, a prominent Washington attorney, "as saying that a review of decisions by the Supreme Court in the last ten years established the disconcerting and perhaps startling fact that in no case has the court liberalized or extended the freedom guaranteed by the [First Amendment to the] Constitution. The general trend has been in the direction of sustaining, in the interest of national security, new restrictions upon those liberties."

From these cited facts, the CIO draws

no conclusions. What is noteworthy, however, is that it feels compelled to note the facts.

## 'TIME TO GET ANGRY'

In March of this year, long before the White-Truman case broke into headlines, James Carey, CIO secretary-treasurer, delivered a long speech at Howard University on civil liberties, appropriately entitled "It is Time to Get Angry." "We are concerned with what threatens to be a complete change in our intellectual and political climate," he said, "the so-called congressional investigations, are only one aspect of it, although I do not underestimate their potentialities for evil."

And: "I would rather—and I say this carefully and deliberately—see a college full of young anarchists, all of them thinking and bickering and quarreling among themselves, than a college full of driven young sheep such as we saw Hitlerism and fascism produce by thought control."

And he concluded with an impassioned appeal for a new militant liberalism to fight for democracy, "not simply a liberalism of thought but a militant liberalism of thought joined to action."

The White-Truman case serves the Republican Party to arouse all the forces of anti-democracy. Let it serve now to remind the CIO of its role: the vanguard of the forces fighting to preserve and extend democracy.

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

Now again available  
for the first time in years—

Karl Marx's  
'CAPITAL'  
Vol. 2 & 3

These volumes, republished in India, contain the same translation as the American edition.

Vol. 2..... \$6.00  
Vol. 3..... \$7.50

Order from:

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.  
(Send remittance with order.)

BOOKS and Ideas

**Marsh: Lobbyist for the People****Testament of a Fighting American Liberal**

**Lobbyist for the People**, by Benjamin C. Marsh—Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C., 1953, \$3.

By GORDON HASKELL

For some fifty years the name of Ben Marsh has been associated with a sizable number of the social movements—or perhaps it would be more accurate to say, causes—in America. A list of the organizations in which he was active serves as a reminder of the times through which he lived.

Starting with the Committee on Congestion of Population in New York (1907!), he worked for the Pennsylvania Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, La Follette's Farmer-Labor Party, the Farm Labor Union of the South, the Farmers National Council, the Anti-Monopoly League, the People's Reconstruction League, the People's Legislative Service, the Joint Committee on Unemployment (1931), and finally, for many years, the People's Lobby.

Although he considered himself a radical opponent of the capitalist system, it does not appear from this autobiographical book that he ever joined one of the political organizations which were dedicated to its abolition. He was not temperamentally suited to organizational life.

And beyond that, the book displays an indifference to theory, a preference for fighting the cause of the moment rather than a thoughtful conception of what makes American society as it is, and hence what is fundamentally needed to change it—a temper which is typical not only of Marsh, but of the whole of what is usually known as "native" American radicalism.

"A 'welfare' state," he writes in the concluding chapter of the book, "that isn't a socialized state—whether through cooperative or public ownership—is almost certain to be a warfare state, as the record of Britain and Germany showed."

**NOT SUCKED IN**

With this point of view maintained throughout, he was a severe critic of the New Deal, and saw it primarily as a slick method of saving capitalism in this country rather than as a step forward toward a new and better kind of capitalism. He was keenly aware that the country was hauled out of the depression only by the war, and that only further wars, or at least a permanent war economy, could keep it from economic disaster.

It was this point of view which kept Ben Marsh from being sucked into the illusions of New- and Fair-Dealism and eventually the swamp of "totalitarian liberalism." Thus he remained a firm fighter against the witchhunt and the distortion of the very idea of democracy which has become so common among liberals of today. It was also his devotion to democracy which prevented him from becoming a Stalinoid.

For much of his life he was a lobbyist for various causes in Washington and elsewhere. His ability to turn a phrase and catch a headline gave him, and gave the causes on behalf of which he was constantly appearing before congressional committees, a good deal of national publicity.

As a lobbyist, a man who is primarily trying to influence legislation and hence legislators and other political figures, he had occasion to get to know an imposing number of public figures down through the years. His reports on conversations with such people are one of the most interesting aspects of the book.

After the First World War, Congress was engaged in a drive to give away many of the natural resources to private business. After opposing such a bill at a Public Lands Committee hearing, Marsh went to see "Reed Smoot of Utah and of the National Association of Manufacturers."

"He didn't deny any of my criticisms," Marsh reports, "but was obdurate. Finally, I asked him if it wasn't true that no Congress could bind a succeeding one, and he agreed it was. 'Then,' I said to him, 'as soon as the people wake up, they can compel Congress to take back what's left of their resources you are giving away, without paying anything for them.'

"Of course they can," he replied, "and that is the reason I hope to God the American people never wake up."

**MONEY-BAG PROBLEM**

Shortly after Harding's inauguration, Marsh went to see Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover in an effort to get \$20 million appropriated for relief for famine-stricken Russia. After listening for a while, this famous Quaker "smashed his fist on the top of his desk and said: 'Marsh, the height of my ambition is to crush out the Soviet form of government and everything it represents.'

"Do you mean you would let the children in Russia starve, to crush out the Soviet Union?" I asked.

"Yes, if necessary," he said."

The organizations for which Marsh worked were often subsidized by wealthy people. He was constantly running into the problem of sponsors who were for a certain reform in general, but who ran out on him when that reform began

to hit them or their closest associates in the pocketbook.

Added to this general problem was Marsh's capacity for saying the truth rather bluntly. Here is one example:

"In the spring of 1909, I was invited to speak on social work to the Twentieth Century Club in Boston, and stated my conviction that many directors of charitable and social-welfare organizations should be sent to institutions for the feeble-minded, or to reformatories. I based my conclusion upon the fact that so many of such directors were officers or directors of some of the great looting institutions of America. The word 'subversive' had not yet wormed its way into general use to characterize a person who dissents from the status quo and challenges its divine origin, but the New York as well as the Boston papers played up my remarks, with double-column headlines, and I was a marked person."

**AMERICAN REBEL**

Of course, he was specially marked by Jacob Schiff and the two Warburgs, who were sizable contributors to the committee for which he was then working. Their contributions were not renewed.

The book is full of stories of a similar nature. In the days before World War II the causes for which Marsh worked were often successful. But in the tightening society of America during and after the war, he more and more often has to report that "I made the record" before some congressional committee, but not that anything came of it.

Although Ben Marsh remained true to himself and his ideas throughout his life, he never discovered a central principle, a key to the problem of how to change American society. To him the working class and the labor movement remained just one among many social forces which were fighting for progressive measures at one time and were stuck in narrow craft and industrial interests at another. A radical and iconoclast, he remained a rebel in American society. He never became a revolutionist.

**Jew-Haters' Group Emboldened to Spread Vicious Call for Pogrom in New York City**

On November 18, pro-Nazi anti-Semitic leaflets were distributed in New York City's garment center in a provocative episode which is unimportant in itself but symptomatic as a straw in the wind.

An outfit which calls itself the "National Renaissance Party" signed the filthy-worded circulars, which were spread in a sort of hit-and-run operation. The content called for war against the Jews; expressed regret that the U. S. went to war against Nazi Germany instead of against "Jewish barbarians" the world over; etc.

The fascist group behind this stunt is of no significance, it is true. But what is symptomatic is that the vicious minds behind it have become so emboldened as to pull off an operation of this sort, one reminiscent of the arrogant daring of the pre-war Christian-Fronters and their plan of 1938 to hold an anti-Semitic parade through New York's East Side.

It has been a long time since material

as foul as this has been openly flaunted in the city. Here is an example of the leaflets' level:

"Thousands of defenseless cattle are tortured by Jewish kosher butchers every day. They are suspended by their hind-legs. The neck is cut through and the unhappy, tortured creature is allowed to die a slow death. Let's protect against kosher slaughtering. Why should the great American civilized people tolerate these cruel Jewish practices?"

The racehating outfit, run by 27-year-old James H. Madole of Beacon, N. Y., has a group of youngsters distributing leaflets mainly in the Yorkville section of the city. It advocates a "strict policy of racial segregation," depriving Jews of citizenship and the right to political and professional posts, and the abolition of parliamentary government in favor of a "trained elite."

There is no doubt that the present boldness of these fascists has been stimulated in the current climate of witchhunt and McCarthyism.

**Just Out—New Issue of 'NI' on Stands**

A new issue of the *New Internationalist*, the bi-monthly Marxist review of the Independent Socialist Movement, is out (dated September-October), with an interesting array of articles covering American and world politics today and socialist theory.

Albert Gates tells the story of "The ISL Fight Against Its 'Subversive' Listing" in an article which analyzes the procedures and policies of the government, from the Truman administration to the Eisenhower regime, up to the notorious Statement of Grounds in the case which we have recently published.

Hal Draper contributes a critical history of "The Myth of Lenin's 'Revolutionary Defeatism'" analyzing the course of this idea in the revolutionary Marxist movement and the various meanings that have been assigned to it, from a point of view which considers the entire concept as a mistaken one. Part I, on "Defeatism Before 1914" appears in the

current issue, dealing particularly with Lenin's war policy in the Russo-Japanese War. It is published as a discussion article.

Two articles, one by Walter Jason and another by Ben Hall, discuss "The Present and Prospects of American Labor," surveying a number of aspects and problems of the trade-union movement in the United States in the present period.

Donald Slaiman writes on "Bevanism During the War," explaining the distinctive ideas of the group around Aneurin Bevan and his *Tribune* as a tendency in the Labor Party and their propaganda emphasis.

Abe Stein discusses "Lord Acton and Political Power" in an article on the English historian who has experienced a revival of reputation in many quarters as the author of the oft-used maxim that "Power corrupts," etc. Stein's article sheds some light on his conceptions which will be new to most readers.

**SP Organ —**

(Continued from page 1)

Grounds, which contains 27 charges, is a frightening experience," he writes. "None of them charges the League with the commission of any act that is considered by the department itself illegal or unconstitutional. The department charges the League and its members with having thoughts, desires and aspirations to bring about a new social order." (Italics in quotes here and elsewhere are in the original.)

**THE GOVERNMENT LINE**

"As we read the Statement of Grounds we feel as Alice in Wonderland after she fell down the rabbit hole, that things are getting 'curiouser and curiouser,' particularly when we read that the League 'knowingly advocated and taught the duty and the desirability of overthrowing and destroying the existing form of government of the United States.' The Statement of Grounds does not say that the League advocated the desirability of the things to be done with other than legal and constitutional means.

"Sought to establish in the United States a socialist state under the dictatorship of a privileged class." As far as the department's Statement is concerned, the League may have sought to establish a socialist state by democratic and therefore legal means. Of course there remains the curious feeling that the department may be of the opinion that the idea of a socialist state by and in itself is subversive, because, as Secretary of the Interior McKay said early this year, the administration of which he is a member is 'representative of business and industry,' to the obvious exclusion of labor, farmers and professionals.

"The department further believes that the League is subversive because if the 'changes' advocated by the League were to be carried out then in place of the present form of government there 'would be established an entirely new social philosophy and system of proletarian internationalism,' whatever the last term may mean. In any case the Statement of Grounds does not claim that the 'change' to bring about a new social philosophy is to rely on illegal means. The department obviously believes that the idea of a new philosophy in itself is subversive."

**"FRIGHTENING"**

Heisler, continuing this analysis, incisively and cogently points out how the attorney general's grounds rely solely on the identification of socialist ideas with "subversion." The "listing" of an organization, he states, will deprive its members of certain rights "solely because they freely spoke about and desired another social philosophy, solely because they advocated a socialist state, and solely because they peaceably assembled in an organization. The attorney general believes that he can undertake actions by executive fiat which Article I of the Bill of Rights does not even permit Congress to do. . . . The attorney general stamped the League subversive solely because of its thoughts, teachings, and desires and because it advocated a political change. . . ."

The Interrogatories set forth by the Justice Department are even worse than the Statement of Grounds, Heisler says.

"While the Statement of Grounds is frightening in its implications the Interrogatories propounded to the League by the Department of Justice are more so. . . ."

"While the Statement of Grounds is clearly indicative of the department's philosophy that any opposition to capitalism or advocacy of socialism in itself is subversive, the Interrogatories make that doubly clear. The department wants to know whether or not the League believes in a 'revived socialist working-class struggle against both capitalism and Stalinism,' irrespective of whether or not the League so stands or so advocates the struggle by legal or unlawful means."

Quoting Justices Douglas and Black on the current drives against civil liberties, Heisler comments: "It is hard if not impossible to see how Justices Douglas and Black could agree with the attorney general that the 'charges' in his Statement ofstitution to stamp any organization as subversive."

In its present status, the case of the ISL versus the Justice Department awaits action by the attorney general on the demands that have been made and repeated by the ISL for the hearing that has been promised. Nothing has yet been heard from the Justice Department in answer to these demands.

**LABOR ACTION**

November 30, 1953 Vol. 17, No. 48

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER  
Asst. Editors: GORDON HASKELL,  
BEN HALL, MARY BELL  
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## PRESS AGENTS OF THE PENTAGON: Part 6 and Conclusion

## THE PROPAGANDA MILL'S LINE OF GOODS

Sixth and concluding installment of a series based on the new pamphlet, "Press Agents of the Pentagon," by John M. Swomley Jr., published by the National Council Against Conscription. The present installment consists of sections from two chapters.—Ed.

An examination of the content of military propaganda during the past six years reveals at least four major emphases.

The first is the idea that peace is synonymous with militarism. Slogans like "Air Power is Peace Power," "A strong America is a peaceful America," and speeches by important military officials drive home through pure repetition the idea that peace is achieved through national military force.

Former Secretary of War Robert Patterson said: "The peace of the world depends on the presence of power in this nation." General Omar Bradley "hailed the passage of the draft act as gaining 'for all peoples an eleventh hour chance to erase tension through understanding, to seek agreement through conference and to provide for the peace of the world through honest cooperation.'"

Former Secretary of the Navy Francis Sullivan said the United States' role was one of guarantor of "peace through restrained strength" and the late Secretary Forrestal claimed that the building of American military might is "an affirmation, not a rejection of this country's 'loyal support of the United Nations.'"

### Just a Good Home for Boys

The second is the idea that the army is just the place for a boy to be—he gets religion, character, and training in democracy through the army and thus becomes an asset to the nation.

Former Secretary Kenneth Royall in a prepared statement after the passage of the draft in 1948, spoke of career-guidance and character-guidance programs in the army. He claimed that the regimentation and killer-training of army life would not make boys "brutal and tough" but would teach them to "become more considerate of others . . . more tolerant . . . and champions of the less strong." Stating that "the army has no caste system" he said of each soldier that "the only obstacle is himself." Nevertheless he decried the "unfortunate attitude of a relative few" who tend "to undermine confidence in authority."

Despite Mr. Royall's statement to the press about no caste system, recruits at Fort Dix in November 1948 were welcomed by a captain with the comment, "If you do what you're told, you'll get along all right."

Army publicity releases have stressed "the pleasant grounds, including a golf course; and considerate non-coms" at the army posts; the guest house for visitors, and a new politeness, including the absence of profanity, on the part of the officers which the officers learned "in a special two week" course. Boys will at the same time be "taught to comprehend the greatness of American democracy" and the reasons for being conscripted so they don't rebel against the lack of democracy symbolized in "the authority centered in military command."

Former Secretary Royall even told a congressional committee that "on the whole UMT will do the boys spiritual good." When a congressman asked, "More than they get in their homes and their churches?" Mr. Royall replied: "And the schools and the filling stations; yes."

### Scare Technique

A third propaganda emphasis is designed to convince those who do not believe that the alleged peace and character benefits of the army justify conscription and military expansion. This approach implies that we may be closer to war than we know, that we are in no military position to go to war and that we've got to be ready immediately.

The public often does not connect the scare propaganda with other statements by the military—on Army Day, Navy Day, etc.—to the effect that the navy today is "the greatest and mightiest navy in the world."

Nor do they remember such little-publicized statements as one made by General Marshall to Congress that "The United States army and navy emerged from the war as the best-equipped and most powerful in the world and characterized by an efficiency in planning and execution superior to or equal to that of any other armed forces."

One of the items the army used in selling the draft was General Bradley's 1948 statement that "we are not sure" that "there is no war right away." Another was former Secretary of the Navy Sullivan's dramatic statement that submarines "not belonging to any nation west of the iron curtain have been sighted off our shores." Although, as Hanson Baldwin pointed out, "off our shores" was "in at least one instance in mid-Pacific," and in other cases "merchant vessels" simply sighted "periscopes" the propaganda had its desired effect.

General Bradley in 1948 in an effort to increase the army's budget, warned the nation that war with Russia is a "plausible possibility." Karl Compton compared America's 60,000 combat troops with Russia's entire army instead of comparing either the combat troops of both powers or the entire armies of both. Later under congressional questioning the military admitted they had more combat troops than Dr. Compton had estimated.

On another occasion General Bradley complained of an "appalling decay" in our military might to a group

of munitions manufacturers, the American Ordnance Association, termed by the Associated Press the "so-called civilian industrial arm of the military."

That the military are very successful in this type of propaganda is seen from the following comment published in the *United States News and World Report*:

" . . . War scares, encouraged by high officials only a few weeks ago, so alarmed the 144,000,000 U. S. public that top planners now are having to struggle hard to keep Congress from pouring more money into national defense than the Joint Chiefs of Staff regard as wise or necessary. It is proving more difficult to turn off than to turn on a war psychology."

### Propaganda? Heavens, No!

The fourth type of army propaganda is one of denying that the army is militaristic or ambitious in the sense of wanting more influence over civilians.

Gen. J. Lawton Collins spoke of "false charges of militarism" as threatening the army and national security. General Bradley also attacked those who think the army would use UMT to influence the civil life of the nation or indoctrinate boys with militarism.

On another occasion, after General Eisenhower had been elected President, General Bradley told the Association of Land Grant Colleges: "I can say from personal knowledge and forty years of experience that we have nothing to fear from military men themselves."

If the public relations division of the Defense Department or any of its branches were asked whether it used funds for propaganda its representatives would reply as they do at congressional hearings that they are a Public Information Office and therefore provide only legitimate news and information. The number of times when misinformation and pure public relations stunts have come from the military's office of Public Information shows that the name of the office itself is a good propaganda device.

Hanson Baldwin, the nation's leading military analyst, wrote in 1951; in illustration of misinformation and propaganda put out by the military:

" . . . In one recent raid by nine B-29s against a target in northwestern Korea near the enemy's 'sanctuary' air bases in Manchuria, the Russian-built MIG's shot down three—or one-third—of the B29s involved, and damaged virtually every one of the rest. One United States jet fighter also was lost in the series of swirling air battles the raid caused. The air force claimed eight enemy jets as definitely destroyed, and others as damaged; yet this action, which was a definite defeat for the United Nations forces, was generally hailed as an air victory. . . . Still another element of the air war in Korea that is not clearly understood is that the United States has lost—despite the edge in the jet versus jet battles—far more planes than the enemy."

### The Colin Kelly Story

Albert H. Jenkins, writing for *Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods' weekly paper*, in 1946 exposed the public relations pattern in a feature story. He wrote:

"The body of Captain Colin P. Kelly has been 'positively identified in the Philippines,' says a newspaper report. It recalls—and contradicts—stories which filled front pages in the earliest days of the war. Then, reports from General MacArthur's headquarters in the Philippines said Kelly died in a suicide dive into the Jap battleship *Haruna*, and that as a result the *Haruna* went down. About three years later, when the war was almost over, the *Haruna* was discovered still afloat. If Kelly had died as was reported, he would have found a watery grave, instead of being buried in Manila, where his body was discovered this week. As a matter of fact, he was shot down by Jap planes near his home airfield, after he had returned from his attack on the *Haruna*."

"The facts make Kelly no less a hero than the fable did. Why was the false story told to the American people? That, said a newspaper man who was in uniform during the war, 'brings up a situation which is unknown to most Americans, but which may have far-reaching results. In the recent war, for the first time in our history, vast propaganda machines were built up and used by the army and navy, with the army air force the worst offender. George Washington got along in the Revolutionary War without benefit of "public relations" men, or even newspaper reporters. In the Civil War it was much the same. In the Spanish War, the only writers present were working for newspapers—not for the generals and admirals. Such writers were not completely free to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, but they did not have to

glorify or falsify at the behest of military commanders.

"The situation began to change in the First World War. In the Second, the change was complete. As Senator Elbert D. Thomas, Utah Democrat who heads the Military Affairs Committee, hired a host of professional "publicity" men and advertising men, and set them to grinding out "news" glorifying the "Brass Hats" and covering up their mistakes, which cost plenty of American lives.

"Other branches of the armed forces did the same thing on almost as huge a scale. So did individual generals and admirals. Moreover, newspaper "correspondents" were made part of the vast propaganda machine. They became "publicity men" for the particular commander to whom they were attached. They pictured him as an ever-victorious genius, a superman who never made mistakes. It all became a world-wide back-scratching game, with every one cooperating to glorify and cover up. For example, the army air force and MacArthur's headquarters cooperated in putting out the Colin Kelly story.

"Fortunately," the veteran newspaper man said, "many of our army and navy commanders needed no such artificial methods to make them great. They "had the stuff" necessary to win the war, but can you remember a single general or admiral who was not pictured as great and infallible?"

"All this would not be so important if it ended when peace came, but it is still going on. It is a dangerous development, and should be watched."

Another illustration of "Public Information" is the following account from the September 19, 1950 *New York Times* about a Salem, N. J. doctor 100 years old:

### Party Line for the Brass

The armed forces' interest in real public information is so great that a gag rule has been placed on officers, writes Fletcher Pratt in an article in *The Nation* January 7, 1950, "which requires them to get approval from top-side before they can express an opinion on service matters in public. It might be justified as a wartime measure but we are not really at war. It might be modified to demand clearances for security, but it has not been. It is simply a device to prevent criticism, to secure an appearance of unanimity by making service opinion a matter of the party line."

James Reston, a veteran *New York Times* correspondent, wrote on December 23, 1951:

"As the prestige of the civilian branch of the government has declined, the prestige of the military has gone up, and the rise of military prestige has never been accompanied by an increase in the flow of public information."

He mentioned the tendency "to play up the good things and play down or censor the bad things. Thus the press agent's view of government public relations is now very much to the fore, with the press conference looked upon by officials more as an opportunity to 'put over' an idea than as an institution to provide answers to the questions that are in the public mind."

## CONCLUSION

Millions of dollars for public relations and thousands of persons employed to mold the public thought constitute a serious threat to democracy, if only because no comparable money and personnel exist to present another point of view.

When only one point of view is hammered home to readers and listeners day after day, there is a tendency to believe that no alternative to what the military proposes has a chance of political acceptance. This is stifling to democracy and injurious to the nation.

Our system of government was founded on the assumption that freedom of thought and discussion would guarantee a consideration of many points of view before the adoption of any one emphasis as the law of the land. Military press agency tends to reduce the process of free discussion to such discussion as can be held in top military levels.

After a military decision has been reached it is to be sold to the public almost as it would be in any non-democratic state. Only if a military proposal seriously interferes with some other powerful institution such as labor, industry, the church or the press itself is there likely to be enough public protest to inspire substantial congressional opposition and therefore adequate scrutiny of many additional points of view.

There is a sense in which the armed forces themselves are to blame for creating and sustaining such a large and efficient propaganda machine. But in a deeper sense the military cannot be held fully accountable.

The professional officers who run the military establishment are taught in military and naval academies to command rather than to discuss and vote. All of their lives is spent in a system in which democracy is completely alien. They work under superiors and over subordinates. Command and obey supersede minority presentation of viewpoint and subsequent majority decision. Immediate efficiency of operation is more important than individual rights, greater truth or a score of other values which democratic processes are intended to safeguard.

For this reason our forefathers warned us against overgrown military establishments. Their concept of an overgrown establishment was not simply in reference to the size of an army but to the professional officer

(Continued on page 6)

You will want the *WHOLE* of this exposé of the military propaganda mill in the United States—

## PRESS AGENTS OF THE PENTAGON

by John M. Swomley Jr.

35 cents each

4 for \$1.00

Order from the publisher:  
NATIONAL COUNCIL AGAINST  
CONSCRIPTION

1013 Eighteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington 6, D. C.

# Heritage of Twenty-Five Years:

From Max Shachtman's speech on "25 Years of Trotskyism in America," delivered November 18 at Adelphi Hall in New York, we present the final section, in which he discusses the heritage of Marxism in the Trotskyist movement. It is slightly condensed as transcribed from tape. In the talk, Comrade Shachtman discussed the beginnings of the Trotskyist movement in the split from the Communist Party, its first struggles against heavy odds, the development of the Cannon leadership in the movement and the 1940 split in the Socialist Workers Party, up to the current breakaway of a Stalinoid wing from the SWP, etc.—Ed.

## By MAX SHACHTMAN

We, the comrades of the Independent Socialist League, the comrades of the Socialist Youth League, the comrades who are with us in solidarity in our work, consider ourselves as heirs of the Trotskyist movement when it was a living movement in the full sense of the word, when it represented the imperishable tradition of revolutionary Marxism. And today, 25 years after the founding of that movement, looking backward with a minimum of maudlin sentimentality and a maximum of calm, objective and reasoned analysis—what do we celebrate on this 25th anniversary?

What do we seek to represent in the working-class movement as a whole, of which we are an inseparable part? What fundamentally justifies our independent and separate existence, our stiff-necked obduracy in maintaining that existence, in refusing to give up, in insisting not only that we will hold on to what we have but get more and more until our ideas infuse the bloodstream of the whole working-class movement?

It is the essence of revolutionary Marxism—that respect in which it always differed, as it differs today, from every other social and political tendency, from every other movement, from every other mode of thought in society.

**And that essence can be summed up in these four words: Marxism is proletarian socialism.**

## Our Kind of Socialism

They say—by "they" I mean professors, former professors, aspirant professors, substitute professors, imitation professors — that there are as many schools of socialism as there are socialists. Every Princeton student bursts his seams when he hears this: "There are other socialisms, and which of the 57 varieties are you referring to?"

I, who like a joke as well as the next man, would be the last man in the world to dream

## The Military Hucksters — —

(Continued from page 5)

group and its influence over the nation, for it is this professional group which develops a vested interest in things militaristic.

Hence Congress and the people with certain constitutional aids were expected to hold the military in check. It is the failure of Congress and especially the appropriations committee which has permitted the concept of military press agency to become an accepted pattern of military operation.

## Obstacle to Democracy

It is the failure of our press, magazines, radio, motion picture industry and the public in general to realize that military publicity is in its final analysis directed against the people as in other ways military tactics are designed to overcome the resistance or opposition of the enemy.

It cannot of course be asserted that each officer or all of them think of the public and public opinion as an enemy to be vanquished.

But it is an accepted part of the American democratic tradition to think of the military as the servant of the people rather than the policy maker, as an agent responsive to civilian control rather than the manipulator of civilian thinking. To the extent that civilian control has become the shadow, and military ideas and power the substance, democracy has been rendered impotent. Any effort to perpetuate military power and influence over the people stems either from an implied contempt for democratic processes or from an arrogance that military knowledge and plans are superior to those hammered out by civilians responsive to political pressures.

The hope of most Americans is a disarmed world where militarism is an anachronism of the past. The obstacles in the path of such an achievement are great enough in our world that they should not be magnified by a military propaganda machine whose chief results are the creation of a militaristic public opinion and the maintenance of the vested interest of a military autocracy.

of depriving these poor, intellectually poverty-stricken apologists for a decaying capitalist social order of their little joke. And you will admit it is little.

So I will say: Yes, historically and actually—if it will make you happy, and after all we socialists are for the extension of happiness—there are 57 and even a greater number of socialisms.

When Marx came on the intellectual scene, in Germany, in France, in Belgium and in England, there were any number of socialisms; and there were socialisms before Marx was born; and there were socialisms promulgated after he died. Marx mentioned a few in his deathless *Communist Manifesto*. There were the "True Socialists," the Christian socialists, the reformer socialists, cooperative socialists, bourgeois socialists, feudal socialists, agrarian socialists, royal and imperial Prussian socialists. They existed and continue to exist. In our time we had "National-Socialists," we have had, if I may say so, "Stalinist socialism." Stalinist socialism—I don't like to say that—I ask your indulgence—but we do have all sorts of "socialisms."

**But even if it gives the professors and the Vassar students another burst seam I say there is one socialism that we adhere to. Even if we will not say that this is the "true" socialism, that it is the "right" socialism, that it is the "genuine" socialism—we will say that is our socialism.**

## The Essence of Marxism

If you don't find it "true" you can become a royal and imperial Prussian socialist, you can become a Stalinist "socialist," you can become (every man is entitled to his joke) a "Sidney Hook socialist." For we believe in everybody having the right to be any kind of socialist, or anti-socialist, he wants. We claim no more for our socialism than the fact that it is *ours*.

Marxian socialism is distinguished from all the others, not in the fact that it holds to the so-called labor theory of value, and not even in the fact that it developed the ideas of dialectical materialism, and not even in the fact that it participates in and prosecutes the class struggle. Its fundamental and irreconcilable difference with all the others is this: Marxism is *proletarian socialism*.

**The great discovery of Marxism—what distinguished it as a new socialism in its day, what distinguished the great discovery of Karl Marx in his search for a "bearer of philosophy," as he used to say in his early days, in his search for a "carrier" out of the contradictions of capitalism—the great discovery of Marxism was the revolutionary character of the modern proletariat.**

That is the essence, that is the durable characteristic, of Marxian socialism. Proletarian socialism, scientific socialism as distinct from all other socialist schools, from utopian socialism all the way over to royal and imperial Prussian socialism, dates from that great discovery—the social revolutionary character of the modern proletariat.

## Only the Working Class . . .

When speaking of socialism and socialist revolution we seek "no condescending saviors," as our great battle hymn, the *International*, so ably says. We do not believe that well-wishing reformers—and there are well-wishing reformers—will solve the problems of society, let alone bring socialism.

We do not believe that kindly bourgeois—and there are kindly bourgeois—with progressive ideas, with emancipating ideas, with Owenite ideas, will solve the problem either. We do not believe that utopian improvers, people with plans, blueprints and perfect ideas for a perfect society, can bring socialism.

We are distinguished from them all in this one respect above all others—we believe that task belongs to the proletariat, only the con-**of the proletariat itself. That is a world-shattering idea. It overshadows all social thought.**

scious working class, no one else, nothing else.

**The most profound, important and lasting thought in Marxism, the most pregnant thought in Marxism, is contained in Marx's phrase that the emancipation of the proletariat is the task. It is clearly the most revolutionary idea ever conceived, if you understand it in all of its great implications.**

That is why we are in the tradition of the Paris Commune, for example, the first great attempt of the proletariat to emancipate itself. That is why we are in the tradition of the great revolution in Russia—the Bolshevik revolution—the second great attempt of the proletariat to emancipate itself. That's why we defend it from its detractors. That's why we are so passionate about it. That's why we are, if you will, so "dogmatic." We know what we are defending even if they do not always know what they are attacking.

And that is what we learn all over again from Trotskyism—what we have begun to forget, what we have begun to ignore, what we have begun to take for granted.

## An Explosive Idea

If I may speak for myself, I can tell you I will never forget the explosion in my Communist smugness when for the first time I read Trotsky's criticism of the draft program of the Comintern, written when he had already been banished to Alma-Ata in 1928, written for the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International. What a commentary it is on the Communist movement in 1928 that, so far back, that precious Marxian document, which is so fresh to this hour, had to be written in exile in Russia in 1928—in exile! It had to be transmitted by theft; Cannon had to steal his copy in Moscow from the Comintern secretariat and smuggle it into the U. S. It had to be disseminated here in the Communist Party illicitly, to three or four people who would read it behind locked doors—because if the leaders of the CP found out that we had it (let alone that we were reading it, let alone that we were favorably influenced by it) they would put us on trial and expel us, and they did.

To read that work and to know what was really going on in that fight of Trotskyism, that it was always a question of international socialism versus national socialism, the coordinative efforts to bring about socialism of the entire working class of the world as against the messianic, nationalistic utopian idea that it could be established in one country alone by the efforts of a benevolent bureaucracy of the working class—that had a shattering effect upon our thinking!

**We learned then from Trotskyism what we hold so firmly to now: There can be no socialism without the working class of the world, no socialism without the working class of Russia. Twenty-five years later we see the results of building socialism without the international working class — without the Russian working class and against the Russian working class. No matter how many books you leaf through, no matter how old they are, where will you find the story of such an unendurable tyranny as has been established in the Stalinist countries, where "socialism" has been built without the working class and against the working class? . . .**

[Here Shachtman further discussed some of the basic issues in the Trotskyist struggle against Stalinism.]

## Declaration of Independence

We are the living carriers and emboument of the ideas to be learned from these events. We are its living teachers, for those whom we can get to listen in these days of darkness, confusion and cowardice.

In this country we have learned far more about the meaning of the idea of an American labor party, a labor party based on the trade unions, than we ever dreamed was represented by that idea when we first put it forward in 1922 in the American Communist movement, than when we put it forward again and again later in the Trotskyist movement. To us it rep-

# Marxism and Proletarian Socialism

resents a declaration of independence of the working class, its first great step in this country toward self-emancipation, and also to us it represents the remedy for that series of tragedies, calamities, misunderstandings and frustrations represented by New-Dealism—that is, collaboration of the working class with a benevolent liberal bourgeoisie.

And what it represents runs through everything we say and everything we do and everything we want others to do in the United States and elsewhere: *Not with them—not under them—you yourselves are the masters not only of your own fate but the masters of the fate of all society if you but take control of society into your own hands! That is your destiny! That is the hope of us all.*

## Class Self-Reliance

**We are optimistic because that will remain our hope in the greatest hours of adversity, while everywhere else lies pessimism. Our role is to teach Marxism, that Marxism which is proletarian socialism, Marxism politics, socialist politics. Our idea of politics boils down to this revolutionary idea—to teach the working class to rely upon itself, upon its own organizations, upon its own program, upon its own leadership, upon its own ideas and need for democracy, and to subordinate itself at any time to the interest, the needs, the leadership, the program, the movement, the organization, or the ideas of any other class.**

We regret that in other branches of the socialist movement, or what is called the socialist movement, that idea does not dominate every thought. We are proud that in our section of the socialist movement it does dominate every thought. We are proud that in our section of the socialist movement it does dominate every thought and every deed. That's why we are Marxists; that's what we learned all over again in many intellectual and political battles under that peerless teacher and peerless revolutionary, Trotsky.

And we start by teaching *socialists* to rely upon themselves.

## A Bible of Democracy

When we read for the first time the New Course by Trotsky, his work directed against the first big and dangerous manifestations of bureaucratism in the Russian Soviet state, another explosion took place in our smugness. I venture to call it—it's an awkward phrase and I hope it's not too badly misunderstood—a *bible* of working-class democracy. This was Trotsky's brilliant simple overwhelming pamphlet on how a socialist movement should act inside and outside, how a socialist state should act, how socialist leaders and socialist ranks, the socialist elders and the socialist youth, should act toward themselves and one another. . . .

What we have learned more sturdily in our minds than ever before, what is more completely a part of our Marxian idea of proletarian socialism, is that there is no socialism and no progress to socialism without the working class, without the working-class revolution, without the working class in power, without the working class having been lifted to "political supremacy" (as Marx called it), to the "victory of democracy" (as Marx also calls it). No socialism and no advance to socialism without it! That is our rock. That is what we build the fight for the socialist future on. That is what we are unshakably committed to.

## Common Ground of the Deserters

**Look at what has happened—I hold them up as horrible examples—to all and singly who have renounced this struggle after having known its meaning. They have no confidence in the social-revolutionary power of the proletariat—that is the alpha and omega of them all. One will embroider it with one color thread and another with another, but at bottom that is it.**

I claim to know whereof I speak because I

know so many of them and know them so intimately—excuse me, *knew* them so intimately—and know also what caused their renunciation of the struggle. They have been corrupted by that most ancient of corrupt ideas: that as for the lower class, there must always be one; that the lower class must always be exploited and oppressed; that there is no other way. That's their real feeling and that's what caused their renunciation of the struggle.

They are the Stalinists in reverse. They have lost their faith in the socialist faith for that reason, and for that reason primarily and fundamentally.

**They have lost their respect for the working class because for so long a period of time it can, and it has, and it does, lie dormant and stagnant and seems to be absolutely passive, immobilized in permanence. In other words, they have doomed it—this working class which has shown itself so capable of so many miracles in the past hundred and two hundred years of its struggle against the bourgeoisie and against oppression in general—doomed it to eternal servitude. That's why they are not Trotskyists; that's why they're not socialists; that's why they're not democrats; that's why they're not people with human integrity any longer.**

## The Pointed Question

Ask any of them point-blank (if you're on sufficiently good terms with them): *Do you believe that the working class can ever rule society and usher in a classless socialist regime? Do you believe that the working class has that capacity innate within it?* Not one of them, if he is honest, will admit agreeing with it. You will notice every one of them beginning to hedge and to hem and to haw and to talk about 25 other subjects—because in all of them the corrupt idea has taken sound and firm roots that the working class will always be oppressed and exploited by someone or another.

Look at Burnham and his "Machiavellians"—the whole theory is there, the whole snobbish bourgeois theory that goes back to feudalism and goes back to slavery before that: there have to be serfs, there have to be slaves, there have to be exploited workers, and the best they can hope for is that the rulers fight among themselves and that in the interstices of this fight they may be able to promote their own interests just a little bit without ever changing their exploited status.

**What is this at bottom but a variety of that notorious philosophy which the Stalinoid intellectuals and apologists used to whisper to us in justification of their support of the Kremlin: "You don't mean to say that you really believe that the workers can emancipate themselves, can themselves take power? . . . They need a strong hand over them. . . ."**

## Skeptics and Snobs

These people can't absorb the idea that the workers can free themselves. Take that diluted variety of these skeptics, the pro-war socialists (if you can call them socialists):

*We would be for a Third Camp, you see, if it existed. Show us a Third Camp and we would be the first ones to be for it—if it were big and powerful and had lots of dues-paying members. But there is no Third Camp now, so why be for it? But the minute it comes into being—we don't believe that will ever happen, of course, but if despite our skepticism it should come into being, against capitalism (which we are not really for) and against Stalinism (which we detest)—we will support it with all the power of speech and pen at our command. But until then allow us to be the snobs and careerists that we are.*

Those who swoon with delight at being accepted nowadays in respectable society (of which, alas, we are not a part) have lost all respect for themselves—that's what it is with the cynics, with the somewhat milder version, the skeptics, the climbers, the turncoats and the veterans who never saw combat in the class struggle and who nevertheless have the effrontery to live off pensions from the bourgeoisie to

day in various institutions reserved for them exclusively.

For us who have nothing in common with such people and want nothing in common with such people, in all their 57 schools, the 25th anniversary comes after a quarter century of defeats and setbacks, yes, but defeats and setbacks accumulated only because men and movements left the working class in the lurch.

## Forces of Regeneration

**But although it is silent so often, and silent for so long, and although it is disoriented, this proletariat—today's proletariat, or tomorrow's, like yesterday's—will outlast this trial as it will outlast its old leaders, and resume its iron march to socialist freedom. Our confidence in it, maintained these 25 years, is undiminished 25 years after we took up the banner of renewed faith in it and renewed willingness to learn from it, as well as to teach it what we know.**

For the man who lives for himself, alone like a clod of mud in a ditch, like a solitary animal in a savage forest, 25 years of dedication to socialism is as incomprehensible as it is unendurable. But we are, thank god, not like the clods of mud, the careerists and the opportunists, the philistines of all sorts and varieties who have specially strong fountains of strength in this last trench of world capitalism, the United States. We are people who have been intellectually and spiritually emancipated by the great philosophical and cultural revolution in thought that Marx began and Trotsky so richly expanded. We are the fortunate ones who are not resigned, and know that they need not resign ourselves, to the inevitability of advancing barbarism, to the decay and disintegration of society.

We know with scientific sureness that no reaction—no matter how strong at the moment, no matter how prolonged—can destroy that social force whose very conditions of existence force it into a revolutionary struggle against the conditions of its existence, the proletariat.

We know with scientific sureness that no matter how dark and powerful reaction may be at any given time, it not only generates but regenerates its gravedigger—that same proletariat, the only social force which class society has endowed with infinite capacity for recuperation from temporary defeat.

## To Walk Erect

**And we know with scientific sureness that the achievement of the fullest development of democracy, which is socialism, is in safe hands when entrusted to the proletariat and in safe hands only when it is in its charge, for it alone must have democracy for its existence and it alone can realize it in full by its irrepressible aspiration for socialism and its unceasing fight for it.**

For the man to whom the debasement and oppression of others is a mortal offense to himself, who cannot live as a free man while others are unfree, who understands that without resisting the decay of society there is no life worth living—for him the informed struggle against exploitation and social iniquity is the blood-stream of life. It is indispensable to the self-realization of humanity and therefore to the attainment of his own dignity. It is the mark of his respect for his fellow man, of his yearning to gain the respect of others, and therewith to assure his respect for himself.

For such men, and we count ourselves as such, these turbulent 25 years are a long episode that has given richer and stouter meaning to the moral life of all who passed through it with their loyalties unimpaired, and it is in this life, the life of freedom, that the founder of our contemporary movement, Leon Trotsky, was a startling example.

It is to the grand vindication of this life that lies ahead that we renew our bond tonight—the oldest and noblest bond in history, the bond that will be redeemed only on the day when the last chain has been struck from the body and mind of man, so that he may walk for the first time among his equals erect.

# Myth of FBI Broken — —

(Continued from page 1)

was not in the position of a clerk who had to do his boss's bidding.

In the second place, there was no formal reason why he had to testify. It is his official superior, Attorney General Brownell, who speaks for the Justice Department. There was only one reason why Hoover was trotted out in addition to his boss: that was to use the prestige of His Reverence as an instrument against the Democrats, who had built up this prestige when he was in their own stable.

Thirdly, Hoover's testimony was dishonestly and tendentiously formulated so as to stick the stileto into Truman's back. In his heavy reverent manner, the FBI head emphasized that he had not approved Truman's decision on White. He thus went out of his way to make it possible for the headlines to blare that he had blown up Truman's story. He gave only lip service to the claim that it was not his job to either approve or disapprove. If the latter claim were honest, then he could have equally stressed that he did not disapprove Truman's tactic.

### "VISHINSKY"

Fourthly, and consequently, this revered cop, who has liked to pose as a mere non-political "technician," ran into a howling contradiction which has somewhat dimmed the aureole about him. This technician, who testified that he never, never evaluates the hodge-podge of information that his snoops gather, simultaneously testified that he had made an evaluation on the case of White—an evaluation on which the administration was presumably supposed to act without his revealing or testing the sources of information or making them available for due process of law. There are some who have seen in this the public acknowledgment that the His Reverence is an unabashed two-faced and hypocritical hatchetman.

This performance is no doubt certain to increase the reverence in which this cop is held by the McCarthyites, the Republicans and their ilk. It has a silver lining, however. At the same time, and for the same reason, by Hoover's own act and the GOP's own strategy, the FBI has begun to lose its character as a privileged sanctuary which no one dare attack.

A liberal Washington columnist has gone so far as to refer to Hoover as a "Vishinsky." The publisher of the liberal N. Y.

Post columnizes on his "morality." Dorothy Schiff goes so far as to remember that—

"Curiously enough, one of the actors in the present drama—or farce might be a more accurate word—also played a prominent role in the post-World War I madness. J. Edgar Hoover . . . was given his first important assignment when he became 'Special Assistant' to A. Mitchell Palmer, the then attorney general. Remember the Palmer raids? . . ."

This lady hastens to add that "Mr. Hoover has, of course, redeemed himself in the years since" for has he not "done a wonderful job in catching gangsters and Communists"? The halo has been knicked a bit askew, over the right ear, but it is still there. . . .

Even timid liberals are beginning to recover from their amnesia about the role of this revered policeman. The police-state trends in the U. S. are not the creation of either J. Edgar Hoover or the FBI, but a political-police agency such as it represents in a very early stage inevitably had to become an instrument of all these trends. It would appear that self-stifled voices can now speak out more of the truth.

### WHO'S NEXT?

The police-state atmosphere has thickened with Hoover's intervention into the political fight over the Brownell red herings. And no one is safe. Even two years ago, perhaps not even the most pessimistic Cassandra might have dared to predict that so soon, so crudely, the person of ex-President Harry Truman himself would be involved in the witchhunt. Is it too early to see another figure dimly shadowed in the crystal ball, taking his stand in the dock? We mean Eisenhower himself.

Not too early to point out that powerful forces are looking precisely in this direction. At the same time that lunatic-fringe fascists, who amount to nothing, to be sure, are emboldened to distribute bloody calls for anti-Jewish pogroms in New York's garment center [see page 5], other people who are not lunatics at all, and who do amount to something, are emboldened too.

The Scripps-Howard Washington column, "Washington Calling," reports:

"Right-wing Republicans think they see their big chance to take over.

"They're privately gleeful over election results, think Eisenhower administration is staggering.

"Right-wingers are moving in from

two directions. . . . Both groups talk of running Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy for president in 1956.

"Strongest backer of a new 'American Party' is Col. Robert R. McCormick, Chicago Tribune publisher. Invitations have been sent out by Hamilton Fish . . . to a select group of anti-Eisenhower Republicans. . . . Same group was lukewarm to American Party idea last year at a similar meeting. . . . Now some, at least, feel time is right to entice right-wing Republicans and conservative Democrats into a new organization. . . ."

Westbrook Pegler has made no secret of the fact that he denounces Eisenhower as a "socialist," same as Truman.

How long will it be before it is found that Eisenhower is soft on Communists and suspiciously lax about cracking down on them?

### IKE ISN'T WILD BILL

At this is written, Eisenhower has just made a speech before the B'nai B'rith filled with astonishing language about the right of all men to face their accuser in the open light. The astonishment need not be due to surprise that the man harbors these democratic sentiments in his bosom. The question is: Does he know what's going on in the country, and does he know what he was saying?

Eisenhower is performing a doubtful service if, with whatever best of intentions, he makes such speeches to quiet the civil-libertarian sheriffs while his administration shoots men in the back (to use the metaphor he himself suggested by his reference to the Wild Bill Hickok tradition). On a somewhat higher level, the liberals who are honestly and even violently appalled by the lowering smog of police-state tactics are performing a doubtful service when they pull their punch against this menace for fear of the consequences, while they support the Fair-Dealers who have counter-punched only when their own hides are at stake.

From no high source has come the courage and passion for democracy (certainly not from Mr. Adlai Stevenson) that can turn the tide. There is only one source it can come from, the sector which is menaced more than any other as the tide engulfs one stronghold after another—the labor movement. Its leaders have been as cowardly and timid as their Fair-Deal mentors, by and large and up to now, but it will have to fight back, or else drown.

# U.S. Trend Alarms the World—

(Continued from page 1)

can people, they have a healthy instinct about what is up. They have seen it happen before in other countries, and it has never led to anything but grief.

### WHO'S 'MYOPIC'?

In a special dispatch to the New York Times of November 14, Harold Callender, writing from Paris, describes the impressions of "most educated Europeans." The latter feel that:

Attorney General Brownell reopened the White case from partisan political motives, and in so doing "adopted methods similar to those of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy . . . who is now widely known in Europe.

"That Mr. Brownell convicted Mr. White of espionage without a trial by any court and merely on the unpublished testimony of anonymous policemen. . . . That the traditional assumption that every man is innocent until proved guilty no longer fully applies in the United States.

"That anyone accused of being a Communist or a friend of Communists may be publicly classed as a Soviet agent until he proves his innocence. That the traditional right of trial by jury is considered superfluous in cases of alleged Communists or their associates, with trial by the FBI or by congressional committees being regarded as sufficient to deprive them of their jobs and their reputations.

"That while the legislative and executive branches of the government assume judicial functions, the fear of being labeled a Communist checks in practice the liberties enshrined in the Bill of Rights."

Callender ends this summary of European reactions to the White case by saying:

"Such is the way the American scene looks to the always somewhat myopic eyes of Europeans. They rarely fail to see the defects of American political life, and American propaganda has been unable

to reply by saying much about McCarthyism.

"Therefore there seems a golden opportunity for the United States Information Agency to offset these unfavorable views by showing the world that there is lots of democracy left in the United States."

We are happy that there is lots of it left, but what disturbs us, as well as the "myopic" Europeans, is that so much of it has been whittled away. And it is apparently obvious to Callender that the Information Agency will not be able to take advantage of its "golden opportunity" just because the men who direct it either share McCarthy's views or are so scared of him that they would never dare to point to the anti-McCarthyite sentiment in the country.

### CANADA'S ATTITUDE

Nor will the Information Agency find much to say, in counteracting foreign opinions, about the strong-arm pressure that the government has been applying to Canada in connection with the White case. Here is one foreign government which has found itself drawn into the middle of the White-Truman scandal—drawn in by the unilateral action of the Republican witchhunters in course of prosecuting their domestic partisan witchhunt.

Canada has resented the open publication by the GOP officials of correspondence with it, of the release of FBI reports on opinions of Canadian government representatives on White; it resents the implications in Washington's demand that Gouzenko be questioned by the congressional red-hunters, as if the Canadians had not done a responsible job and have to be supplemented by American McCarthyites. And Canada has made no bones about its attitude.

Like the European nations, Canada no doubt is disquieted by the growth of ram-paging Republican McCarthyism not (or

not merely) because of the affront which this spectacle gives its democratic sentiments, but especially because of the fears and doubts which the whole show arouses about the future course of American FOREIGN policy. It is well known that these nations (rightists as well as leftists) fear that the American colossus, to which they feel subordinated, is all too ready to embark on an adventurist course in the world in its hysterical fright before the threat of Russian Stalinism, and they fear that the political climate being intensified now will only push further in this direction.

### FEAR U.S. COURSE

But that does not end the matter. The peoples of these nations feel that they are caught between the two great powers, America and Russia, between the capitalist and Stalinist socio-economic systems. As they see American politics plunging in an ever-more reactionary and irresponsible course, it cannot help but have the effect of strengthening the appeal of the Stalinist system for them. And this feeling is reinforced if they do not detect in America powerful social forces which are combating the drift, which are swimming against the stream.

That they do not see such forces is not their fault. The labor movement, from which they would tend to expect the most powerful resistance, rails against the Republican administration's domestic policies, but supports its foreign policy, and on the question of civil liberties usually takes a timid stand in practice, where it counts. In their own organizations, most unions tend to fight Stalinism in pretty much the same way as does the government. And even where they do not, they remain tied to the politics of the Democratic Party, which is better only in degree (and a slight one at that) on these matters than are the Republicans.

The drift to reaction continues, but the

## The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION —  
\$2 a year does it!

final word is yet far from having been said. The American labor movement is still intact, and the workers themselves have been lulled into a false feeling of economic security on the one hand and an apathetic attitude toward the attack on civil liberties on the other. They have not been defeated in political struggle; they have not even entered the political arena on their own behalf as yet.

But it would be a major mistake to believe that this situation will go on indefinitely. It is already crystal-clear that the attack which has been launched against the Stalinists is aimed, in the long run, at a far more important target on the domestic scene. That target is the American working class. Once it feels the blow which is being prepared for it, its reaction will be powerful. Even "myopic" Americans will have their vision corrected when this takes place.