

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 25, 1954

FIVE CENTS

**VIEWS OF THE DEMOCRATIC
OPPOSITION IN YUGOSLAVIA**
Text of Article by Milovan Djilas

... page 6

The Political Struggle in Italy

... page 7

Auto Reflects the Economy

... page 2

Dulles' Announcement Means

No 'Little' Wars—Atom War or Nothing—As Washington Adopts 'Preventive War' Line

By GORDON HASKELL

The American government's military policy has been set, and announced to the world: the United States will not fight any more "little wars." From now on it is virtually either an atomic World War III, or nothing.

The American armed forces are to be reorganized on the basis of this strategy, to the extent that it will be extremely difficult for the government to revise it in the future. The dim hope, held by many people in this country as well as in the rest of the world that even if World War III should come the great powers will be restricted from using atomic warfare, as they were from using poison gas in World War II, is fading fast.

The formal announcement of the new

policy was made by Secretary of State Dulles in a speech delivered on January 12. In brief, it was outlined as follows. "Local defenses" will be maintained. But they must be "reinforced by the further deterrent of massive retaliatory power. . . . The way to deter aggression is for the free community to be willing and able to respond vigorously at places and with means of its own choosing."

"Retaliatory power" means the power to attack as distinct from the power to defend. The strategy which is indicated, the reorganization of the military forces which is indicated, is an aggressive strategy.

In order to gauge the effect which this new policy announcement produces among the European peoples—and among the peoples behind the Iron Curtain—one need only think of this: What would be the reaction here if Russia had announced that it was reorienting its whole foreign policy and military organization along the lines of preparing for aggressive warfare?

The Dulles announcement also endorses the heart of the idea of "preventive war." It was scarcely a couple of years ago that even a whisper (in public) about the idea of making preventive war was greeted from almost every corner with denunciation, indeed as next to insane. Now its central thought is adopted as the policy of the land. So far have we traveled.

Although the United States will continue to foster the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Defense Community, without the rearmament of Western Germany both these schemes "are in jeopardy." "Distrust between France and Germany is inflammable, and

already Communist agents are looking to it as a means for international arson."

This is a polite way of indicating that unless France changes her attitude toward German rearmament, the basic concept of NATO may be permitted to wither on the vine; and that the vast majority of Frenchmen, who oppose German rearmament, are being influenced by "Communist agents."

FANCY TALK

Side by side with the new military policy, Dulles announced that this government is definitely going to curtail, if not cut off, all economic aid to other countries. "Broadly speaking," he said, "foreign budgetary aid is being limited to situations where it clearly contributes to military strength."

But surely even this administration realizes that Stalinism is not solely a military danger, that it has a social content as well? Surely there must be some indication of a program by which to meet Stalinism in the political arena, once its military expansionism has been contained by the threat that the moment a Russian or Chinese soldier crosses the present frontiers of Stalinist-held territory the H-bomb may be dropped on Moscow?

Yes, the rest of the speech does contain some reference to the political weapons to be used by the United States. These are "the richness—spiritual, intellectual and material—that freedom can produce and the irresistible attraction it then sets up. That is why we do not plan ourselves to shackle freedom to preserve freedom. We intend that our conduct and example shall continue, as in the past, to show all men how good can be the fruits of freedom." And there was more along the same lines.

All of it, all that could be called social or political, was in the realm of fancy

(Turn to last page)



CIO Union Goes Along With GE's Industrial McCarthyism

By BEN HALL

The one-man safari came to Boston to hunt out spies. Joe McCarthy, senator and subcommittee, didn't turn any up but he tracked down several members of the Harvard faculty and then announced a spy probe of the General Electric plant at Lynn, Mass., on the eve of an NLRB election between the CIO electrical workers' union (IUE-CIO) and the rival Stalinist-controlled UE.

No spies were probed there either but McCarthy was surprised and delighted to discover a former Harvard Law School student among UE supporters in the factory. But more important, he won another small-scale victory.

GE President Ralph Cordiner hastened to announce a new company policy just in time to receive McCarthy's congratulations. From now on, he said, all Communists would be discharged; those who refused to testify before courts or committees on the grounds of the Fifth Amendment would be suspended from their jobs for 90 days and then fired if they persisted in their refusal.

This decree was a pure-and-simple denial of the right to work on political grounds unqualified by references to "secret" or "confidential" projects. McCarthy turned over to the company the names of witnesses who invoked the Fifth Amendment and they were fired or suspended.

What makes this case more than a routine example of the rise of McCarthy is the fact that the Lynn GE plant has been under contract with the IUE-CIO since 1950.

The union had a chance to stand up openly and clearly for democracy in action; everyone is for his own democratic rights; but in this case the union had the duty of defending the democratic rights of its critics, rivals and opponents. It failed.

(Turn to last page)

Ever since the IUE-CIO won the plant three years ago, it faced a substantial minority opposition from the old UE. In NLRB elections on December 10, 1953, the IUE received 6,438 votes. But its defeated UE rival piled up 5,098 votes, an astounding achievement in the face of enormous pressure against it. The victims of the new GE policy are invariably members or supporters of the UE.

The IUE has charged, in the past, that the General Electric Company was encouraging the UE in its plants because the Stalinist-dominated union was ready to make economic concessions to it. The company was ready to keep a Communist-controlled union in its plants, said the IUE, to divide the workers and to coin a few extra profit-dollars.

FORGOTTEN WORDS

But the new General Electric policy is not designed to encourage unionism; least of all does it seek to replace a soft union bargaining policy by a harder and less compromising one. It is purely and simply an application of McCarthyism to factory life. The owners of industry utilize their control over jobs and their disposition over a man's livelihood to impose political conditions on the right to work. It is anti-democracy in action.

The CIO, in general terms, has expressed itself on such questions. One convention denounced the Smith Act and the prosecution of Communist Party leaders under its provisions. Every convention, every labor speech excoriates McCarthy. The UAW, in its official policy, defends the right of Stalinists to work in auto plants and has instructed local unions, in some cases, to defend Stalinists against company discharge. The IUE, in this case, had the opportunity to show in action its own readiness to defend civil liberties.

The Socialist Alternative To the Bricker Amendment

By PHILIP COBEN

The hottest potato in Congressional politics right now is not any item presented in Eisenhower's legislative program—the most important items of which seem to be due for a spell on ice—but an attack leveled against Eisenhower by the dinosaurian wing of his own party. It is the right-wing front which has assembled around the Bricker amendment (a proposed constitutional amendment) designed to chop down the present powers of the president in the handling of foreign policy, particularly treaties.

From the socialist point of view it is a slightly more complicated problem than the usual way it is being debated would show. To the Bricker amendment, for example, liberals by and large are counterposing the retention of the presidential powers unchanged. We do not think genu-

ine democrats can line up with either of these two sides.

The Bricker amendment sets an objective which is, at least, in part, definitely progressive—and proposes a way of meeting this objective which is clearly reactionary, for the most part.

The problem which is raised by the Bricker amendment is the problem of democratizing the control over foreign policy which is now exercised so autonomously by the president. But the character of this problem which it raises should not be confused with the specific proposal that it makes.

"STATES' RIGHTS"

The reactionary nature of the Bricker amendment is based upon "states' rights." At present, according to the Constitution, a treaty made by the U. S.

(Turn to last page)

The Auto Industry Reflects the Economy

Forced Optimism and Official Faith in Capitalism Isn't Lifting the Gathering Gloom

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Jan. 17—From every sign available, the indications are that the generally accepted views about a "decline," "re-adjustment" or "orthodox recession" have been on the optimistic side, and nowhere does this point become clearer than in an appraisal of the status of the auto industry in 1954—the so-called bellwether of American prosperity.

Only last week, the Michigan Employment Security Commission admitted that its previous figures and estimates on unemployment had been off. At least 107,000 were unemployed in Detroit alone by January 1, 1954, and around 167,000 in Michigan, as compared to a total estimated at 125,000 for Michigan, when the MESC gave its December statement.

The national CIO, through Emil Rieve, easily exposed the inadequacy and inaccuracy of the Department of Commerce figure of 1,800,000 unemployed in December. The actual number is close to 3,200,000.

The predicted upturn in steel production simply isn't taking place, and one reason is that this year the auto industry is buying only two tons of steel for every three they obtained last year. This is a significant figure not only because it suggests that steel production isn't going to get its usual uplift from auto purchasing, but also for what it says about auto production.

DANGER SIGNS

Even with the cutback in steel purchases, and by using up their steel inventory, the auto industry, notably Ford and General Motors, is producing at a high rate, and car production for the first quarter will be at least 1,500,000. This occurs with a large part of the auto labor force unemployed!—and with some unused plant capacity remaining.

Meanwhile, Chrysler continues to limp along, Nash and Hudson merge to keep from going under, and Briggs recently was swallowed by Chrysler.

Another reflection of the danger signs in the auto industry came from the 37th annual convention of the National Automobile Dealers Association. Buried deep in the stories of the pep-talks made by prominent businessmen and industrialists was this item: "The most frequent topics were dealers' protests against over-production, bootlegging of new cars, factory coercion and a general uncertainty about sales of new and used cars in 1954."

In reply to this, the public statements of auto industry officials, as contained in the yearly financial reviews and forecasts by Detroit's daily papers, put the whole problem as one reduced to "salesmanship."

SAVINGS MYTH

Insofar as they dare treat of basic economic factors, the auto industry economists—and they are not paid to tell sales forces that there will be less sales in 1954—fall back on two old saws: There are 17,000,000 pre-war cars which are bound to be replaced, and America has over \$200,000,000,000 in savings. Checking the long unemployment lines in Detroit will furnish the answer to the purchasing power of those individuals with the pre-war cars. The unemployed are worried about food and rent, not their jalopies.

As for the myth about America's savings—and this has been a key point in the economic prognosis of such respectable institutions as the National City Bank in its monthly economic bulletin—this was thoroughly exploded by researchers who have looked into the subject.

In the New York Herald Tribune of January 10, the question is put this way: "This examination indicates for one thing that personal savings in the post-war years have, in general, been more than offset by the concurrent rise in personal debt, short-term debt and mortgage. In other words, the net liquid position of the average person has deteriorated, not improved. Further, it would seem that this decrease in liquidity applies more particularly to the 'mass markets,' represented by lower and middle income brackets."

The Tribune story is based on the work of Harold B. Dorsey, of the Argus Research Corporation, who has studied this and has exposed all the fake interpretations and yardsticks used to measure "savings."

The heart of his analysis shows that while personal liquid savings increased from 1946 to 1952 by \$26,000,000,000,

short-term personal debt increased by \$30,000,000,000 and personal mortgage debt was increased by \$44,000,000,000. This is quite different from a \$200,000,000,000 "savings" figure which includes insurance policies, equities in homes, and other "frozen" assets (and liabilities).

All of this indicates for at least one major industry—the auto industry—that a 25 per cent reduction in production and sales in the year 1954 is most probable, and private industry estimates admit this, in spite of public pep-talks to the contrary.

Here, then, is the over-all outlook for the auto industry: Something around 4,000,000 cars and 1,000,000 trucks in 1954—and a good profit can be made on this kind of production, especially with the excess profits tax out of the picture. But this means at least 250,000 auto workers unemployed for around six months, and a half a worker unemployed in a "feeder" industry for every unemployed auto worker.

These are just some of the economic factors that caused the economists at the recent American Statistical Convention to vote unanimously that an "orthodox recession" was in the offing.

For no other industry in America can present any better outlook than the auto industry.

SETTING UP STATISTICS

Perhaps the orthodox viewpoint is expressed best by Leo Cherne, executive director of the Research Institute of America, who prognosticates a drop in over-all output by 3 to 5 per cent, which would signify 4,000,000 unemployed by the fall (using, however, the absurdly low figure of 1,800,000 unemployed now as his base). After all, if the New York Times can (as it did recently) refer to the highest unemployed figure during the great depression as 11,000,000, where can one expect to get honest statistics?

What is alarming is the failure of any of the orthodox economists to take into account the simple fact that if employment were to remain relatively equal to 1953, the industrial output would have to increase by at least 10 per cent over 1953. (Example: the auto industry would have to produce about 7,000,000 cars and 1,000,000 trucks to keep all auto workers employed all-year—less a brief dip for model changeover.)

Nor do these economists (most of

whom are Republicans and enjoy a very high standard of living, according to the N. Y. Times) say anything about their own classic views on the operation of capitalism. For have they not taught and preached that the historical path of capitalism is boom, recession, depression and revival? And didn't America have major depressions roughly every ten years until World War II?

Business Week in the current issue points out that the present character of American capitalism is so different from that discussed by Adam Smith that economists are hard put to talk about it in orthodox terms. Of course, there is a great deal of truth to this, and that is why in the past twenty years capitalism has not followed a very orthodox path. The key to the answer today has been the introduction into capitalism of the phenomenon called the Permanent War Economy. It has explained up to now what has happened to American capitalism.

And like so many Marxist insights, these will be accepted in respectable circles under the guise of a variation of John Maynard Keynes' theories, a sort of permanent pump-priming via multiplex war expenditures.

ECONOMIC PLAGUES

But even here, an orthodox economist arises to challenge an optimistic outlook. Colin Clark warns of a depression in America unless a super-New Deal economic program is pumped into the economy, and quickly. Actually, his views are no different from those of the pontifical and orthodox financial editor of the New York Times, John Forrest, who ended his hosannas of praise for the superb achievements of American capitalism in 1953 with the deadly remark that all signs of a recession or depression are present to disturb the 1954 outlook.

Clark's proposals include: (1) increasing exports; (2) expanding government expenditures, (3) reducing taxes, (4) satisfying the demand for construction and producers goods, and (5) creating easier credit.

Among other difficulties which face the achievement of this program is the time-lag between political action and economic trends which wait for no man or political party.

The effects and counter-effects of the current recession on European, and above all English, capitalism, are alarming. In the modest decline of 1949 in America, English exports to the U. S. fell 21 per cent in value, and created enormous difficulties for the British.

Domestically, America is also plagued by a fantastically high inventory of over \$46,000,000,000, which acts to produce more and more caution among businessmen. Banks and credit houses are tighten-

ing up on auto dealers, for example, and the squeeze already is causing an increasing number of failures among dealers.

As if the complicated structure of American capitalism, its permanent war economy, and its truly gigantic over-all activity were not enough to plague the orthodox economists and destroy the myth of "pure" capitalism based on "free enterprise," new and disturbing factors have arisen to bother them further.

The advent of atomic energy, especially as applied to the military field, is forcing a revision of routine outlooks and the prospects of the war economy. A continuation of the cold war adds another unforeseen factor.

CAN AN UPSWING COME?

No matter how much the government may want to pump-prime the economy with increasing military expenditures, the trend is downward; and for each billion dollars reduced in the war budget, between 100,000 to 200,000 persons are unemployed. The steel industry can hardly expect more orders for battleships when the government is putting over 50 in mothballs because there just isn't any use for them now, and because the development of atomic weapons makes them more and more obsolete.

The auto industry just received the news that all truck orders end on July 1, 1954. There just isn't any use for them. As C. E. Wilson said last week, military expenditures were made in recent years as if all-out war was imminent, and purchases were made on a war basis. Tanks, artillery, small arms, planes, etc. all had production goals based on immediate, threatening war. Even a continuation of the present cut-back program will produce many obsolete, useless war materials, as absurd economically as the much ridiculed "leaf-raking" of the New Deal days. The fantastic growth in the rate of production of atomic weapons suggests that in a few more years, this too will reach a point of diminishing returns and value.

How, then, will America go into an upswing? On this the orthodox economists at present are very silent. When President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers make their annual report on January 28, there will be an official view stated on these problems by the best brains among orthodox economists. If it is to make any economic sense, it will be a thinly disguised plan for a super-New Deal, whose proposals will stagger the imagination of the politically obtuse administration in control in Washington.

If it reflects blind optimism and faith in capitalism, based on looking backward, such as is expressed so often by high administration spokesmen, then Colin Clark may be nearer right than anyone thinks.

ACLU Backs Three Cases Challenging Witchhunt on Ground of 1st Amendment

(ACLU Release)

The American Civil Liberties Union announced on January 11 its support of three cases challenging, on First Amendment grounds, the power of congressional investigating committees to ask questions concerning political beliefs and associations.

Patrick Murphy Malin, ACLU's executive director, made public on the eve of the Supreme Court's scheduled argument in the Julius Emspak case, the "friend-of-the-court" brief filed with the high court festing the House Un-American Activities Committee right to question the United Electrical Workers Union official about his alleged affiliations with the Communist Party and Communist organizations and his union associates. The case is the first ever heard by the Supreme Court concerning the House committee's power in the area of political associations.

Malin also disclosed that the ACLU will support the cases of authors Harvey O'Connor and Corliss Lamont, who refused to answer questions raised by McCarthy's subcommittee involving alleged Communist sympathies and associations. The questioning of O'Connor took place last summer during McCarthy's probe of the State Department's overseas libraries. Lamont was questioned last fall about his connection with an official army

pamphlet on Soviet Siberia.

"The Union is backing Lamont and O'Connor," Malin said, "because under the free speech, press, and association protection of the First Amendment it believes it was improper for the McCarthy committee to question them, as authors

of books used by the government, concerning their political associations or those of others who wrote such books, either because of the limited scope of the committee's function or its impact on freedom of expression, or both.

"Such questions are outside the range of the committee's function of investigating government economy and efficiency. To refuse to answer under the First Amendment is a wholly proper challenge to questions concerning political associations. The pendulum has swung far too much against the First Amendment in congressional investigations, resulting in growing attacks on free speech and association, the principles which are the core of democracy and the primary need of a free democratic society."

O'Connor has been indicted by a federal grand jury for contempt of Congress, but his trial has been postponed until after the Supreme Court rules in the Emspak case. The McCarthy subcommittee has recommended citation of Lamont, but the Senate has not yet acted.

EMSPAK CASE

The trio of cases, Malin said, were especially significant because they represented a sharp departure from the present practice of witnesses claiming the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-

(Continued on page 3)

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of
LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-52.....\$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

LONDON LETTER

Guerrilla Strikes in Britain

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Jan. 13—A full-scale strike in any industry is a major political move in Britain. The Electrical Trades Unions have been threatening to strike for some time, to force the National Federated Electrical Association to meet their demands for higher wages for 40,000 workers in the industry.

Walter Stevens, the secretary of the Stalinist-controlled ETU, is a clever fellow. He has discovered a way of bringing pressure to bear on the employers without the inconvenience to the public which a full-scale strike would incur. His method is to stage a large number of "guerrilla" strikes in different parts of the country.

Originally it was planned to announce the strikes, but when it was clear that the employers would be able to minimize their effect, it was decided to hold them without warning. This would bring the maximum pressure to bear on employers in different parts of the country at different times.

The National Federated Electrical Association said it would retaliate by locking out the workers for one day for each day they struck; in this way the employers' reprisal would be effective only in those plants which struck, when they did.

Last Monday about 80 workers in four centers came out. Immediately, Director Fenwill of the NFEA declared that the strikes had failed, while Stevens said that all the strikes planned had taken place. He added that it was planned to bring out altogether 2000 key men in 20 plants. Among many places where strikes were to occur were atomic research departments, the BBC, RAF establishments, etc. Stevens promised to reimburse strikers from union funds and from a special strike fund which had been created for the purpose.

TUG O' WAR

Only in one place, Scunthorpe, did strike arrangements go awry. On Friday a meeting of 260 workers voted against the "guerrilla" strike, and did not come out on Monday. Frank Foulkes, president of the ETU, went straight down to Scunthorpe. At a meeting from which the press was excluded he asked for their support.

He pointed out that it was not fair to the other workers, and ended by threatening them with disciplinary action if they did not join in. There was some booing and shouts of "undemocratic" as Foulkes left the meeting.

Foulkes' admonitions were effective and 110 men at Scunthorpe and 250 elsewhere came out on strike on Tuesday at 12 centers. Stevens described this as a 100 per cent turnout.

The next move came from the employers. They announced that they would not take reprisals as they had previously intended. They said that most of the men had come out because the union had threatened to take away their cards. In an attempt to gain the workers' sympathy, they stated that retaliation by lockout would only cause further hardship to the unwilling workers.

So far both sides have remained adamant. It is yet to be seen if the ETU can bring sufficient pressure to bear on the employers to force their hand.

ENGINEERS' CASE

On another front in the industrial battle, fighting has settled down to verbal skirmishes.

Jack Tanner, representing the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, and director Macarty of the Engineering Employers Federation have joined battle before Lord Justice Morris on the issue of whether or not the engineers are entitled to a 15 per cent rise in wages.

Tanner pointed to three clear reasons for the demand for increased wages: (1) a rise in the cost of living; (2) increased productivity; (3) the large and continuous rise in profits. The unions wanted a percentage rise in wages so that they could keep the wage differentials in the industry.

Tanner contended that it was dishonest to say that wages had gone up more than the standard of living since January 1948. If they went back a little farther they would find that productivity had gone up by 50 per cent since 1946 without a commensurate rise in wages. He challenged the figure on average wages given in the employers' statement, as misleading.

In 1952 company reserves had risen to double their issued capital. Between 1947 and 1951 gross profits of all engineering, shipbuilding and electrical goods had doubled. A 15 per cent rise in wages which the workers wanted would add only 2½ per cent to the costs, and Tanner was quite sure that this would not outprice British exports from the markets, as the employers maintained.

The workers' demands would cost the employers \$200 million a year more. Surely that was not excessive.

The employers' case, given by Macarty, carefully avoided any reference to their profits, except to say that a large part was retained for financing future operations—which avoids income tax—and that profits tax is high anyhow.

It will be interesting to see to what conclusions the Tribunal arrives.

permitted investigation; and (3) the particular questioning of Emspak violated his First Amendment rights.

In presenting its views, the ACLU said the Communist Party is "distinctively and essentially characterized by both extreme anti-democratic doctrine and practice, and by obedience to the government of the Soviet Union, a despotic power which dominates a world-wide revolutionary movement unprecedentedly threatening the national independence and individual civil liberties of all other countries. . . . We recognize that Congress has a right to investigate this menace with a view to formulating appropriate legislation, but we are opposed to any tendency by which American democracy might, in combating this menace, pay the supreme compliment of imitation of Communist tyranny by the abridgment of freedom of speech, press, and association.

FREE SPEECH ARGUMENT

"If the First Amendment is a restriction upon congressional inquiry," the brief states, "and no one can doubt that it is—for Congress cannot by inquiry accomplish that which it is forbidden to do by legislation—then it is clear that an inquiry directed toward propaganda, which is . . . nothing more than the exercise of free speech, is the most flagrant violation of the First Amendment which is possible by inquiry. For it takes courage in these days to exercise the right to speak freely, when one knows that—apart from the social consequences following in this day and age from voicing unpopular ideas—any expression of speech, or any association relevant to the exercise of free speech, may enable a

Tunisian Labor Blasts France's Continuing Exploitation of Colonies

By A. GIACOMETTI

On the occasion of the New Year, the Tunisian General Workers Union (UGTT) issued a proclamation to its members calling for the prosecution of the struggle for democracy and for national independence.

The proclamation contains five points. The first four sum up the past two years in the following manner: in spite of the terror regime of the administration of General de Hautecloque, under which the general secretary of the UGTT, Ferhat Hached, was assassinated, and under which numerous militants of the UGTT were murdered, imprisoned, exiled, dismissed from their jobs and put in concentration camps, the organization has grown in numbers and in strength. It has now become a social force which cannot be destroyed. In collaboration with the Int'l Confed. of Free Trade Unions, the UGTT has sought a peaceful and just solution to the problem of Tunisian-French relations. These efforts have been disregarded and suppressed by the Resident-General and his administration, who preferred to seek their solutions in violence and in terrorism.

CONDITIONS WORSE

The fifth point of the resolution is an outline of the present situation and of the course of action the UGTT intends to follow. It says:

"The deplorable failure of De Hautecloque's 'reforms' and of the policy of violence he unsuccessfully tried to impose on the Tunisian people and the Tunisian workers, have forced those responsible to seek out another course. A new Resident-General was appointed last September [Pierre Voizard, see LA of Aug. 5—A. G.] who follows a 'policy of conciliation.'

"If noticeable and real efforts have been made to change the political climate of the country (abolition of censorship, numerous exiles allowed to return to their homes, punitive expeditions and summary executions stopped) this policy of conciliation has not yet erased the injustices and the crimes of the preceding period. There still are patriots and trade-unionists in prison, in concentration camps or under forced residence. Hundreds of workers are still unemployed after the layoffs of April 1952. Reactionary and anti-labor administrators still occupy their functions,

dream of a past of violence and inhibit normal trade-union activity. Political and social immobilism still continues to be the watchword of the higher spheres of government. The large concession-holding companies continue massive layoffs. An anarchical financial and economical policy is still pursued at the expense of the working masses. The condition of the workers is worsening from day to day under the indifferent eye of the public powers.

"Thus the Tunisian problem, in its political and social aspects, remains posed as before. It is only after work on its solution has begun, after a favorable climate is prepared, that a policy of conciliation can become meaningful and acquire a real content. This is what we have been awaiting for three months now.

"However, even though the 'conciliatory phase' has so far remained without any real content, it still disturbs the die-hard representatives of colonial dictatorship and of social reaction. Already certain symptoms indicate that a crude maneuver is being prepared: a handful of puppets from the municipal and caidal assemblies are trying to give life to those organisms which have been unanimously rejected by the people. On the other hand, a campaign of agitation has been started, especially by financial powers, the real source of which is easy to guess, to persuade public opinion that all difficulties come from the absence of a budgetary assembly. The privileged and the colonialists thus try to divert the 'conciliation' toward illusory solutions which can only serve their own interests. This diversionary maneuver tends to reduce the Tunisian problem either to the absence of a budgetary assembly, or to confuse the issues by supporting anti-democratic organisms and by putting forward the need for a budgetary assembly at the expense of the other democratic institutions demanded by the country. But this maneuver will not mislead the working class.

"WE WILL NOT REST"

"Tunisian workers, 'Your exploiters have been unsuccessful with Mr. de Hautecloque's policy of violence. You will not allow them to succeed any better in their attempt to divert the present policy of conciliation toward solutions conforming to their interests alone, instead of directing it toward the solutions that you demand and that justice demands. You have maintained, and the ICFTU has maintained with you—and all democrats and democratic nations of the world have recognized it—that the necessary condition for the solution of your social problems is the solution of the political problems of this country. You know, and nothing can deter you from this knowledge, that your duty is to struggle relentlessly until the present political regime, conceived for your exploitation and for your enslavement, is overthrown and replaced by a truly democratic, national and free regime. You will not be misled by patchwork or by diversions.

"You will maintain by your actions in this new trade-union year, as you have in the preceding years, that you demand real satisfaction of your social and national demands, that you will not rest until the Tunisian people is granted its right to national independence and to the free administration of its own interests, by means of a homogenous national government, responsible to a Tunisian national assembly democratically elected by universal suffrage, and by means of a Tunisian administration returned to Tunisian functions."

The proclamation ends by stating that the UGTT will support any loyal and courageous policy by the French authorities that would lead toward a real solution of the Tunisian problem, and that it will fight relentlessly any attempts to perpetuate the present regime.

ACLU Backs Three Cases — —

(Continued from page 2)

incrimination in appearing before Congressional committees. Emspak, he noted, did involve the Fifth Amendment, but major interest has been focused on the First Amendment question because the Supreme Court will review this point as well.

The ACLU's brief in the Emspak case stressed three points: (1) the First Amendment violation of free speech inherent in the House committee's mandate solely to investigate propaganda; (2) its admitted purpose to "expose Communism" departed from its mandate and constitutionally

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

Read the

NEW INTERNATIONAL

America's leading Marxist review

YOU and SCIENCE

PSYCHIATRY IN THE SERVICE OF PROFIT

By CARL DARTON

Factory workers daily see in their own experience the manner in which the physical sciences have been transformed into the technologies of the mass-production industries. But not so apparent is the utilization of the social sciences by the industrial owners and managers to increase their profits.

This is a development of the past twenty years; whereas formerly practically all social scientists, such as psychologists, socialists, economists and statisticians, were college teachers, it is estimated that now nearly half of these professionals are in industry, on the management "team." The activities of the economists and statisticians have become so commonplace that even the unions are using them in self-defense.

Less familiar is the work of the psychologists and sociologists in industry. Very new is the practice of "Industrial Mental Hygiene" by professional psychiatrists to increase production efficiency. Industry has been reluctant to talk about its psychiatric program but the efforts of such companies as American Cyanamid and DuPont were described in the *Chemical and Engineering News* of several months ago. We quote from an article by J. W. Irwin, who is a "Public and Industrial Relations Counsellor to Management":

"Purpose of the DuPont program is to increase the efficiency of its professional staff on the premise that the helping of professional men and women in straightening out their emotional problems is as important to efficient industrial output as seeing to it that they are provided with the best available equipment and tools."

"The old bugaboo of the front office that technical and scientific people cannot work under the gun and meet rigid deadlines fell by the roadside in a group of 160 DuPont research workers who were required to function under specific work schedules for completion of their assignments. Their performance was almost doubled."

TRY WAGE-THERAPY!

It is apparent that speedup under the not so subtle prodding of the psychiatrist has caught up with the industrial scientists themselves. The factory worker likewise has not escaped. The same article quoted above also describes the report of Dr. William Menninger titled "Men, Machines and Mental Health." Following are some very illuminating excerpts:

"What are some of the results of maladjustment as they must be apparent to every management engineer, supervisor and executive? When I say maladjustment, I refer to the type of individual who is a perennial trouble-maker, to the gold-brickers, to the individual who can't give or take orders, to the absentee, the undependable worker, the suspicious worker."

"We must also take into account, when we are talking of the mental health of the worker, the well-known fact that even for us and all our friends, 50 per cent of the visits we make to a physician

complaining about our hearts, our heads, or our stomachs, are fundamentally emotional in origin, even though reflected in the mirrors of our bodies."

"In considering the incidence of maladjustment that is revealed in the high percentages of absenteeism and turnover, and in strikes and other symptoms of employee discontent: Obviously the direct effect of the maladjusted person, no matter where he is—in home, factory, or store—can be damaging. We know that an emotionally disturbed employee can mess up his whole department like the proverbial single rotten apple in the barrel, and that the cost of such a person can hardly be estimated. We know that mental health means money in the pocket of industry."

The learned doctors do not dare to hint at the therapeutic effect that a guaranteed annual wage would have upon workers' mental and physical health. Such advances will have to be fought for by the workers themselves without benefit of the social scientists.

We do not predict that many militant unionists will be made into compliant company men by psychiatry, but production and profits figures show that such innovations in "scientific management" pay off—for the bosses.

Socialists and class-conscious workers need realize that present-day management techniques no longer rely on "Taylorism" alone to speed production, to increase output and profits. Streamlined personnel departments under the suave leadership of "Directors of Industrial Relations" have in many industries, temporarily at least, replaced the anti-union goon squads. Though stop-watch technicians are still active they are kept in the background while the gowned doctors of the social sciences endeavor to promote harmony and cooperation—for profits. Under whatever name, however, the speedup is still with us.

BOOKS and Ideas

Such Was Orwell's Faith

SUCH, SUCH WERE THE JOYS, by George Orwell.—Harcourt, Brace & Co., 230 pp. \$3.50.

By GABRIEL GERSH

In an age when democracy and socialism have been abused and perverted, George Orwell reasserted their true values more than any other contemporary writer. Emerging from his writing was the portrait of an intelligent and sensitive being who keenly understood the totalitarian catastrophe into which the world is drifting. What distinguished Orwell was his sense of outrage against injustice and the sincerity of his political beliefs.

Soon after the British Labor Party achieved power in 1945, the barren outlook of what Alex Comfort once called "Bevinocracy" (referring to the late Ernest Bevin) had created a gap between the Labor movement and those writers who regarded themselves as left-wing. The marked irritation of these writers with the Labor Party had been due partly to the philistinism that had arisen in government circles and partly to their disappointment with the Labor Party's failure to launch a cultural revival or a new cultural movement that would keep pace with its political and economic achievements.

If Orwell, however, had the imaginative courage not to let himself be repelled by the aggressive philistinism of some of the chief Labor leaders, this was no accident. His stand derived from the fact that his own left-wing views were sincere and passionate, the result of a long and hard struggle to link himself with the British radical tradition that stretches from Tom Paine to the Bevanites of today.

The second aspect of Orwell's honesty was his readiness to remain always aware that today, as he put it, there was "no such thing as keeping out of politics." Certain critics have deplored his preoccupation with political polemic. He

was conscious of this preoccupation, but he did not indulge in it because he was opposed to art for art's sake, but because he believed—and who should say he was wrong?—that the defense of literature and free speech against the threats of their increasingly powerful enemies was today more important than (let's say) escape into simulated enthusiasm about the charms of Victorian lady novelists.

A third aspect of Orwell's honesty as a writer was his uncompromising refusal to adapt his style (or even worse, his outlook) to what an editor might require or might think his readers required. Whether engaged on a novel, a political essay or a lighter weekly column, he wrote in the same forthright way—a quality rare in journalists' and critics' circles today.

ORDEAL

All these qualities are in various ways illustrated in this volume of Orwell's collected writings, the second to be published since his death.

Take, for instance, the essay from which the book's title is drawn, an account of his school days. Orwell, who was born in India, was sent at the age of eight to a boarding-school in England, which he calls Crossgates.

Here, amid the beautiful surroundings of England's countryside, he was exposed to the worst kind of teaching, to brutal discipline, to bad food and to constant abuse and discrimination based on the fact that he was a poor boy on a scholarship. Orwell writes about these experiences without any mean bitterness. However, he does not underestimate the extent to which these childhood ordeals haunted him in later years.

In the present collection, there is an essay, written in 1943, called "Looking Back on the Spanish Civil War." Here, as in *Homage to Catalonia*, Orwell states again the lesson he learned in Spain. He was a tough-minded person and he knew that war was degrading and had to be nasty, but he could not tolerate the deception and lies.

Fascist apologists in England and elsewhere had denied the facts of German and Italian intervention in Spain. But, as he knew from personal experience, the Stalinists and their apologists lied about the POUM uprising in Barcelona. "This kind of thing is frightening to me," he wrote, "because it often gives me the feeling that the very concept of objective truth is fading out of the world."

Many of the essays in *Such, Such Were The Joys* have this underlying theme. For instance, "Inside the Whale" probes the writer's role in an "epoch of fear, tyranny and regimentation."

HE LIVED BY IT

In "Notes on Nationalism" Orwell examines not only the worst expressions of nationalism—fascism, Nazism and Japanese emperor-worship—but also such causes as Stalinism, Zionism and anti-Semitism. Nationalism frightens Orwell because it is "a habit of identifying oneself with a single nation or other unit, placing it beyond good or evil and recognizing no other duty than that of advancing its interests." Therefore nationalism is an enemy of truth and it is as such that he dislikes it. Another essay, "Anti-Semitism in Britain," examines a special manifestation of this "lunacy."

The last piece in the book, "England, Your England," written during the war, illustrates the distinction between nationalism, as Orwell understands it, and patriotism. It is a warm essay, full of affection for England, with its deep liberal traditions.

But this patriotism, unlike nationalism, does not blind a man, and in the same essay in which he expresses his love for England Orwell can also comment harshly on the abuses and injustices which the workers suffered under capitalism.

There are, of course, judgments in this book with which it is possible to disagree, but there is not any essay which does not inspire respect for Orwell. In spite of his unpleasant school days and the poverty and disappointment of his later years, Orwell never lost faith in democracy and socialism. Imbued with a sense of human dignity, Orwell knew that if socialism were to succeed it would have to be compatible with common decency. This was the touchstone of his faith and more than any other writer of our time he lived and died by it.

Less Noyes, Please!

The Indiana state textbook commissioner who branded "Robin Hood" as Communist propaganda has now also denounced, as unfit for school children, the poem "The Highwayman" by Alfred Noyes, because "The hero is a robber and the villains the law."—NEWS ITEM.

THE FBI-WAYMAN

New Americanized version—desubversivized, disinfected, deodorized and dehydrated, guaranteed pure for teen-agers and tots

The moon was a ghostly yellow, like a stoolie in the sky,
The wind was at every window, just like the FBI,
The road was a mouth of darkness, that was getting ready to blab,
And the Communist came skulking—
Skulking—skulking—
The Communist came skulking, up to the government lab.

"Heh, heh!" he chuckled and chortled, as he twirled his red mustache,
"My Sinister Spy-Ring's waiting, with Top Secrets for my cash."
And indeed, who should come slinking subversively to his side
But the atom scientist's daughter,
Bess, the scientist's daughter,
With a dozen assorted atoms, all highly Classified.

"One kiss, my bonny sweetheart, I'm after a prize—one kiss!
I'm getting the latest Secrets from a guy named Alger Hiss.
But I'll be back tomorrow night in a brand-new Ford coupé,
So look for me with a pumpkin—
Watch for me with a pumpkin—
I'll come to you with a pumpkin, though G-men bar the way."

He left; and instantly Bessie phoned up the FBI—
For our heroine was no Communist but a patriot counter-spy—
"I'm spilling my guts, J. Edgar"—she said, "I want to enlist
Like Budenz and Whittaker Chambers,
Like Bentley and Whittaker Chambers,
Like Gitlow and Whittaker Chambers, as a respected Ex-Communist!"

The Red Master Spy was captured, and Bessie's fame was rife,
She became a well-known expert on the American Way of Life,
She published a big best-seller, and started a new career—
The American Dream, they call it,
Scalwags to witches, they call it—
As the country's first public stool teacher in the Little Red Stool House here.

PHILIP COBEN

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



LABOR
ACTION

January 25, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 4

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

Youth and Student Corner

At the SDA Regional Convention

By BOGDAN DENITCH

Students for Democratic Action, the major national liberal student organization, has held a regional convention and a meeting of its top national committee, the National Board, in New York.

SDA, which claims a national membership of "between 2500 to 3500," is numerically the strongest of the liberal student organizations. Of course the membership figures given probably do not reflect active membership and in that sense are inflated, since any political student organization today with over 2000 real members would be a major factor in student politics. Nevertheless, as the liberal student organization SDA deserves close attention of the socialists in the youth field.

According to its press release, the SDA National Board declined to support the Labor Youth League (the Stalinist student and youth organization) in its opposition to the move of the Subversive Activities Control Board to force the LYL to register as a CP front organization. The SDA action was taken in response to a request sent out by the LYL to all student organizations (except the socialist ones) urging them to support the LYL case. However, the National Board of the SDA then went on to say that although it was unwilling to support the LYL in this particular fight, since it considers that the LYL is a CP front, the SDA urges that the McCarran Act, under which the registration procedure has been set up, be itself declared unconstitutional. The SDA attacked the act as a danger to democracy.

The New York Regional Convention of

SDA, meeting at the Union Theological Seminary, with about 75 delegates representing about 12 campuses, seems to have been enlivened at only two points.

The first real controversy was injected by a socialist student who proposed a resolution supporting the ISL in its fight against the subversive list. This resolution was defeated by being "tabled indefinitely" after considerable debate.

The second "controversy" added a touch of humor to the proceedings when the Regional Convention rejected a motion urging the unification of the New York transit system under a city administration. The opponents of this proposal characterized it as "socialism." (In Europe, however, when it comes to attempting to defend the foreign policies of American imperialism before the European socialist youth movements, SDAers have not hesitated to portray it as a "sort" of socialist youth organization.)

A rather amusing incident between the SDA and its parent organization the ADA recently took place in New York that is indicative of the difference in approach between the adult bastion of liberalism and its student affiliate. The New York SDA Educational Committee spent some time preparing a proposed revised song book which was to be cleared for national distribution. The song book included some old Wobbly songs, and this apparently upset the ADA office personnel no end.

Thus it was discovered that the day before the SDA Regional Convention all the song books vanished, only to reappear under lock and key in charge of the local ADA office personnel!

Lively Debate at Young Socialist Forum

A very successful debate was held on January 15, between Abe Kimbay of the Independent Socialist League and M. Shiloh of the *Contemporary Issues* group, under the sponsorship of the joint SYL-YPSL Forum in New York.

Contemporary Issues is the publication of the group that has emerged from the old "IKD" (Internationalisten Kommunisten Deutschlands), an old German group of the international Trotskyist movement.

The topic, "Is Russia State Capitalism?" drew over fifty people for a debate and discussion that lasted three and a half hours (though youth forums in New York now generally run no longer than a decent two hours).

In the opinion of this listener, Abe Kimbay, defending the theory of bureaucratic collectivism, had much the better of the argument, particularly since the *CI* people seem incapable of holding a discussion where (assuming a complete ignorance on the part of their audience) they do not begin with an exposition of basic capitalist economics. In this case the *CI* speaker spent by far the greatest part of his time describing monopoly capitalism, coming to grips with the topics—i.e., the nature of Russia, only toward the end of his talk.

The *CI* people build up their case on a number of "parallels" between capitalism and Stalinism, and in turn they identify these parallels with the developments in Labor Britain and Nazi Germany. As an "example" of their method, which they pose as an alternative to the "theoretical irresponsibility of Max Shachtman," they cite the "parallel" between the economic role of slave labor in the USSR and the extermination camps in Nazi Germany!—in spite of the fact that the death camps (which often involved the murder of skilled laborers desperately needed by the Nazi war machine) and the slave labor camps (which are used as an integral economic institution in this backward economy)—are entirely dissimilar phenomena, economically speaking, since presumably it is not the common inhumanity of these institutions which is at issue.

At the root of the *CI* group's theories lies their rejection of a class solution to the present political and economic situation. Having given up the "archaic" concept that the workers are a revolutionary, or even necessarily a progressive force, and having substituted the theory that the real revolutionary elements in society are now the peasantry and the middle class, the *CI* people find no significant differences between (a) Labor

Britain, where collectivism developed as a result of a smashing political victory of the mass working-class party, and (b) Nazi Germany, where the "collectivist" elements in the economy (unless one is talking about the last stage of Nazi decay when the more "radical" elements in the Nazi bureaucracy became dominant) consisted of the intrusion of a capitalist state into the economy essentially through a phenomena similar to the permanent war economy of the U. S.; and (c) Russia, where the capitalist class has been totally expropriated and the bureaucracy only "owns" the economy as a group, and where profit and the market mechanism are not the regulators of the bureaucratically planned economy.

A KIND OF WAY OUT

Shiloh pointed out, for example, that the capitalists are engaged in a desperate struggle among themselves since they must make a profit if they are to survive, and this, he tried to tell the forum, was paralleled in the USSR by the continuous purges that racked the bureaucracy—as if the ability of any given bureaucrat to increase production helped his survival if he happened to be (say) a Bukharinite in the late thirties; or—as Kimbay pointed out—as if the size of the plant or sector of the economy which any given bureaucrat controlled reflected his political power. (Presumably under a "state capitalism," the bigger the "capitalist" the more powerful would be the role he played in political life.)

In any case the high-level debate on economics expected by all did not quite develop, for one thing since the *CI*'s technique (which includes an intensely personal vitriolic polemical style) made difficult any possibility of a serious discussion of their views.

This *CI* group has managed to attract a number of bright people from various Marxist movements, on their way out of politics. The group's politics, constituting a rejection of both the working-class orientation and the organizational approach of most radical groups, offers an excellent "cover" for ex-radicals anxious to make their peace with the existing society. The discussions which constitute the entire political life of the group are a restful and safe change from the "objectively useless" political life of various socialist organizations. The apparent "ultra-radicalism" of the *CI* people thus makes it possible for their young people in student work to work with the most bureaucratic of movements, so long as there is plenty of time to discuss.

Those Student Junkets to Russia

After the apparent "success" of a "good-will tour" to Russia by three student editors last year, dozens of schools are rushing to follow the example. Just recently, for example, the students of the City College of New York voted to send their school newspaper editors off on a junket, presumably "to see things as they are" and help reduce war tensions.

Apparently, except for the out-and-out McCarthyite elements the question of the tour was not even considered to be particularly controversial—certainly not by editors themselves, who seem to like to travel as much as the next man.

Now we are not informed about the way these trips are supposed to be financed, but if the financing is to be done through student government funds, we must say that the money is being wasted. It is being wasted two ways: if the student body is seriously interested in learning more about Russia the funds might be used more constructively to run a series of forums and lectures by competent scholars and analysts on the other hand, if the point is to give the hard-working school newspaper editors a well-deserved vacation we are sure that a much more gratifying and economical trip to (say) Paris could be arranged.

Quite seriously, though, it is hard to see much point in these tours, unless it is simply to convince American students that Russians are "human beings too" and that this has been established through personal investigation.

To be sure, it is difficult, if not impossible, to tell these student editors that they should not take a trip to Russia if they want to; but what is easy is to explain why such a trip is a waste of time and money from the point of view of the objectives which are set for them. A junket is a junket and should not be described as a sociological investigation.

INNOCENTS ABROAD

The Russians have long experience with conducted tours, particularly when the "observers" are untrained, do not adequately speak the language and (most particularly) when they are politically naive. Conducted tours, from the days of the "Potemkin villages" to the cut-rate tours conducted in the thirties, have been a skilled tool of state propaganda.

The inexperience of the student observers, combined with their natural tendency to consider their opinions "as good if not better than anyone else's"—you know, "after all we were there"—results in the remarkably idiotic reports that are brought back and made with an air of authority. (For example, the reports of the three college editors last year.)

What is perhaps most amusing about the whole business of tours to Russia is the attitude of the liberal student leaders. These same student leaders who refuse to be "made into dupes" by defending the civil liberties of the CPers at home are perfectly indifferent to this, the most simple of all propaganda techniques. This, of course, is a result of the craven politics of campus liberal groups which show a great reluctance to fight for liberal principles and against war when it comes to concrete issues, while at the same time professing boundless love of "peace," "international good-will" and "anti-McCarthyism," so long as they deal with vague abstractions.

Let us say, for example, that the student editors, eager to get the real low-down about this dictatorship business decide to talk (through a state-cleared interpreter, of course) to their opposite number, the editor of the Moscow university paper. What happens? They come back and report that the Russian students are happy, support the regime, etc. The fact that the position of newspaper editor on a Stalinist campus is in the hands of the most trustworthy of the party hacks obtainable does not affect this. Why? Well, dammit, if a good red-blooded American student (with no radical nonsense about him) cannot tell who is sincere and what constitutes a high standard of living (seen from the vantage point of the traditional vodka-caviar parties), who can?

Maybe we'll be told that the trouble with us sectarian anti-war socialists is that we just cannot seem to believe that it is possible to do anything "constructive for peace" without bringing in the old dreary business about ideologies, power conflict, and the rest of the Marxist "ritual." It is so much simpler the other way: you have a couple of drinks with Ivan; he tells you (man to man) that there is no reason why Russia and America cannot coexist; you have been there, you have gotten the truth from the horse's mouth, and you can come back to America and inform the rest of the students that "Russia" wants peace.

Two side-points on this:

(1) Whoever has been in charge of these student tours on the Russian end, that is, for the Kremlin, has obviously been guilty of heinous sabotage and should be removed from his post as a Trotskyist wrecker. Reading the report of the student editors, one cannot help noticing that perhaps the major part of the report is made up of a very unfavorable discussion of Russian co-eds as compared with American college girls. If we remember the much better impression made by the very friendly, very sympathetic and well-dressed Komsomol girls in the '30s, then it must be obvious that a glaring defect is exposed.

(2) Searching back through our memory we seem to remember that this whole tour-idea was offered as an important solution to the war danger and a major contribution to the struggle for peace, by at least one party during the last presidential campaign.

Yes—in the campaign statement of the Socialist Party's senatorial candidate in New York, we can read that the SP candidate's international program consisted of "exchanging tens of thousands of students with the funds to be saved from a cut in the arms budget"! That was in the *Call's* front-page article in October of 1952, we add for incredulous readers.

Asia's Young Socialists

Information on the socialist youth movement in Asia is very scanty since, unlike the European socialist youth movements, the Asian socialist youth for most part do not belong to the IUSY (the International Union of Socialist Youth).

In any case the personnel and the leadership of most of the Asian socialist parties is so young that no youth organization seems to have been considered necessary for sometime. This is notably the case in Burma and Indonesia where the socialist youth are organized in local branches of the parties, and although these branches are large and vigorous, they do not have any life of their own distinct from that of the adult parties.

A recent issue of the organ of the IUSY, the *Survey*, carried a story on the first convention of the Indian socialist youth, held in Benaras in July of 1953. Since the *Survey* avoids controversial politics, no material about the political complexion and discussions of the convention appeared; instead the article gave a brief descriptive history of the Indian youth movement.

The Indian socialist youth organization, the Samajhadi Yawak Sabha (Young Socialist League), grew primarily through the initiative of local sections of the Indian SP. Up to the convention, it had no autonomy or organizational democracy, but was governed by a steering committee appointed by the SP itself.

Apparently during the struggles for Indian independence all political and nationalist youth were united in the "All-Indian Student Congress." After independence was achieved in 1947, primarily on the initiative of the socialists the AISC was transformed into the Indian National Union of Students, modeled after the British NUS. The split of the socialists from the Congress marked the beginning of active youth work.

The Indian socialist youth are placing a special emphasis on building sports organizations and on the land program of the Praja Socialist Party. A special emphasis on the woman question (always acute in India) was recognized by the formation of a special committee for the formation of a women's organization.

**A Labor Action sub is \$2 a year.
Get it EVERY week!**

The Views of the Democratic Opposition In Yugoslavia: An Article by Djilas

The Djilas purge in Yugoslavia appears, at this writing, to be bringing the Titoist bureaucracy to a watershed in its development.

Up to now, there has been plenty of talk from the tops of the bureaucracy about democracy and the fight against bureaucratism, but at the same time the fundamental concepts and practices of Stalinist totalitarianism were fiercely defended and preserved. As we have emphasized in LABOR ACTION, especially in articles about four years ago, such talk and such concessions—however sincere and well-intentioned—stopped short sternly within the framework of the Stalinist system. Most particularly, what remained sacrosanct was the state party's monopoly on political life and suppression of any opportunity for real political opposition. Such measures as the setting up of the "workers' councils," which were touted as channels of "economic democracy," could only remain a tantalizing promise or a subordinate safety-valve as long as no political opposition was permitted.

We have had not a particle of faith in the belief once widespread that the Titoist bureaucracy was engaged in democratizing the regime from the top. We did, however, expect that sooner or later the promises dangled in the demagogic talk would awake real aspirations in the ranks below to make the talk real, and that these aspirations would be possible of achievement only against the bureaucracy, not with it.

This is essentially what appears to be happening in Yugoslavia today, from the too-scanty reports now available. What has turned out is that the pressure from below found a representative within the bureaucratic leadership itself, Milovan Djilas — certainly a more highly placed representative than one might have expected.

By MILOVAN DJILAS

... Since it is assumed that the views of functionaries are to be considered as "directives," particularly when concrete forms of work are discussed, I must emphasize that there is no forum [discussion group?] behind my views but only myself, personally. . . . Accordingly, the views I am expressing in these articles are not "directives" but only views presented as material for discussion and consideration. Such a way of working and presenting views is new, and this by itself confirms the fact that a change in real relations has already started in our country, and with it also a change in the forms of work. . . .

The question is raised whether my proposals, about changing the Communist League's type of work, are entirely in conformity with the decisions of the 6th Congress [of the CPY] and the statutes approved by that congress. This is a serious question and a complicated one. It seems to me that my views are in conformity with those decisions, even though some of my proposals are not in conformity with the letter of the statutes.

If the decisions of the 6th Congress mean weakening the Communist League's practical-political role as a party and strengthening its ideological and educational role, as well as strengthening the practical-political function of the Socialist Alliance [the old People's Front], then my views are right in line with this; whereas this cannot be said for those practices which "strengthen" the Communist League by imposing the forms and character of its ideological work, and moreover of the kind of ideological work which has no connection with either reality or theory. And the same thing is true with regard to interference by the Communist organizations with everything and in everything, while at the same time every expression of more serious and systematic work in the Socialist Alliance is neglected and considered less valuable.

[Djilas then recalls, as precedent, the fact that the party Central Committee "changed the statutes in essential parts" in-between the 5th and 6th Congresses.] And the Central Committee acted wisely and well. Life smashed the forms which we had inherited and accepted, and the Central Committee adapted itself to conditions on this earth, and not to the wise Stalinist bibles. But in this case even that is not necessary. The statutes adopted by the 6th Congress, fortunately, and by no means accidentally, are elastic enough to make possible

Up to a month ago, Djilas' writings and thought did not appear to be different essentially from that of the rest of the bureaucracy. Beginning with articles in December, however, Djilas' open writings on the subject of democracy began to strike a brand-new note, completely new from the pen of any of the leaders.

Make no mistake about this: Djilas' articles are not the "same old thing." It is a new development.

After the turmoil was aroused, Djilas summed up his views in a series of three articles in *Borba* beginning January 4.

On this page we begin publication of the main sections of this series of articles, and this we hope will convey the approach of the Djilas tendency better than the isolated quotations that have appeared in the press. The installment in this issue covers the first article in the series. In the sections still to be published (we might mention now) Djilas becomes appreciably more concrete, though still using a peculiar variety of "Aesopian" language; but something of the "feel" of his ideas can be appreciated.

We wish to apologize for the translation that we have obtained. It is very rough, and in some spots we feel whole phrases may be unintelligible; however, it is hard to separate the possible inadequacy of the translation from the indubitably muddy and unclear language which Djilas uses; and in any case we have not been able to get the translation checked. We think its main content will get across in spite of such defects.

Words enclosed in square brackets are interpolated, either to explain references, or to give a possible clarification of the translation, or to summarize sections not translated verbatim.

Hal DRAPER

organizational changes "even" in the way I have stressed.

Even if this were not so, solutions would have to be found when their necessity is imposed by life itself. Therefore I do not think that the basic question is whether this or that is in conformity with the statutes, although that must be taken into consideration but rather whether this or that does or does not strengthen the forces of socialism and democracy.

The present situation in the city organizations [units of the party, that is, of the Communist League] is this: initiative for new forms of work increased among the membership after the 6th Congress, while the committees [i.e., the leading committees] accepted the new forms only slowly or "under pressure." Hence the committees complain about the inactivity of the [lower party] organizations. And, in point of fact, the forms of work and organizational principles held up to now make real activity impossible.

The present forms of work in the Communist League—in the basic organizations and lower committees—have not developed but have mostly remained the same as before the 6th Congress: the apparatus plans and fixes everything in advance; the Communists separate themselves from the socialist mass of ordinary citizens; the [party] organizations get involved in dogmatic, moralistic, useless and senseless discussions, while life goes on outside of them.

PARTY CRISIS IN CITIES

The presumption that the contradiction between life and the methods of work, and the absence of a capacity for work among the Communist organizations, are the consequences of "a low political level in the [party] organizations" or of the fact that "the committees do not find their way" or similar things—this presumption is not based on a really scientific and political analysis.

Our best men, who were withdrawn from the institutions and who are better than the people in the committees, are now in the basic [party] organizations of the cities. But these same organizations, these committees and these men, who were on a high level and were able more or less to overcome all problems—they have a feeling of futility about their work and don't know what to do.

Obviously, the problem does not lie in the men, or not entirely in them, but in something else.

It is a striking fact that the crisis in the methods of political work emerged for the most part precisely in our most developed centers

(the big cities) and in the most highly developed [party] organizations.

For me the entire problem resides in the following: The cities are already to a very great extent socialist and democratic, and therefore do not permit outdated methods because economic and political life became more free. Moreover, these methods can seem bureaucratic and dogmatic (whether or not they are) only to those to whom they are applied and who observe the discrepancy between them and the changed reality.

The situation in the villages is different. There the economic and social changes are not and cannot be even nearly the same as in the cities. Therefore the discrepancy between reality and methods is not felt so much in the villages. But that does not mean that it does not exist in the villages and that changes will not be necessary there too. But there they are not so urgent and must not be so "radical."

The new economic relations and the increased democratic consciousness in the cities cannot any longer tolerate the old political methods and relations. Formerly, the party committee kept everything in its own hands, it administered even the consciousness of the people, it ordered what was to be "done" and how it was to be done; it watched over the ideological and political level. But even under these conditions the consciousness of the people was strengthened not only by good speeches and articles but also by life as a whole. Because life was then to a great extent less socialistic than it is now, it was necessary to "elaborate" the theory more.

At that time we were engaged in a hard struggle; therefore unity in everything, even in the acceptance of imposed ideas, was unavoidable. But now this is not so, or at least this must not be so.

Now in the cities socialism is stronger than capitalism. If one takes into consideration the fact that the Communists do not follow the old practices, that they do not administer everything any more, that they have new ways of proceeding, because they live under new conditions and relations, then it is obvious that the old methods of political and ideological work must not suit them.

And this is really so. The crisis in the methods and character of political and ideological work originates not only from the usual—and, in our practice, so frequent—discrepancy between methods of work and reality, but this time is much deeper. The change in the economic and social structure has brought about other changes, and is still bringing them about. The increase of freedom in the economy conflicts with the old relations and conceptions. Our entire inherited ideological and organizational system and apparatus (except for the basic materialist, Marxist, philosophical and sociological premises) is now in question. The present discrepancy between methods of work and reality can and must be removed, but it goes deeper than usual; an essential change is at stake.

"CONFLICTING OPINIONS"

The theoretical elaboration, the explanation of new phenomena, cannot be done overnight. These points bring up hitherto unknown difficulties. But this does not mean that the first is not connected with the second, or that it cannot be solved separately. Theory and practice are connected, as they always are, regardless of the fact that the method is different and that different methods and terms are needed.

That will be a longer process. How long it will take is not important; rather what is important is that its existence should be understood, and the expression of its internal contradictions be made easier. Therefore it is not a question of radical changes but only of normal socialist movement, which cannot take place without conflicting opinions.

The crisis in the methods of work is the result of not grasping the characteristic way in which the old methods resist the new methods and new forms. This today is a struggle between life and inherited forms, between dogma and reality. What today are the old forms once used to be almost in conformity, and were neither a form or a dogma. At that time they were alive. Since today they no longer are in conformity, they are in complete contradiction with what they were before—they are a schema and a dogma above life, and under our concrete conditions they must appear as the resistance of bureaucratism against democracy, of state capitalism against socialism, even though the persons who embody these tendencies in their subconsciousness and ideas are themselves opposed to dogmatism and bureaucratism. . . . When a thing falls behind [becomes outmoded? degenerates?] it must appear in an ugly form. . . . How beautiful adolescence was once! . . .

(Continued next week)

NEXT WEEK
**TITOISM AND THE
DEMOCRATIC OPPOSITION**
by Hal Draper

and the continuation of Milovan Djilas' article on his opposition views

THE POLITICAL STRUGGLE IN ITALY

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Jan. 10—The center-right coalition of bourgeois parties has proven as incapable of providing a stable government in Italy as it has in France. In both cases the equivocal nature of the Christian-Democratic parties makes a stable coalition impossible.

Before the June elections Christian-Democracy was strong enough to command by itself the majority it needed to govern. Since June, this has no longer been true. Now it can govern only with the support of the left on a liberal program or with support of the right on a reactionary program.

But Italian Christian-Democracy, much like the French MRP, is a "house divided against itself." Whereas the majority of its electoral supporters are conservative and reactionary, it nevertheless contains a strong left wing with a program of social reform, based on the Catholic trade unions and led by politicians such as Fanfani and the "Iniziativa Democratica" group.

Any C-D government therefore finds itself before a dilemma: It can either form a coalition with the small center-left parties (the Liberals, the Republicans and the Social-Democrats) and pursue a moderate course of social reform against the majority of its party; or it can govern with the Monarchists' support against its own left wing. In the first case it drives its reactionary following into the arms of the Monarchists and the Neo-Fascists; in the second case it risks a split of its left wing and the formation of some sort of working-class "front" to its left.

The Pella government succumbed to the latter alternative. It was formed in June after the failure of De Gasperi and Piccioni to form a government from the new parliament. In the beginning it was to be only a natural "technician's" government, and temporary in character. Composed only of Christian-Democrats, it governed with the support of the Monarchists and functioned in practice as a government of the Right.

The social issues which it was incapable of solving would undoubtedly have brought it to fall a few months earlier if the Trieste issue hadn't given it a new lease on life. Its policy of blustering patriotism unfortunately managed to unite a majority behind it, including the Stalinists and the pro-Stalinist socialists of the PSI (Nenni) who have their own reasons for feeling aggressive toward Yugoslavia. The present deadlock in Trieste, however, confronted the Pella government with all the problems it had successfully evaded until now and finally caused its fall.

The nature of these problems was revealed by several strike waves which swept through the peninsula since September. The issues in these strikes were purely economic—the workers struck for higher wages and against layoffs. At their peak, the strikes involved 6 million workers, in September and again in December. They achieved an average participation of 80 per cent and 90 per cent in all important sectors. They also achieved unity of action between the three main trade-union federations: the Stalinist CGIL, the Catholic CISL and the smaller social-democratic UIL.

The new and important factor, besides the achievement of unity of action, was the militancy of the Catholic unions. This was well illustrated by the recent strike at the Pignone foundry works in Florence.

Behind the Government Crisis

Following a decision by the management to lay off large numbers of its workers, the Catholic and the Stalinist unions jointly proceeded to take over the factory and to continue working in it on their own account. It so happens that the mayor of Florence, La Pira, is a militant Catholic liberal, who came out in support of the strikers. Moreover, the strikers enjoyed unanimous popular support as well as papal blessings. As a result of this combined assistance of heaven and earth, they were able to bring the company to terms after 49 days of occupation of the factory.

From now on, the Catholic unions announced, they will "march separately but strike together" with the Stalinist unions as well as with the social-democratic ones.

Underlying these strikes is the profound misery and distress of the Italian working class. Unemployment, lack of housing and extremely low salaries have made it one of the poorest and most exploited in Europe.

Whereas prices have risen almost continually, salaries haven't been adjusted for years. Working conditions are also miserable: the number of industrial accidents has steadily risen from 414,645 in 1948 to 649,750 in 1952. Also the Italian working class is confronted by some of the most ruthless capitalists in Europe, organized in the "Confindustria." A recent report published by the Italian government gives an excellent statistical picture of this situation but it will take a separate article to describe this in detail.

Consequently, a general wage raise, an energetic housing program, an agrarian reform and other similar measures have become a minimum platform which even large sections of the C-D have had to accept. Because of this need, and because it was the left wing of the C-D itself that caused the Pella government to fall, it is likely that a solution of the present crisis will be sought in the return to the pre-June coalition of the C-D with the small lay parties. Such a coalition would probably be headed by a leader of the C-D left, and would govern on the basis of a social reform program.

At the present time it is questionable, though, whether the Social-Democrats will again participate in such a coalition, for they have always before been the losers. It is also questionable whether such a government could carry out a serious program of social reform. Even though the basic problems are economic, they call for political solutions, and such solutions can be carried out only by a government that comes to power on a genuine socialist program.

The Socialist Groups

This, in turn, raises the whole problem of Italian socialism, or rather of its unification. A socialist program could be carried out effectively only by a socialist mass party backed by the majority of the electorate and, perhaps, in coalition with the Catholic left wing.

Since 1947, however, such a socialist mass party has not existed, and today Italian socialism is characterized by its extreme fragmentation. It is almost impossible to keep track of all the organizations that have arisen since 1947 as the result of splits, but, on the whole, the three main tendencies of world socialism also exist in Italy.

The pro-Stalinist tendency is represented by the Partito Socialista Italiano (PSI) with Nenni and Basso. The Partito Social-Democratico Italiano (PSDI) with Saragat represents the pro-American tendency, whereas the independent socialists of various origins and descriptions are divided among several groups of which only two are really important: the MAS, which recently left the PSDI with Greppi, Codignola and Calamandrei, and the Unione Socialista Indipendente (USI) with Silone, Cucchi, Magnani.

During the June elections several important things happened to the socialist movement: on the part of the PSI, there was a trend away from CP domination; after the elections, the PSDI started revising its policy toward more militancy and more independence.

Under pressure from its rank and file, the PSI did not run on joint lists with the Communist Party as it had in 1948 but ran under its own banner and under the slogan "socialist alternative."

The Stalinist reaction to this slogan was one of hostility. In the PSI itself, differences became public: whereas Nenni had been discussing with Saragat the possibilities of closer cooperation between the two socialist organizations for two months previously, one of the

more pro-Stalinist leaders, Morandi, declared war on social-democracy in a pre-election speech and declared all "dialogue" with social-democracy closed.

Nevertheless the election campaign of the PSI was very successful, and strengthened the "autonomists" in the party. Even though the PSI leadership relapsed into parliamentary cooperation with the Communist Party after the elections, it cannot afford to forget that it owes its support especially to those people who voted PSI because they did not want to vote Stalinist—people who were attracted by the slogan of the "socialist alternative" because they expected the PSI to break loose from the Stalinist's coattails.

But the leaders of the PSI also know that the course of a genuine "socialist alternative" implies sooner or later collaboration or unification with the PSDI and the independent socialist groups. There is no other way for them to leave the Stalinist orbit and yet be backed by a majority that would enable them to put a socialist program into practice.

The elections were not nearly as kind to the PSDI. From 7 per cent of the total vote in 1948 it fell to 4.5 per cent, losing practically a million voters. (The PSI had polled 12.7 per cent, the CP 22.6 per cent and the C-D 40.1 per cent.) The leadership of the PSDI correctly inferred that these losses were the result of its alliance with the C-D. The local election which followed soon after only confirmed this: the PSDI lost heavily whenever it put up joint lists with the C-D.

Toward Left Unity

Therefore, after the elections, the PSDI took a turn to the left. The new policy, named "opening to the left," involves autonomy from the C-D and an orientation toward the PSI and toward its voters. It also involves the demand that the PSI be included in the government if it agrees to break its "unity pact" with the CP.

In short, the leadership of the PSDI has begun to realize that if the organization is to continue to exist, it must conform more closely to the aspirations of the millions who have turned to the PSI because they want a "socialist alternative" and not a questionable "defense of the democratic institutions" in collaboration with the bourgeois parties of the center, the most important of which harbors in its inconsistent hulk one of the main threats to democracy.

Spokesmen for the USI commented in Resorgimento Socialista on the policy changes in the two main socialist parties: "these are comforting signs of a process which . . . if the need for clarity and coherence is equally present in all parties concerned, will necessarily lead to the reconstitution of socialist unity on the only level on which it is possible: on the level of full independence from both totalitarian blocs."

For the time being, unification takes place on a more modest scale: unity negotiations are in course between the USI and the MAS. If they succeed, the result will be a more effective independent socialist party and a more effective instrument to achieve socialist unity. In its statement of immediate aims, the USI proposes the following short-term program for independent socialists:

- (1) a united and autonomous SP;
- (2) a trade-union front including all workers (class unity on the economic level);
- (3) a new parliamentary majority (against the right and the Stalinists);
- (4) rapid substitution for the CP in the rural areas of the South (where the CP is losing votes and finds itself in a permanent crisis)

Although the most important point of this program, a unification of the main socialist tendencies in an independent SP, is not likely in the immediate future, it is nevertheless a practical possibility and the only alternative providing a solution to the Italian deadlock. To bring about such a unification is one of the most important functions of independent socialists in Italy today.

'Preventive War' Line — —

(Continued from page 1)

like that above. Only the military program — of reliance on the atom bomb and the long-range bomber to deliver it, and the financial program of cutting help to the rest of the world to bare military subsidies—only this was concrete.

It appears that the aspects of this program which appeal most to the businessmen and generals who run the administration are two; It will cut the cost of military expenditures and economic aid to the allies, and it will presumably give the United States the military initiative, or the choice of where and when to strike. That is a concept which is appealing to people who think of world affairs in terms of budgetary economy and strategic military maps. But in the realm of the real world it is a policy of dangerous irresponsibility.

ABANDONING DEFENSE

Even critics who are generally favorably impressed by the "clearness" and "definiteness" of this concept cannot help observing that it does not exactly spell out what the American government would do if the Stalinists should come to power in some country by political means. A serious economic recession in Europe would certainly make this a possibility.

If in Italy or France, deprived of American economic aid because this government did not think it would "clearly contribute to military strength," the Stalinists or a heavily Stalinist-influenced regime should come to power, would the United States launch the atomic bombers against Moscow, Rome, or Paris? If despite the flow of American arms, the Stalinist-led Vietminh should throw the French out of Indo-China, would a "retaliatory attack" be launched against Peiping?

And if so, how many of America's present allies could be counted upon to join in the fighting which would inevitably follow such an attack?

And even short of such developments, how is this policy going to affect the present American allies in Europe? If it means nothing else, it surely means that unless Germany is rearmed (and possibly even if she is) the United States has abandoned the idea of "defending Europe" against a possible Russian attack, and has decided instead on the "peripheral strategy" of holding England and North Africa and possibly Spain as air bases and platforms from which to launch a future reinvasion of a conquered continent. But so far no European government has been willing to accept this concept of military defense.

In one sense, it is a good thing that this administration has chosen to spell out its policy so clearly. At least the room for illusions has been considerably reduced. Though it is evident that in this country there has been no real understanding of what this means for the future, the rest of the world is far more likely to grasp the full implications of the "new look" in American strategic planning.

It is far from certain that the administration will actually be able to carry out this policy on the clear-cut lines an-

nounced by Dulles. The world of real politics is far too full of surprises to permit the long-term application of such a simple notion as that all the United States will have to do is sit behind its pile of A-bombs, ready to "deliver" them at a moment's notice, and Stalinist expansion will come to an end. If the policy may seem to have any durability at all, it is chiefly because it is announced at a period when the cold war has tended to become territorially static due to a worldwide political stalemate.

NO INITIATIVE

It is evident that there is nothing in this policy which can give the United States the political initiative. At the moment, the Stalinist initiative has also been greatly reduced by the internal difficulties of the regime. The most important question for humanity is this: given the political as well as military stalemate in the world struggle between the two imperialist giants, will significant social movements arise which can wrest the initiative from both of them?

At the moment, the signs do not appear too propitious. The German Social-Democracy seems to have become disoriented by its recent political defeat, rather than to have gained insight into the reasons for it. In Britain the Labor Party has been thrashing about for sev-

eral years in the search for a new perspective, but seems far from having achieved it. In France and Italy the socialist movements are still paralyzed by their reformism and the power of domestic Stalinism. And in the United States, the labor movement is still in the grip of the prosperity-engendered conservative trend which has dominated it for the past several years.

But in all these situations there are glimmerings of a brighter future. The political defeat in Germany has tended to undermine the authority of the party leadership, and hence to make room for a more questioning attitude in the ranks. In Britain the fact remains that large sections of the party are earnestly searching for a new road, and are thus open to absorbing the lessons of the times. The strikes in France last summer revealed strong, militant working-class currents which are not stifled by Stalinism. And even in this country, the economic recession is creating a restlessness in the more advanced sections of the labor movement which cannot but have political repercussions in the months ahead.

Despite the irresponsibility of the Eisenhower-Dulles policy, World War III is no doubt a long way off. But the socialist movement must use the time at its disposal well, or it will be all too short.

Bricker Amendment — —

(Continued from page 1)

supersedes not only other federal law but also any state law—even in cases where the federal Congress would not otherwise have any power to pass a law. (For example, the Supreme Court voided a 1913 federal migratory-bird protection law, on the ground that only the states had the right to legislate in the field; but when a treaty on the subject was made with Britain, and after Congress re-enacted the law, the court ruled it valid. For the Constitution states that, along with federal laws and the federal Constitution, a treaty is "the supreme law of the land . . . anything in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding.")

To knock this out, the Bricker amendment provides that a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the country only if Congress also passes special legislation to do so "which would be valid in the absence of a treaty."

This "which clause" is a round-about way of curtailing the treaty-making and foreign-policy-making powers of the federal government as against the states. It is not a provision aimed at the president's powers as against some other or wider democratic sanction. It would deprive the people of the United States as a whole, and any government it has, of certain of their powers and rights.

The real issue here, therefore, is not the powers of the president. The issue here is a reactionary use of "states' rights" to achieve certain immediate political objectives desired by a united front

of reactionaries in Congress. This united front combines the isolationists or semi-isolationists of the GOP right with the reactionary Southern Jim-Crowers and white-supremacy advocates of the Democratic Party. It is aimed most particularly at any possible effect of UN conventions or the UN charter in affecting U. S. policy at home, for example, UN convention provisions against racism and for racial democracy.

This "states' rights" point is the heart of the Bricker amendment as it is presented to Congress. It is the aspect on which Bricker and his group refuse to compromise. A number of offers of compromise have been made by the administration forces, according to the press, though these offers have not been spelled out; but the know-nothing front refuses to back down in any way that would imperil the states-rights gimmick.

The big impetus behind the Bricker amendment came during the Truman administration, when to many right-wingers in Congress any restriction on the president's powers was a good thing, since they didn't like the incumbent. It is reported that many Republicans who plumped for it then have since longed to change their stand. In any case they learned that it is not at all a good idea to take a stand on a policy on the basis of merely asking "who is for it and who is against it."

REAL DEMOCRATIZATION

The liberals should find this out too. Too many of them apparently are aware only that the support for the Bricker amendment comes from the reaction, and therefore conclude that they must support Eisenhower's stand in favor of the status quo.

But this is not so. A genuine democrat must also raise the question, as Bricker has done from his own reactionary viewpoint, of the democratic propriety of the president's present control of foreign relations to the point where, in a field no less important nowadays than domestic policy, it is the Executive which has almost a free hand in setting policy for the people. This is intolerable, and in scarcely any other democratic government in the world is the Executive so unchecked and uncheckable as in the U. S.

The democratization of foreign-policy control would require at least two elementary steps—both of which are secondarily involved in the Bricker amendment, to be sure, although they do not constitute its heart:

(1) The right of control over foreign policy, specifically treaty-making, which is now vested by the Constitution in the Senate exclusively, must be extended to the Congress as a whole. There is not and never has been any democratic sanction for the formal exclusion from treaty-making of the more popularly elected of the two houses, rather than by the upper house alone.

(2) Congress must have full rights to intervene, whenever it wishes or sees fit, to regulate, change, endorse or throw out not only formal treaties but also other Executive agreements and acts which do in fact set policy or determine the action

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

of the country. Congress by any democratic criterion cannot be deprived of these rights any more than (say) the British parliament is deprived of it.

It is true that in the U. S. there is the famous separation of powers and the system of checks-and-balances as among the Executive, legislative and judicial departments of government; but the rights of the legislative must include full power to set policy in every way in the field of foreign relations as in the field of domestic policy.

We must add that we are under no illusions that even such steps of democratization would, under present conditions and the present system, really succeed in making the Executive's foreign policies and acts subordinate to the people's wishes—that, for example, it could have prevented the unconstitutional declaration of war in Korea by the president's say so.

The Bricker amendment is a reactionary instrument, but the alternative offered by the Eisenhower-liberal-Fair Deal opposition—namely, defense of the status quo—is no defense of democracy. A change is needed, a change diametrically opposite to the kind of change emphasized by the Brickerites.

GE McCarthyism — —

(Continued from page 1)

The IUE News on December 21 called the announcement of the 90-day suspensions "silly." In a brilliant comment, it argued, "You could imagine an avalanche of people looking for three months' vacation invoking the amendment and then coming clean on the 90th day." Of two men, Mills and Goodwin, who were suspended by the company as Communists, the IUE paper says, "The IUE-CIO expelled one from membership and barred the other from its rolls. This was on the grounds that both were—and still are—Communists." About the right of a man to work regardless of his politics? Nothing.

In a public statement, James Carey, president of the IUE and secretary of the CIO, emphasized this: "The General Electric Company, after three years of evasion and doubletalk, is finally beginning to admit the warnings of the IUE-CIO about the danger to our national defense from Communists associated with its plants."

Carey mildly criticizes the company procedures which might "fire or suspend some rank-and-file workers who were dupes of Communist leaders." But what, he asks, do they intend to do about the national "ringleaders" of the UE "who have consistently refused to testify on their Communist connections"?

In a speech before the Ohio CIO in December, Carey dramatically denounced McCarthyism as "a coldly calculated political device by which the reactionaries hope to maintain big-business control of our government for an endless period." That was in Ohio. But he finds no significance in the fact that General Electric acts, not upon suggestion from the IUE, but under pressure from McCarthy. Nor does he allow himself to remember that committee interrogations into "Communist connections" have political intimidation and persecution as their aim and result.

"We are concerned with what threatens to be a complete change in our intellectual and political climate," said Carey on March 2, 1953. That was when he called for "a new militant liberalism, not simply a liberalism of thought but a militant liberalism of thought joined to action."

And he had added: "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." These were fine sentiments and noble words.

But when McCarthy came to Boston, these words were forgotten; and so McCarthy won, once again, his little victory.