

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Students and Academic Freedom

... A Four-Page Issue of the Young Socialist Challenge

Britain Debates the H-Bomb

... page 2

A Curious Tale — and a Brand-New Slogan

... page 3

APRIL 19, 1954

FIVE CENTS

Oppenheimer Case

So Eisenhower Forestalled McCarthy ...

Nothing foreseeable that can happen in the investigation of the McCarthy-Army fracas (if it ever comes off) can be as important and as ominous as what has already happened, in anticipation of that investigation, with the public-outbreak of the Oppenheimer case.

It puts the spotlight squarely on that aspect of the McCarthy question in the U. S. which is more basic than anything that can happen to McCarthy.

The main trend in the withering away of bourgeois democracy in the United States stems not directly from the activities of the McCarthys but from the counter-moves of the authoritarian "anti-McCarthyites." Eisenhower is not a "McCarthyite." He has been attacked, and properly so, for the cowardliness and faintheartedness of his pulled-punches against the senator, but he has not himself been attacked for sympathizing with him. He would like to push Joe back, at least into the background. So we are told, and so we are ready to believe, as far as it goes.

Now he has made another move to "undercut" McCarthy.

"STOPPING" JOE

McCarthy was planning to explode the Oppenheimer case in a speech just before the delayed committee investigation. That case (the press now reports) has been known to journalistic and government circles for quite a while; it is nothing that McCarthy dug up. But the totalitarian from Wisconsin, on the ropes, was going to use it. He had already launched the accusation that H-bomb development had been delayed for 18 months by subversive influence. The charge seemed a dud: Eisenhower denied it; old bugaboo Acheson, the well-known Communist, it turned out, had been an enthusiastic backer of the H-bomb. Then Joe was going to turn the tables by "revealing" Top A-Bomb Scientist Suspended As Security Risk.

Sensation! Headline screamers! Who said the H-bomb charge was a dud? Why has Oppenheimer been secretly suspended? Isn't it true that Oppenheimer is a friend, husband, brother and lover of Reds? Then, the next day the "investigation" starts and who will remember Private Schine?

So the anti-McCarthyites, the Eisenhower group, figured out how to "undercut" this slick maneuver: Do unto Oppenheimer as McCarthy would do unto him.

Oppenheimer is charged with advising against the policy of concentrating on the H-bomb. This is the new element in

(Continued on page 2)

Are We Being 'Softened Up' for U.S. Intervention in Indo-China?

By GORDON HASKELL

The Eisenhower government is openly threatening to plunge America into the war in Indo-China. They must be stopped now! The only means open to the people of this country is to protest, vigorously, openly, loudly, by every means at their disposal.

It must be made clear to the government, and to the world, that if they follow to the bitter end the suicidal course on which they are embarked, they do so without the support of the nation, in fact, in the face of the opposition of the people. If we are silent now, later there may be nothing for us to do but to mourn our dead. And this time, they may be counted in the millions rather than in the tens of thousands.

Once before, when the Chinese Stalinists entered the war in Korea in strength, America was pushed from the brink of World War III by the vigorous intervention of the allied governments of Europe. The leaders of these governments, reflecting in their own way the widespread revulsion of their peoples to the proposal to extend the war to Chinese territory, begged Washington to stay its hand, and informed Truman that if this country got into full-scale war with China, it would have to go it alone.

The reluctance of America's allies in Europe, Asia and the Pacific

to fight a futile war in Indo-China may have the same effect once more. But the American people cannot count indefinitely on the resistance of the peoples of foreign countries to restrain a government which they do little to restrain themselves.

But how about Indo-China itself? Are we to permit the Stalin-

ists to throw out the French and subject the country to their oppressive, totalitarian rule? Are we to stand idly by while that country is conquered by Stalinist arms? Are we to permit the loss of this key country in Southeast Asia, which will weaken the resistance to Stalinism in the rest of the area, and open it up to eventual conquest by military or political means?

How else, in the present situation, can a Stalinist victory in Indo-China be prevented but by massive American military intervention, backed, if possible, by the moral and material aid of America's allies? How else can the peoples of Indo-China be given a chance, in due course, to work out their destiny democratically, in their own way, without being subjected to the iron rule of Stalinist dictatorship?

IS THERE A WAY?

Those who ask such questions sincerely, that is, who are sincerely devoted to the preservation and extension in Asia not of Western imperialism, but of democracy, deserve an honest answer.

But first, they should seek to answer honestly to themselves this question: How can American military intervention possibly achieve the purposes which they want to achieve in this struggle?

At this very hour, when the French government has made it clear that it cannot hope to win the war in Indo-China, or even to continue it on the present basis, France and the Vietnam government have more and vastly better equipped troops in the field than do their enemies of the Vietminh. The military and economic aid which has been given the French by the

(Turn to last page)

CIO Runs Labor Candidates In Newark City Elections

By JOHN WILLIAMS

NEWARK, Apr. 1—The Essex-West Hudson CIO Council has endorsed two labor candidates for the Newark city elections who are effectively independent of the old party machines.

One is James Callaghan, treasurer of District 4 of the CIO Electrical Workers Union (IUE-CIO), for councilman-at-large in the city of Newark; the other is Jerry Leopoldi, president of IUE-CIO's Local 447 (Federal Telephone), for councilman from the East Ward, a predominantly working-class area.

Candidates for Newark city posts are elected on a non-partisan basis—that is, nominally no one runs as a Democrat or Republican; the actual practice, of course, has been that the two main machines, the Republican and Democratic Parties, line up their support for their own candidates. This type of election allows for a certain amount of fluidity and, we might add, for deals.

What is interesting and essentially new about the Callaghan and Leopoldi endorse-

ments is the fact that these men are genuinely CIO candidates. This is no case of mere endorsement of liberal-Democratic machine-men, as has most often been the case in the past.

The two have been outstanding militants and organizers for IUE in District 4. Callaghan is a full-time functionary of the district. He is in general associated with the progressive leadership of the IUE-CIO district, which has done an outstanding job in defeating the rival Stalinist-controlled union (UE) and in securing some of the bet union contracts gained in the international. They started from scratch, but now represent approximately 75,000 workers in District 4, comprising North New Jersey and the New York metropolitan area.

WELCOME MOVE

Leopoldi, Local 447 president, heads a local which was one of the first to defeat the UE and whose leadership, by and large, has played a progressive role in IUE-CIO.

From all reports the two candidates' decisive financial and organizational support will come from CIO affiliates. The Essex and West Hudson Counties CIO Council represents the heart of the organized CIO movement in the Newark-Jersey City area.

There can be no doubt that this electoral move reflects a yearning on the part of the most advanced unionists in Newark toward independent labor activity.

Many of the IUE militants have grumbled when faced with the task of supporting Democratic "friends of labor" who, immediately after election, proceed to forget any pledges to push for the CIO program, under the guise of representing "all the people." They must welcome the opportunity to vote for their own labor candidates and to build their own

(Continued on page 2)

April 23—Friday evening at 8:15—Hear
**Max Shachtman on
Indo-China and the War Crisis**

LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Jointly sponsored by the
ISL and YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

NEXT WEEK

Special reports on the convention of Americans for Democratic Action and on the United Auto Workers educational conference.

LONDON LETTER

Britain Debates H-Bomb

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Apr. 7—Almost a fortnight ago, one of the London morning newspapers appeared with a front-page map of the British Isles on which was marked the area of uninhabitable country which would result from the dropping of one hydrogen bomb. Last Friday evening a United States film of an atomic explosion at Eniwetok was shown on our television. The map of the British Isles showed that one hydrogen bomb would destroy the core of any big town, and make practically the entire country uninhabitable.

For the past three weeks violent discussions have been taking place in all political circles here about what the British government should do about the situation. Briefly the following alternatives are open to it:

(1) It could watch the Americans build bigger and better weapons, and hope they would keep ahead of the Russians; (2) it could try to talk the Russians into an agreement to ban atomic and hydrogen weapons now, and in any future conflict; (3) it could try to persuade the American government to stop further hydrogen bomb development irrespective of Russia's progress; or (4) it could hope that Britain will in time develop its own production of atomic bombs, and be in a sufficiently strong bargaining position to deter both sides.

LABOR'S MOTION

The Conservative view was that we should let the Americans go on developing the hydrogen bomb; not only because it was better for them to be ahead in the race, but also because the British government had no influence whatsoever on the Americans in this matter. If Churchill were to protest, this would be interpreted as interference, and nothing could be achieved by protests which were doomed to be ignored. He was pleased that it was the Americans and not the Russians who were in control of so lethal a weapon and taunted Labor by asking why it had made no protest at the Russian atomic tests last year. The answer was clearly because these protests also would go unheard.

The Labor Party was once again battling on a sticky wicket. It had initiated the policy against which it was now protesting. But it put down a motion in Parliament:

"That this House, recognizing that the hydrogen bomb . . . constitutes a grave threat to civilization and that any recourse to war would lead to its use, would welcome an immediate initiative by Her Majesty's government to bring about a meeting between the prime minister and the heads of the administrations of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the purpose of . . . reduction and control of armaments and of . . . removing from all the peoples of the world the fear which now oppresses them and for the strengthening of collective peace through UNO."

WEAK APPROACH

Attlee, speaking "in no party spirit," pointed out the terrible damage which the hydrogen bomb could do to great cities, but he did not believe that this would act as a deterrent. He was frightened that a small war, say on the Burmese border, might embroil the world in a full-scale atomic disaster. Rather, he

thought, the bigger the bombs produced, the greater advantage the aggressor would have from the first move. These were cogent arguments for approaching Malenkov for an agreement at once.

I need hardly point out the weakness of the argument. Any socialist knows that both imperialisms have a vested interest in world tension, especially Malenkov. He is quite prepared to enter into an agreement on banning atomic weapons provided it is not enforced by inspection. At the same time, he is very unlikely to agree to stop the race while the Americans are ahead. The recent Berlin Conference showed abundantly that for the time being Malenkov has no intention of any modus vivendi with the West except at exceedingly favorable terms.

What of the other suggestions? We can dismiss the idea that the Americans would stop atomic and hydrogen bomb development without an enforceable agreement with the Russians. It seems to me that the British development of these lethal weapons will be the outcome of this situation, and that in time it will assume a more than marginal significance.

I myself have the severest doubts about the likelihood of any hydrogen bomb war—or any war, for that matter, until the Russians are prepared for it. The general feeling here is that however irresponsible certain sections of the American administration may be, it is unlikely to start an atomic war lightly. Irrespective of the McMahon Act, it is believed that Britain would at least be informed if not consulted.

VULNERABLE

Of all the countries in the world Britain is most vulnerable to atomic attack, whichever side starts the war. There are areas in the United States where one could get away from big targets, but not in Britain. Likewise, the Russians have been dispersing their heavy industry across the Urals since 1942, and their population since 1924.

What worries me is this. If a Russian bomber were to swoop out of a cloudy sky while I was having my tea and crumpets one afternoon, and drop a bomb on the center of London where I work, I would be vaporized before I had time to think about it. But between now and then the side with the bigger number of bombs uses it in its bargaining with the other side. Who loses from it? Only the small nations, and the vast exploited masses laboring to throw off ever-strengthening imperialisms.

Ironically, the Ministry of Supply and the War Office have just announced the production of a bigger and better tank, the Conqueror; costing \$100,000 each. Anyone want a game of soldiers?

Newark —

(Continued from page 1)

electoral machine to push for the CIO program. This does not mean, however, that there is no possibility of their compromising their independent activity under the usual formula of "not splitting the liberal vote."

APPEAL TO LABOR

Be that as it may be, right now socialists should support the Callaghan and Leopoldi candidacies, and favor their election as a step toward encouraging independent labor political action. They can welcome the CIO's political move as a significant step toward a genuine labor party in the area.

The CIO openly appeals for labor support in order to give the working people a voice in the Newark city government. As its statement put it, "the election of Jim Callaghan and Jerry Leopoldi will pave the way for more decent and responsible labor people to be elected to public office."

Leopoldi has already encountered the opposition of the official Democratic machine, which fears his influence among the predominantly Italian, Polish and Negro workers of this area. The Democrats understand the threat that an independent CIO political machine represents to it.

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

Oppenheimer Case —

(Continued from page 1)

the revival of his case. The information about his past Stalinist associations and connections have long been combed through. They were known; they were investigated; he was cleared; he had made a clean breast of it, and all. The new Oppenheimer case goes beyond even the stand taken by McCarthy.

McCarthy had charged disloyal sabotage of the H-bomb, in effect. It was one of his Big Lies, but let's make a distinction. It is one kind of crime to throw out such general accusations (against unnamed persons) on the basis of no evidence. It is another kind of crime to victimize a man on the basis of a true charge—when the "charge" itself is merely that the scientist had ascertain opinion about the work he was an expert in.

LILIENTHAL ON H-BOMB

See the difference between the "immoral methods" of McCarthy and the responsible, moral witchhunting of the respectable anti-McCarthyites! McCarthy's methods consist of smearing with lies. Eisenhower's method consists of making the truth a smear.

Not only Oppenheimer but David Lilienthal was against the H-bomb program as it was proposed. In the October 4, 1953 issue of the N. Y. Times—as recently as that—Lilienthal was still persisting in pressing the question. In an article in the Times magazine, Lilienthal wrote about the reaction in Washington in September 1949 when the Russian A-bomb was announced. A section of the administration's heavy thinkers decided: we must make a bigger bomb. Lilienthal continues:

"This particular recommendation did not seek to alter our almost exclusive reliance upon big bombs—except that they were to be bigger.

"A different view was taken by others among the president's advisers, including the present writer, others in the AEC, and most of the members of a statutory

advisory committee of leading military scientists and administrators [including Oppenheimer—Ed.]. These individuals thought this answer was certainly not the best one; that it was woefully and even dangerously inadequate.

"Launching an all-out crash program for the H-bomb, before we had taken a hard look at the over-all state of our security, and reassessed it—militarily, diplomatic, and the rest—meant, we feared, that these realities simply would not be faced, the reassessment would not be made. . . . Lilienthal then alludes to other arguments which could not be made because of security limitations."

" . . . the opportunity was lost, for the H-bomb effort was promptly adopted as the program. . . . But as was feared, once the H-bomb program had been launched, nothing else of significance was done.

"So now once again our country faces essentially the same question we did four years ago: What do we do now, what is the answer, in terms of American security, to the Russian H-bomb? . . ."

AND TOMORROW?

This, however vaguely, was a political opposition to the H-bomb "crash program." One of Oppenheimer's high crimes, as now charged, was that he had political objections to the H-bomb perspective.

American scientists are being told: You have no right to opinions about the social and political use of your work. You must even beware of expressing any other sort of objection.

Tomorrow they may be told that the order of the day is the dread cobalt bomb, which can "take out" not merely a city but a whole swathe of a continent, the first weapon in history that can destroy a planet. Will there be demurrals? Will there even be murmurs? There will be, but at what cost?

All this is happening under the head of stopping McCarthy. Is the enemy merely McCarthyism or is it the dead-end capitalism that rules America?

ISL FUND DRIVE

Drive Hits 60%—Last Push Ahead

By ALBERT GATES Fund Drive Director

With contributions of over \$600 this week, we doubled the amount received a week ago and the over-all total in the fund drive is now over \$6000, or 60.8 per cent will come through.

Chicago headed the list with a contribution of \$296 giving it a total of \$1731 or 96.1 per cent of its goal. Another \$69 will put the Windy City at 100 per cent and make it the first large area to reach its goal in the drive. Chicago promises to make this good by the end of next week. We are pretty sure by the showing it has made so far in the campaign that Chicago will come through.

Little Streater has come through again with 100 per cent of its quota. But then Streater has always done so and we knew long before the drive began that our friends there would do the job.

Next to Chicago and Streater, our biggest entry is Newark. Newark has been a pleasant surprise in the drive. With a relatively high quota of \$400, our friends in Newark have already sent in \$340.50, making 85.1 per cent of its quota. There is no doubt that Newark too will make its goal before very long. Cleveland likewise

has moved up within striking distance, and the Bay Area is not far behind. They stand a good chance of going over the top in the next week or two, and Pittsburgh is not far behind them.

Those are the better standings in the campaign. We need some real help from some of the other big places, like New York and Buffalo, who have a good start. Even more, we need a real response from four other areas which could push the whole drive right up where it belongs at this stage of the campaign: Buffalo, Philadelphia, Detroit and Los Angeles.

Los Angeles finally made its appearance in the scoring column, but it is far from sufficient. Fifteen dollars came from the Los Angeles branch and \$10 from a friend in the area. We have been giving Los Angeles the needle in the past few weeks and are certain that we shall get a proper response from our friends there.

There remain three weeks to the campaign, which is to close with May Day meetings and celebrations. We have to make up \$4000 to complete the campaign. This is no small sum, to be sure, but if every branch meets its assignment and makes the necessary special effort in these coming weeks, we can make it.

We are, therefore, appealing once more to our branches, our sympathizers, friends and readers, to help us in these closing weeks of the drive to push us over the top and keep our wonderful LABOR ACTION and New International for another year.

BOX SCORE

Table with 4 columns: Quota, Paid, % and City names. Total: \$10,200 Quota, \$6206.50 Paid, 60.8 %

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by Max Shachtman

A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!

\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

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



LABOR ACTION

April 19, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 16

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

Assf. Ed.: GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

YOU and SCIENCE

CAN SCIENTISTS EVADE THEIR RESPONSIBILITY?

By CARL DARTON

"What next, Big Atom?" is the question which is being posed in an inescapable manner before the little men of the world today. With ever-larger atomic explosions following each other almost monthly and threatening to get out of control of the scientists, the contradictions of the most gigantic technological development ever wrought by man appear insurmountable under present social conditions. A mere listing of the questions indicates the immensity of the problem.

How can atomic tests be continued without threatening a large part of the world with radioactive dust or rain and even tidal waves which might follow underwater atomic explosions? How can individual scientists hide behind the sacred cow of the "search for knowledge" as they fashion ever more deadly weapons for irresponsible leaders?

How can the leaders of nations which took a leading part in the Nuremberg trials against the Nazi military, who "merely followed orders" in committing crimes against a few thousand people, continue to escape guilt for perpetuating atomic warfare which threatens to wipe out a large section of humanity? A future generation, if there are any, may see little difference between Nazi medical science mutilating the people of a minority race, and atomic scientists triggering off nuclear explosions which disfigure and threaten death to nations.

"MASS SUICIDE"

How much longer can any intellectual worthy of the name continue to support a class which has demonstrated its bankruptcy? Lewis Mumford, writing in the N. Y. Times of March 28, castigates the American government for its mishandling of atomic energy. He writes:

"Once the facts of our policy of total extermination are publicly canvassed, and the final outcome, mass suicide, is faced, I believe that the American people are still sane enough to come to a wiser decision than our government yet made. They will realize that retaliation is not protection; that total extermination of both sides is not victory; that a constant state of morbid fear, suspicion and hatred is not security; that, in short, what seems like unlimited power has become impotence."

On the diplomatic side, how much farther can the ante be raised in the international "game" of power politics between the United States and Russia? Can many hope that efforts toward disarmament will be any more successful than they have been in the past? How

can civil defense efforts be maintained as the plans of months and years are made obsolete with each successive bomb test? As it becomes clear that the only means which offers any semblance of effective protection are mass evacuations and dispersal of industry, it is also apparent that these are impossible without disruption of the present economic and social system beyond repair.

How much longer can the people of the United States continue to maintain the surface appearance of normality under the psychological stress of atomic insecurity? How can a system which requires an orderly and systematic way of life for commerce and industry hold up? How much longer can the "leaders" themselves maintain a semblance of confidence in their ability to find a way out of the ever-growing nightmare?

Were we not governed by the rationality of Marxism we might ask: "Why don't the misleaders of society give up now?" History, however, demonstrates that socialism just doesn't happen. No matter how impotent capitalism may be in its efforts to solve its problems, it will take a politically strong working class to make the march toward socialism.

PITIFUL PERFORMANCE

A few days ago the president of the United States went on the air primarily to alleviate people's fear about the hydrogen bomb. His informal and chatty style may have done so. Certainly the meager treatment of the subject was not at all reassuring. He contended that awe of the H-bomb may help prevent war (that was also said about the machine gun and the bow and arrow before it). But the president admitted that war may come in spite of the H-bomb. If war comes and bombs fall, we cannot hope to escape all of them.

The president was followed on TV by a scientist, Assistant Secretary of Defense Donald A. Quarles. Questioned by a panel of alert college students on the program "Junior Press Conference," the secretary made a worse showing than the president. He knew more about the H-bomb and could say less. Security (real, or used as a convenient excuse) and support of governmental policy almost muted him. He could discuss neither the technical aspects, nor the political implications, nor the social results.

It was a pitiful performance particularly to scientists who are accustomed to frank, precise, and uncolored descriptions of natural phenomena. No listener could have been reassured by his answers, particularly at his remark, "We would not have prepared the H-bomb unless we intended to use it."

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Puerto Rico

To the Editor:

The article by Hal Draper in the March 29 LABOR ACTION, "A Socialist Policy on Puerto Rico," raises an interesting question for American socialists. This is not the kind of problem, as least not to the same degree, that arises for the anti-imperialist socialist in Europe in respect to "their" colonies. It is the wealth of the United States which makes "independence-plus" a real possibility and a useful slogan.

However, the exact content of the slogan as stated in Hal Draper's article is never quite clear. There is no spelling out of the "present forms of economic aid" that should be continued since this is the only specific statement. What economic aid is being referred to? Certain tariff and tax arrangements are not "economic aid," and if they were, would that be sufficient for an independent Puerto Rico? To continue this kind of "economic aid" would not be enough for a country whose entire economy has been distorted by its imperialist master. Puerto Rico would still be at the mercy of American capitalism.

It is recognized that there are many problems facing an independent Puerto Rico, outside of the question of independence, that will have to be solved if independence is to have real meaning. But that does not mean that the slogan "independence-plus" does not have to be spelled out in more detail than at present. What of the present economic relationship is to be continued and what is to be discarded, that is, the exact relationship that is to exist to give meaning to the "plus"?

The slogan performs the job of illustrating the meaning of "free and unfettered" elections. If that is all that is intended, then there is no need to go further. However, the United States does have a responsibility to the Puerto Rican people and that can only mean a plan for substantial aid to an independent Puerto Rico as well as a Caribbean federation. And all of this must be stated in more concrete terms.

Tom STANLEY

The forms of economic aid now rendered by the U. S. can be found spelled out in a book like V. Petruccio's *Puerto Rican Paradox* and other places. A detailed blueprint (or program) for economic relations between the U. S. and an independent Puerto Rico should indeed be the concern, first of all, of a serious Puerto Rican independence movement, as well as of U. S. socialists interested in developing such a project. The kind of political line which I wrote about, however, does not depend on the "exact content" of such a detailed program.

—Hal DRAPER

YOU'RE INVITED

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

A Curious Tale About Cultural Freedom

By BERNARD CRAMER

This is a curious tale about the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, a letter we didn't receive, and a brand-new slogan.

It began with the piece in LABOR ACTION for March 22 on "The Squabble Over Einstein's Birthday," anent the bisymmetric civil-liberties policies of the Stalinoids, on the one hand, and of the cold-war liberals of the ACCF on the other.

The former yell about the sad state of civil liberties in the U. S. but gag when it comes to criticizing Stalinist totalitarianism; the ACCF-type cold-warriors turn this inside out. They direct their fire against Stalinist tyranny but "when it comes to defense of freedom at home, the ACCF gets very diplomatic . . . [it] is the mirror image of the Stalinoids of the ECLC."

So we wrote in our article, to put it briefly.

Well, the following week we received a phone call from a Mr. Schwarzschild of the ACCF office. He was disturbed by our unkind reference to his organization. Would we print a reply on behalf of the ACCF?—Of course. But that wasn't enough.—Would we allow the reply more space than letters to the editor usually get?—We would. In fact (he was informed) don't worry about space (within reason); we always print critical letters.—Mr. Schwarzschild was gratified to hear that. But just in case, if the reply was too long, would we return it uncut for revision?—Why, certainly.—"Good, tomorrow you will get the manuscript or Mr. Stein [the ACCF executive director] will get in touch with you. . ."

We Would Have Been Interested . . .

The reply didn't come the next day. Or the next week. In fact, it didn't come. And let's be perfectly truthful: we really hadn't expected it, in spite of Mr. Schwarzschild's over-anxiety about space. The ACCF is geared to expose Stalinist demagoguery about freedom by crying "How about the slave-labor camps?" etc. It's the obverse of the Stalinist pot-and-kettle recipe: "Slave-labor? How about the Negroes in the South. . ."

But a reply in our columns, where merely beating the Stalinists over the head would hardly help? That was a little harder to imagine. No offense to Mr. Schwarzschild, whom we do not have the pleasure of knowing. He clearly believes in what the ACCF is doing and sincerely wishes to defend it against detractors, as indeed he should. We would have been very interested in reading (and printing) the reply which he was so anxious to send in.

We would have been interested, for example, in finding out what he could have said about the strange refusal of the ACCF even to come out against the McCarran anti-alien law, which had been denounced by every half-decent liberal and even every half-decent conservative. (See LABOR ACTION of Feb. 2, 1953 for our "Open Letter to the ACCF," where, incidentally, the political character of the organization was documented in some detail—in irrefutable detail, we like to think.)

For another, we would have been interested in finding out how Mr. Schwarzschild reconciles his picture of the ACCF with the continued presence of a notorious McCarthyite in the leadership of his organization—(we refer to member of the executive committee James Burnham)—not to speak of the presence of McCarthyites like Victor Lasky, Ralph de Toledano, Max Eastman, Victor Riesel among the liberal names on its stationery.

We would be interested in many other aspects of the letter which we never received in spite of Mr. Schwarzschild's laudable ardor for defending the ACCF.

It's a Topsy-Turvy World

But don't go away—the tale is not over. We did finally get a letter this week. In it Executive Director Stein finally explains why there will be no reply from the ACCF.

It seems his "limited energies" should not be "frittered away" answering people who "quite consciously and purposefully misinterpret" the ACCF. And "our main energies will continue to be devoted toward combating both Communism and demagogues like McCarthy."

We gather that Mr. Schwarzschild had not taken the energy issue into account. And we are overjoyed to hear that Mr. Stein's unfrittered energy resources will be directed against both Stalinists and McCarthyites. He is in an enviable position to do good in the latter respect. Most liberal organizations which want to fight McCarthyism have a handicap: they must go outside their own ranks to find it. It's convenient to have all the factors for activity present right at home.

So we are almost ashamed that Mr. Stein had to fritter even so much as to write us his note. But there's Mr. Schwarzschild—now, there's clearly another matter. The energy-and-fritter picture would seem to be different. After all, have we not both already expended a measurable number of ergs and fritter-units making arrangements for the reply that was going to vindicate the ACCF? The calorie expenditure involved can never be regained; it already represents an investment. What can possibly be stopping Mr. Schwarzschild from telling us, and our misled readers, the truth about the ACCF?

Surely, the Cultural Freedom committee cannot be the type of organization in which only the Leader can speak for it. Surely, it cannot be that a staff member cannot even write a defense of the organization without the OK of (say) Sidney Hook.

Surely, as a matter of fact, it is within the province of Cultural Freedom to raise the issue of Mr. Schwarzschild's unfettered right to defend the ACCF, even though he is a staff member. We hereby demand that he be given the right to attack us! This is one of the most curious slogans ever raised in LABOR ACTION, but it's a topsy-turvy world, isn't it?

NEW YORK

Celebrate

May Day

with the ISL and

Young Socialist League

SPECIAL FILM
FEATURE

FOOD • DANCING

CAMARADERIE

at the
Women's Trade Union League
247 Lexington Avenue, N. Y. C.

SATURDAY EVENING
MAY 1

U.S. Intervention? — —

(Continued from page 1)

United States in this war vastly exceeds the aid which the Chinese Stalinists have given the Vietminh, by the admission of the American government.

Yet the French are hanging on the ropes. Why is this? Can the United States, by sending planes and ships, or even ground troops, change the situation?

Everyone admits the reason for the French failure in Indo-China. They are a foreign imperialist power, fighting a war to retain their hold on a country which wants no part of them. They have no friends in Indo-China, only hirelings, puppets, and "supporters" who seek an opportunity, or the tipping of the scales against French power, to desert them either, to go over to the Vietminh or to launch an independent struggle for the freedom of their country.

The Vietminh has grown stronger in years of bloody war, not so much because of aid they have received from the Chinese but because they have attracted anti-French, pro-independence masses and leaders the bulk of whom are not Stalinists, but who see in the Stalinists the most powerful and active fighters for national independence. As long as the French continue to exercise their rule in Indo-China, they will be the chief recruiters to the Stalinist armies.

SITTING ON DYNAMITE

True, American planes in sufficient numbers, American troops, and perhaps American tactical A-bombs could turn the military tide. Unless the Chinese intervene also, as they did in Korea, an American victory over the organized armies of the Vietminh is entirely possible. But would this mean an American victory over Stalinism in Indo-China, or in Southeast Asia?

For years the Vietminh confined its military actions to guerrilla warfare. The French held some military outposts and the big cities. They patrolled the roads in the daytime. But the moment night fell, the countryside belonged to the Vietminh. Such guerrilla warfare can only be fought successfully over a prolonged period with the backing of the mass of the people. Would American military occupation of the country be any more palatable to the people than has been that of the French?

An American military victory would mean simply this: that U. S. troops would have to sit, for an undeterminable period, on a keg of dynamite in Southeast Asia. And through the area, in fact, throughout the world, Stalinism would grow fat on this further proof of American imperialist expansion.

But of course, everyone knows that even this mockery of "saving democracy" is not what will most likely happen if the United States actually intervenes in Indo-China. The most likely outcome would be the entry of China into the war, either openly and formally, or by means of its notorious "volunteers," Korea-style.

ALARM RINGS

Dulles knows it; that is certain. And this is why he and the whole Eisenhower administration have been softening up the American people for acceptance of full-scale war with China. This is why they, and their propagandists, have been pulling out all the stops in warning the people that what is involved is not just Indo-China but the whole of Southeast Asia, and that if "we" lose Indo-China it is just a matter of time before the hundreds of millions of people in that vast area fall under the sway of Stalinism.

Why is it a certainty, or even likely, that if Indo-China goes the rest will go

with it? Will the Indo-Chinese Stalinists set out to conquer Thailand, Burma, Malay, Indonesia and the rest by military aggression? Or will the Chinese seek to follow the road of the Japanese empire in the last war? No, it is not a military conquest of the area which is the real danger—not even the warmongers claim that.

It is the political vulnerability of the area which constitutes the real danger. But that can be countered not by military force, but by political, economic and social means alone. Dulles and the Eisenhower administration have no such means at their disposal in Indo-China or in the rest of Asia. And that is why they wave the A-bomb instead!

PUSH TO WAR

Responsible newspaper columnists say that there are men high in the government, led by the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who advocate immediate intervention within the next two weeks by air and sea power. Their counsels may well be rejected. It appears that Dulles is primarily concerned, at the moment, with a big maneuver of pressure diplomacy in the hope of staving off disaster at the Geneva conference.

But such is the nature of his gamble, and that of the Eisenhower administration for which he acts, that it may lead them, even unwillingly, to involve us in disaster. They are gambling with the lives of millions.



In an effort to stave off an open split among the allies at the conference in Berlin, Dulles was forced to agree to the meeting in Geneva which would take up the problems of Korea and Indo-China. The French desperately want an end to the war in Indo-China. The most they could hope for was some kind of deal with the Chinese Stalinists in which, for some consideration elsewhere, the Chinese would agree to stop support to their Vietminh allies and perhaps to engineer some kind of political settlement in Indo-China.

But it is well known that the minimum price the Stalinists want for such a deal is admission to the United Nations as the government of China. The maximum might be a French abandonment of any further toying with the idea of a European Defense Community army.

The French are certainly willing to accept the first demand, and seem as likely as not to grant the second in practice, with or without a deal in Asia. But the United States stands in the way of both. Even if the leaders of the Eisenhower administration were willing to normalize relations with the actual government of China by admitting it into the UN, they could not do so without risking an irreparable split in the already divided Republican Party.

Thus Dulles faced the prospect of going to Geneva to reject an imperative French demand for concessions which he could not give. The British incline to the French view on admitting China into the UN. The only thing which could save United States policy from open disaster, from isolation from its major allies in the face of Stalinist pressure, would be a miracle.

But Dulles, despite his well-known religious convictions, is not the kind of man to passively await miraculous intervention when he, and the government he represents, can help the miracle to occur.

TURNABOUT

Thus, just a month before the Geneva conference was to meet, it was suddenly discovered that unless something is done now, immediately, Indo-China is as good as lost to Stalinism. Dulles warned that China is "perilously close" to military aggression in Indo-China. Eisenhower, who on February 10 had told a press conference that he could conceive of no

greater tragedy for America than to get heavily involved in an all-out war in "any of those regions," has now (March 25) announced that the defense of Indo-China was of "transcendent importance."

Dulles then began his international diplomatic campaign to line up Britain, France, and a number of other countries behind a pledge of "united action" in Indo-China. The American people and the peoples of the world were left to guess just what "action" is proposed. But they need not wonder too much. It is clear that what is proposed is war, or at the very least, the threat of war.

How does all this improve the prospects of the United States government for the Geneva conference? The French and British, who until yesterday were pressing the United States to offer concessions to Stalinist China, are now in a position where they will feel relieved if they get out of the "negotiations" with nothing worse than a continuation of the war in Indo-China on its present "small" scale. If the United States presses them hard enough, and Dulles has not flown to Europe to exchange pleasantries with them, they will be faced with the alternatives of either openly breaking with America, or of going along in the hope of restraining the United States from a fatal adventure in Asia.

GAMBLE WITH LIVES

But is it not possible that the American government is just bluffing; that Dulles hopes that if Stalinist China is confronted with the threat of "united action," or of just American military action, they will draw back in Indo-China?

Of course it is possible, and even likely. But this is a gamble, as we have said above, with the lives of millions. If the bluff is called, if the Chinese simply continue to give the kind of support to the Vietminh they have given in the past while holding out the offer of peace in exchange for a seat in the UN, either American policy will be left at loose ends before the world, or we will be in a war which, this time, may not end even with the kind of tragedy which we suffered in Korea.

But even if all this is true, is there any other course by which Indo-China can be saved from Stalinism? Can we do nothing but "sit idly by"?

Yes, there is another course. Its success is not guaranteed, but it is possible. In this, it differs from the policy of the American government which is guaranteed to bring disaster, and which cannot possibly bring success for democracy.

This course, in a word, is to turn over the defense of democracy and freedom in Indo-China to the people of that country. Its first step is to give them their freedom so that they can defend their own country against Stalinist enslavement.

This means: the French must give up their claim to rule, and their rule itself, in Indo-China now. They must be induced to turn over the government and the military authority to the Vietnamese now. Once this has been done, once the Vietnamese people have gained their sovereignty, it would be up to them to decide what military support they may request, under their own control, to help them to stave off the Stalinist military danger to their rule.

NO DICE

But, practically speaking, are there organized political forces in the country capable of taking over the government, undermining the political appeal of Stalinism, and thus mobilizing the people to fight for their own independence? Yes, there are.

This is the big difference between Korea and Indo-China. In the former, the Rhee government was and is a discredited, hated, reactionary force which itself engendered support for Stalinism. In Indo-China, on both sides of the "front" there are still political and social movements (organized in Vietnam, in less organized form among the supporters of the Vietminh) which are capable of waging a progressive war against the Stalinists as their similars did successfully in Burma. But they cannot be effective as long as the French rule the country.

This is the only policy which can possibly win for democracy in Indo-China. The hour for its application is late, but if instead the country is engulfed in a war between the United States and Stalinist China, and the Russians who stand behind her, the last chance for democracy and for peace in this generation may be lost for Southeast Asia, and possibly for the world.

The time for protest, the time to stop the gamblers in Washington from staking everything on this mad throw of the dice, is now.

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

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

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

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2. New
 - 6 months at \$1. Renewal
 - Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

SUBSCRIBERS—ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

18-16

If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW!

YSL Urges Full Support of SDA Program to Fight for Academic Freedom for All!

By MAX MARTIN

The New York Region of Students for Democratic Action (SDA) deserves the congratulations and active support of all democrats for its initiation and sponsorship of an Academic Freedom Week campaign.

The campaign, to be held in the New York area from May 5 to 12, will include the distribution of a pamphlet outlining SDA's position on the rights of students and teachers, and of thousands of copies of a leaflet. Plans are now being made for forums and symposiums on the various campuses in the area.

The climax of the Week will consist of a city-wide rally for academic freedom which will be held on Sunday, May 9, at Community Church. Efforts are being made to obtain well-known civil-libertarians as speakers for this rally.

SDA is endeavoring to achieve wide student support for and participation in the Week. The campus meetings will be sponsored by the largest number of student organizations that can be involved in the campaign. SDA, moreover, has called upon all democratic student groups to endorse the Week; each endorsing organization will be entitled to have a speaker at the rally.

To date, the Young Socialist League and the state Young Liberals have given their endorsements—each, however, as will be explained below, on a different basis.

PROGRAMMATIC BASIS

Even more significant than the fact that such a campaign is being conducted is the programmatic basis of the campaign. The program of this Week consists of a principled defense of academic freedom, a defense of the rights of all students and teachers, including those whose politics liberals and socialists violently detest—the Stalinists.

The SDA program calls for the right of students and teachers to freely hold and express any political opinions, to participate in the political life of the community, to organize any associations they may see fit on the campus and to hear speakers of their own choosing at meetings of these associations. It declares that the only valid criteria for the hiring and firing of faculty members is competence and the meeting of professional standards.

SDA denies the contention that advocacy of Stalinist or other unpopular views, or membership in political organizations, including the Communist Party, or pleading the Fifth Amendment before investigating committees, are grounds for the dismissal of teachers.

THE TREND

The fact that SDA's action elicits praise from socialists is an index to the political nature of our times, to its stark reactionary and apathetic character. The sad truth is that SDA is rare among liberal organizations in defending the view that all, even Stalinists, should enjoy political and civil liberties.

The prevalent trend today among lib-

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the *Challenge* or the YSL.

Editor: Bogdan Denitch

Editorial Board:

Denitch, Henry Gale, Michael Harrington

slaught against non-conformist radicals, socialists and even liberals.

The retreat on civil-liberties by liberals, moreover, is part of the whole pattern of movement to the right which has characterized our period, the liberals and labor movement along with everybody else. After twenty years of New and Fair Deals the liberals find themselves fighting for political ideas whose victory they had long ago thought achieved.

Our congratulations to SDA, and the Young Socialist League's endorsement of the Week and participation in the campaign, are enthusiastic precisely because this campaign has as its ideological center a principled program. The Young Liberals present an interesting contrast; they have announced their endorsement of the Week as an endorsement "in principle," making clear their disassociation from the defense of the rights of Stalinists.

A CRITICISM

While congratulating SDA we cannot omit entirely some friendly criticism. For the truth is that SDA, like liberalism in general, has not fought for civil-liberties and academic freedom consistently. Too often their timidity, their need for "respectability" and "gentility" have caused them to defend their ideas in a half-hearted fashion. Above all, they have compromised and weakened their defense of freedom as well as of all other aspects of their program by remaining tied to the Democratic Party.

The self-defeating and impractical nature of this political alliance is nowhere better seen than in relation to the fight for civil liberties. For the hysteria now raging in the land was initiated, not by

the Republicans and not by McCarthy, but by the Truman administration, in the form of "subversive" lists and loyalty oaths. Moreover, the very politicians whom SDA supports, Stevenson for example, defends decisive aspects of the witchhunt, objecting only to McCarthy, to his excesses and methods, and to the fact that the witchhunt is beginning to be directed against Democrats themselves.

The same politicians for whom SDAers will ring doorbells this November conduct their quarrel with McCarthy and Eisenhower by saying, "Let the FBI do it," or "We can do it better," and "We put more Reds in jail than you did."

But what is it that the Democrats want the FBI to do, or claim that they can do more effectively? Nothing other than what SDA is opposed to, the denial of political rights to Stalinists and even socialists and radicals.

Nor does the rest of SDA's program fare any better at the hands of its political standard-bearers. The Democrats whom SDA endorses respond to its program with reactions which range from outspoken hostility to verbal lip-service without accompanying effort.

SUPPORT DEMOCRATS?

We of the Young Socialist League believe that a genuine program of civil liberties and genuinely progressive domestic and foreign policies cannot be expected from the Democratic Party; that to effectuate the program of the labor movement and the liberals, limited as that program is now, the unions and the liberals must break with the Democrats and organize a party of their own. It would appear that the question of who is right about the Democratic Party could easily be settled by appealing to experience.

The reason why it is, however, difficult to convince SDA-type liberals of our view in this matter is that they do not in actuality require their candidates to espouse their own program. In doing so, they unwittingly bear out our contentions. What is wrong with SDA is not merely that its program is often a limited and timid one, and not merely that its conception of politics is a mistaken one insofar as it does not think in terms of class and social forces but thinks rather in terms of "good" versus "bad" capitalist politicians, but also that it does not fight aggressively for its program; it does not demand that the parties and candidates it supports should struggle for its program, as a condition for that support.

BACK THE CAMPAIGN

In the final analysis, a genuine fight for freedom cannot be carried on without an understanding of the relationship of the witchhunt to the cold war. The attacks on democracy are the domestic analogues of the Truman and Eisenhower foreign policies; policies which liberals by and large support. American capitalism can meet the support which Stalinism's anti-capitalist social program is able to muster only by military means abroad and repression at home. The witchhunt has the function of silencing in advance the critics of what will certainly be an unpopular war.

Critical as we are of liberalism, we fully recognize the progressive achievement of this Academic Freedom Week campaign. The Young Socialist League calls upon all of its members and friends, all readers of *Challenge*, and all democratic students in the New York area to attend the rally and participate fully in the campaign.

We can only hope that this campaign is taken up in other localities and becomes the beginning of a counteroffensive by the students, who have been silent for too long.

Will SDA Press Its Campaign?

The article on this page refers to a program for an Academic Freedom Week which the New York Region of the Students for Democratic Action had planned to run in this city.

At last week's convention of Americans for Democratic Action, the adult organization of which SDA is the youth section, a resolution was adopted which retreats from the previous ambiguous stand taken by ADA on the right of Stalinist teachers to teach. In effect, ADA has come out for the denial of this right.

The SDA, however, at its convention last winter took the excellent stand on academic freedom referred to in the accompanying article. They had planned to make the issue of academic freedom in this period in America the central theme of their Academic Freedom Week. But their adult organization has yielded another step before the McCarthyite drive, against civil liberties and democratic rights.

It is to the credit of the SDA delegates at the ADA convention that they put up a vigorous fight for their own civil-libertarian point of view. They were joined in this fight by a section of ADA who have refused to cave in on this issue before the reactionary drive.

One reason they lost will undoubtedly be found in the failure of liberals to push their views all year round and to do so in a vigorous and consistent manner. If the SDAers and genuine civil-libertarians in ADA had conducted a long campaign to convince the ranks of ADA of their views, the convention might have turned out differently.

NO RETREAT FROM PRINCIPLES!

As a result, the question of whether or not SDA can continue to conduct a campaign on the basis of its views on Academic Freedom has now been raised. The ideological nature of the campaign, and indeed the very continuation of the Week, are now in doubt. It may also become necessary for the Young Socialist League to reconsider the nature of its endorsement and participation in the campaign, depending upon what the ultimate SDA decision is.

If the New York region of the SDA changes the political basis of their plans for an Academic Freedom Week, then it will be because their ties to ADA, and ADA's ties to certain Democratic leaders who are more concerned with holding their jobs than with the principles of civil liberties, have, in effect, forced them to be silent on that which needs to be cried from the housetops. Once again, they are confronted with the whole dilemma of liberal politics in America: to stand for liberty, for decency in political and academic life, for a truly progressive social program—or to continue the dreary retreat before the legions led by the senator from Wisconsin, in the name of "political practicality."

We urge the SDA to continue the campaign for Academic Freedom and not to retreat from their principled defense of democratic rights.

We of the Young Socialist League are still free to fight for academic freedom in its deepest and broadest meaning. We will continue this fight during Academic Freedom Week, as we do throughout the year. We will gladly participate with SDA and others who want to continue in this struggle.

The Liberals

Why Their Influence Has Been on the Wane —

Self-Delusions of the Liberal 'Realists'

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

In the fight for civil liberties, the socialist most often finds himself in an alliance with the consistent liberal. And there he is confronted with a paradoxical fact: that the liberal is quite near to him and, at the same time, quite far. The index of the closeness is usually the liberal's position on civil liberties—and the measure of the distance is the liberal's insistence on what he calls "realism."

Often the argument will begin with the liberal admitting socialist tendencies in his thinking, advocating a political syncretism which is phrased as "We are all working for the same goal." But then he will point out that the compromises, which he privately deplores, are necessary to maintain influence in the centers of power. The socialist, he will remark, may have his ideological purity (or, in more unfriendly terms, his doctrine, his dogma), but he is ineffective. The liberal's dirty hands, he will conclude, are merely the result of working vigorously.

But what are the actual characteristics of liberal "realism" and radical intransigence? The answer lies, I think, in two areas: an analysis of the reality of this realism, and a discussion of the theory behind it.

The most immediate answer is that the liberal's realism isn't realistic. It is, in C. Wright Mills' apt phrase, crackpot realism. For the last ten years, the liberal has spoken the language of practical politics (i.e., Democratic Party politics), and made all the necessary compromises; yet he has exercised practically no political power.

Americans for Democratic Action is a case in point. While candidly admitting that the liberal minority in "both" parties (a necessary bow to the façade of bipartisanship) is ineffective, ADA simply

calls for renewed effort without examining their basic position within the American political structure. The result is that the chairman of the Democratic Party can indicate that he wishes that ADA would go away, and he can do so with impunity.

THE ILLUSION PERSISTS

Even in the thirties, when the liberal was able to take over jobs in the New Deal bureaucracy, his political influence was well-mixed with illusion. It was possible for the liberal rhetorician to present Roosevelt as an American radical, a nineteenth-century Populist, in twentieth-century dress. Yet in reality Roosevelt was usually far more concerned with big city machines and Southern bourgeois than with the spontaneous masses. The machines and the Southerners were organized, the liberals only vaguely so.

But the illusion persists. The New Deal—as a movement of social reform—was over by 1938. During the War Deal, the liberals' actual influence diminished while his rhetorical importance increased. Henry Wallace's war was fought in the liberal press while Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill exchanged openly imperialist notes about spheres of influence.

Thus by the first test—the test of reality—the liberal formula of compromising in order to gain influence fails. It falls on a simple fact: liberal influence

never was great and it has been on the wane in dramatic fashion for the last ten years.

But the theory behind this crackpot realism is even more revealing. At bottom, it represents a fantastic simplification, and this conceptual naiveté is present in almost everything the liberal does.

The theory is an essentially moralistic analysis of social change. The political struggle is between the good and the bad. Political victory is the result of the mobilization of the people with good will, of sincerity. Both the content of a political program and the force of objective circumstance are seen as subordinate to the ethical factor in history.

Now it is obvious that the socialist is not anti-ethical, nor is he against the people of good will. But that is a far cry from elevating respect for sincerity to a political theory. The socialist sees change as the result of an interaction of will and objective circumstance. A perfectly sincere, honest, even idealistic banker is not necessarily on the side of "the good." For the question is not of a man's personality but of his social function, when you are discussing social change.

NEW DEAL MYTH

More than this, the socialist sees the labor movement as the growing edge of freedom not because of some abstract idealism but because of the objective conditions in which the worker finds himself. Will and sincerity are still important, but they must be related to actual social forces.

But now let us follow some of the results of the liberal theory in practice.

The reason why Stephen Mitchell could insult ADA as he did, and get away with it, is that ADA does not represent an organized social force. As a middle-class stratum of good-willed fellow travelers of the Democratic Party, it does not qualify as a voice in party councils. Unfortunate as it may be, Carmine de Sapio is a force within the Democratic Party, not through his idealism but through his control of organization and of votes.

Now this aspect of American liberalism is not isolated. It is, for instance, connected to the liberal's joy with the bureaucratization of the New Deal, a tendency to endorse all government intervention as "good." For after all, the New Deal approach is one which can by-pass the actual social masses and deal only with their leaders. And here, the liberal can step into the bureaucracy without the necessity of having popular support. Here, in terms of national politics, is a microcosm of the liberal's private world in which the good men will make the "revolution" and spare the people that task.

Probably the most extreme statement of this point of view is the liberal myth that Section 7A of the NIRA (the first "legislation" of union organization passed by the New Deal) "created" the labor movement. The legislative fiat of the good men becomes more important than the actual organization of the people.

It is out of this kind of naive theory that the compromise-for-influence position emerges. For if it is the bureaucrat who changes history it is paramount that the liberal always be with the bureaucrat to guide him. The result is two-fold. The liberal finds himself dedicated to an attitude of perpetual movement and to a quantitative notion of success.

CAMP-FOLLOWERS

The commitment to perpetual movement means that the liberal must always be the camp-follower of those who succeed. He must move with them, for he has no base of his own among the people, and his influence is dependent on their success. And in recent years, as reaction gained, the liberal swung to the right for, after all, that was where power was going.

Take an example of this kind of movement. When Point Four was announced, it was a "bold new program," it was the "only war we want." True, it did make tremendous concessions to private capital and it was necessary to explain it to the hard-headed businessmen in congress as a plan which would "create a favorable atmosphere for private investment." But this was the compromise which one had to accept in order to get the bold new program.

But as time passed, Point Four became the Mutual Security Administration, and its subordination to the needs of American capitalism in the cold war was

clearly revealed. The liberal made the turn, rhetoric and all, with a nostalgic look back at the old bold program. For doing this, he received exactly nothing. He had no influence in determining how the change would be made, or what it would be made to. But he was allowed to provide a democratic rationalization for both.

It is possible, I suppose, to say that this represents "realism" and "influence," but it is of a curious sort. After all, in a mercenary theory of politics in which you trade compromises for influence, it is a necessary part of the equation that you get influence.

This contradiction leads to yet another aspect of liberal thought, one which is particularly important today. Since the good-man, or bureaucratic, theory of history will lead one into all kinds of unfamiliar positions, it will be necessary to explain how each new position is a turn for the good. And this is done by making the present eternal, by generalizing any local change into a new form of society.

The Permanent War Economy is a good example of the operation of this psychology. For the last fifteen years, the American economy has been maintained by a huge armament sector. On two occasions, in 1949 and in 1953, reductions in that sector have led to recessions. Thus, the phenomenon of American capitalist prosperity in the last fifteen years is hardly a mysterious thing. The main causes are in clear outline.

SCHIZOID LIBERALISM

But in the long trek to the right in this period, the liberal could not accept such an analysis. Instead, this Permanent War Economy became a new form of society, a mixed economy and a welfare state, testifying to the particular ingenuity of American pragmatism as opposed to socialist dogmatism. Lacking a theory capable of analyzing the complex causation of social change, the liberal is forced into turning each particular situation into a metaphysic. This is the logical outcome of the quantitative attitude toward success, for each change in politics must be rationalized as a success.

These are some of the aspects of the liberal schizophrenia—of the tremendous distance between the announced "realism" and the actual reality. In practice, the influence which the liberal is to receive as payment for his compromises turns out to be illusory. In theory, this is inextricably related to a bureaucratic theory of history, to an unwillingness to work with organized masses, and to base upon them. It is inherent in the very pressure-group rationale of Americans for Democratic Action itself.

The socialist movement is, on the other hand, admittedly weak. Yet if the socialist is "unrealistic" in the sense of rejecting a reality which he sees clearly, this is far more healthy than the liberal acceptance of the illusion of reality. We stand our ground. There is no substitute for a truly practical orientation toward social change, and for us this means that we seek the dynamic force in the labor movement. Perhaps the revolution will never come, but if it does, if it will be democratic, this is how it will come.

Young Socialist Fund Drive Launched; Chicago in Lead — Let's Get Over the Top!

By SCOTT ARDEN
National Secretary, YSL

The first national Fund Drive of the Young Socialist League is now under way. Opening its drive on April 1, the YSL has until June 30 to reach, or exceed, its necessary quota of \$1,500.

As is evident from the figures in the box score, the drive is off to a slow start. This in itself is not a danger sign but it must be remedied at once. There is a natural tendency for friends and comrades to feel that, since the drive will last several months, it really doesn't matter too much whether they send in their contributions now or later. Experience has shown, however, that there is a difference, and a very real one at that.

The first month of the drive is the crucial one, and success or failure of the whole drive might well depend on what happens within the next two weeks. If it

is impossible to send in your total contribution now, then send in a part of it. The important thing is that it be done now.

The significance of this drive is obvious. The \$1,500 total was chosen not because it is a nice round number but because \$1,500 is what the YSL must raise if it is to plan to function in an effective way on any realistic basis.

The YSL has no "angel" and no private source of funds. As a newly formed independent organization, the YSL has no adult group to support or subsidize it, as do other youth organizations. The YSL stands on its own, and can draw only on its friends and members for support.

Why should you contribute to the YSL? The answer can best be found in the pages of this and previous issues of *Challenge*. The YSL is the only nationwide youth group that is doing something about fighting for democracy, civil liberties, and socialism, fighting against the witchhunt, the war drive, and human exploitation, whether under Stalinism or capitalism.

A contribution does not necessarily represent an "endorsement" of the program or views of the YSL. It does, however, mean that you are willing to give us a chance to continue our work. The aura of silence and conformity cloaking the American campus today is alone evidence enough of the need for an organized democratic force that will not be silenced and resists docile conformity. In the youth and student field today the YSL is the only such force.

What's the Score?

	Quota	Paid-in	%
Total	\$1500	\$266	18
Berkeley	100	0	0
Boston	70	0	0
Chicago	200	125	62
Los Angeles	200	5	2.5
Newark	50	0	0
New Haven	35	0	0
New York	675	128	19
At Large	170	8	4

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

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the YSL's Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE

(Make checks payable to Scott Arden)

The YSL's Aim

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

Cold War

"Heavy, Heavy Hangs Over Thy Head . . ."

FOREIGN POLICY: THE AMERICAN FAILURE

By OWEN MORSE

After seven years of the bipartisan foreign policy of "containment of Communism"—a policy that has seen the fall of Czechoslovakia and China, that has seen the Korean bloodbath of the last years to achieve a stalemate, and that moves now toward another Korea in Indo-China for the glory of French imperialism—after all this, one might think that at least a wise few among its liberal supporters would be re-examining their conception of the nature of this policy.

The cold war has been pictured by the spokesmen for America's foreign policy as a fight for Freedom and Democracy against Totalitarianism:

In the course of this struggle, all sorts of pressing situations and the need for hasty decision have caused "blunders." The U. S. has supported Franco, Chiang Kai-shek, De Gasperi, Tito, Adenauer, Bao Dai, Syngman Rhee; and the list goes on. All were a bit on the dictatorial, reactionary, or totalitarian side, to be sure, but they were against the Russians! And anyway, they weren't as bad as all that. . . .

But these blunders are only peripheral things. After all—look at the Marshall Plan, Point Four, NATO. The forces of Democracy (i.e., the nations in the American camp) have been strengthened. And we've built up such a pile of A- and H-bombs that they'd never dare strike. All things considered, the "free world" is at least stronger, and that's what counts in this real world. Let us be realists.

So our liberal spokesmen speak. These gentlemen confuse two different things: the fight for democracy and against totalitarianism, which is a political and social fight, and the military-diplomatic maneuvers of "naked and arbitrary powers." Washington and Moscow.

FOR WHAT?

There was a day when these maneuvers were carried out in a straightforward fashion with no verbose shilly-shallying. In the days before the First World War the rallying cries were "National Honor" and "Manifest Destiny" and the like. Since then the world and the nature of the struggle among imperialist nations have changed. Modern wars call for all-out efforts and total mobilization of the population; national unity and popular support is a necessity.

And so we have had two world wars for "democracy" which left the world less free and less democratic, and in the space of thirty years killed and enslaved more people than in the previous three centuries.

The Second World War is a fine case study. Allied against fascist totalitarianism were, among others, Chiang Kai-shek, Smuts of South Africa, and Stalin, that great friend of democracy and freedom. The division of the spoils at Yalta, Potsdam, etc., handed over the people of Eastern Europe, Manchuria and North Korea—a greater number than Hitler controlled at the height of his power—to the most vicious totalitarian force the

world has ever seen. The "liberated" people of Korea were saddled with a Russian puppet in the north and an American puppet in the south, a situation which ruined the economy and laid the basis for the bloodbath.

Defeating Hitler didn't mean defeating totalitarianism or fascism. It did mean the crushing of Germany as a world power. This is ABC. Defeating Moscow in a military struggle will do no more to weaken, much less destroy, totalitarianism. It's not only what you're against that counts, it's what you're for. And what has U. S. foreign policy been for?

STATUS QUO POLITICS

Almost without exception the U. S. has allied itself with the most reactionary forces in every country. With the collapse of the old empires, all of Asia has been up in revolt demanding independence, land reform and industrialization. And everywhere the hand of the U. S. is seen bolstering the status quo—that which is totally unacceptable to the millions of peasants and workers who for centuries have borne the burden of the white man, on their backs.

Stalinism comes with a dynamic program against the status quo and gains the support of these millions. When the disillusionment with Stalinism comes, as it comes now in China, it is too late. The new shackles are firmly in place.

But to say that the major problem is the naiveté of the Asian peasant is to miss the point. The obvious solution that immediately follows is merely a stepped-up program of "telling them the truth"—a barrage of words via Voice of America and the like—and we have seen how effective this is.

To the Asian peasant, his African brother, the masses of Europe, in fact to the major portion of the world's population, the "real" problems come first. Capitalism and the fruits of its imperialism they know at first hand with the knowledge of centuries. The hypothetical terrors of modern totalitarianism are not yet real things to them. The important thing for them is to get land and independence.

And if the Americans continue to bolster the status quo which prevents the realization of these basic goals, then they will be against the Americans. And they are. And no pittance from Point Four will help. Only deeds, not words, can change this. And we socialists are convinced that a capitalist U. S. will never offer them more than words.

THE FORCE FOR PEACE

The only way to defeat Stalinism as a social force is by building an anti-Stalinist people's movement that fights, as a minimum, for the legitimate demands, spoken of above, demands that every principled democrat must support. This movement is the Third Camp that we socialists speak of.

It is international in scope, but as yet without an international organizational form. It commands no governments or armies; few leading parties pay any attention to it. But it is a major force in the world today, the force that exploited people everywhere have always had; and the world will shake and powers crumble when it becomes conscious of its power. It is the force that socialists since the beginnings of the socialist movement have looked to, and offered a program for.

Liberals today—and unfortunately the great bulk of the social-democrats as well—have forgotten this force. They have been corrupted by the power of governments and the might of armies. These seem to them the only forces that exist, that can do things, that can fight battles and win victories. If you don't identify with the American or Russian state then you are indeed helpless and impotent in their eyes.

Yet the workers of East Berlin did more in a few days to shake the power of Stalinism than the years of NATO and Voice of America. It is with the workers of East Berlin and their counterparts the world over—on both sides of the Iron Curtain—that we identify. They are the leaders of the "free world," not the United States government.

PROGRAM FOR FREE WORLD

To those liberals who believe that a capitalist America can have a democratic foreign policy, we say:

Fight to make that policy a reality. Fight in your own way—within the Democratic Party if you insist—but at least fight! Do more than pass a resolution at a union convention or a Liberal Party meeting. Bring your program to the public, wage your electoral campaigns about it, try to make the Democratic Party put it in its program, if you believe in the Democratic Party. But fight!

Whenever and wherever you militantly fight for your own program we will fight with you side by side. But have the courage of your convictions, don't stand for the hiding of this program because it is not "respectable." Don't cower behind the skirts of "independent" or "good government" groups that have no program and are especially created for that quality. Speak in your own name and fight for your own program. Have some guts!

As long as there is no strong voice for a democratic foreign policy in the U. S., the people of the world will see America as a monolith of reaction, not as the "leader of the free world." Only when such a policy is put into effect—in deeds not words—will "anti-American" feeling die.

And until that time, the fight for freedom is a fight against the United States policy as well as against Russia. Capitalism provides no answer to Stalinism; the former's decay means the latter's growth. The atom bomb and its like is the only weapon that a capitalist America can use effectively against Stalinism. The Third World War will come inevitably if capitalist America and Stalinist Russia remain the arbiters of world destiny. The Third Camp and the hope it represents points the way out.

The Home Front

The Outlook for Students Today —

Peace AND Prosperity Under Capitalism?

By CHARLES MARSHALL

The continuing blindness of liberals to the failures of the capitalist economy, their refusal to recognize the role of the Permanent War Economy as the only means of shoring up an economic system in serious difficulties, makes it impossible for them to come to realistic conclusions about the present state of the economy and prohibits their offering any solutions other than those that failed in the past.

The liberals point to the "Roosevelt Era" as though it had worked out some solution of U. S. economic problems which, if only applied now, would solve all of our economic difficulties. In order to do this, of course, they must overlook the facts about the thirties.

The fact is that despite the tremendous efforts of the Roosevelt administration, the application of "Keynesian" techniques, the attempts to increase consumer purchasing power, the American economy continued to decline during the thirties, and in 1937 a new low in industrial output was reached. That is to say, all of the "radical" schemes for increasing consumer buying power—the same ideas now being offered by liberal spokesmen—all the "noble" experiments, NRA, WPA, all the "alphabet administrations" of the New Deal, had no lasting effect. Unemployment remained at record levels and industrial production stagnated.

SOME TIE-UPS

When did the rate of production again rise? When did unemployment begin to decline significantly. Curiously enough, shortly after the start of the war in Europe, with the United States becoming the "arsenal of democracy," with the start of "lend-lease," with the beginning of war

production, we find that the depression was finally overcome. What about after the war? A decline in the economy in 1946—Marshall Plan; a recession in 1949-1950—Korean War. Are there no conclusions to be drawn?

Let's take a glance at the budget. We have forgotten what a "normal" budget looks like. Even the budgets of the early Roosevelt years are minute in comparison to the ones we have become accustomed to. Military budgets and expenditures ranging from a low of twenty to a high of seventy billion dollars have become an accepted part of our economic life. Are we to draw from them no conclusions as to what is shoring up the American economy? Are we to continue to argue that the formulation characterizing the American economy as basically a Permanent War Economy is mere "polemic"? To deny the Permanent War Economy is to be blind to a fact.

What about today? The Eisenhower administration does not even offer us the sop of increased consumer buying power. It offers us instead the "trickle-down" theory. "What's good for General Motors is good for the country." Do you think so? What about the foreign policy that goes with this economic theory? What does it offer to the small and colonial nations in terms of development of their economies?

CAN IT WORK?

Before we draw any conclusions let's look at our side of things for a minute. What have we as students to look forward to in seeking jobs? Are you a high school graduate out looking for work? Are you getting out of college this semester and expecting to go out job hunting? The chances are not so good.

According to our business leaders—whom the Eisenhower administration proudly represents—we are in a period of "rolling readjustment." That is, the economy, according to them, is just returning to a normal and healthy basis—a few unemployed are good for business. How do you like the idea?

So what have we got? On the one hand we are faced with a present administration which piously hopes that by creating a favorable atmosphere for big business all of our economic problems will solve themselves. That this hasn't worked in the

past, and besides leaves us with an untenable foreign policy, is of little interest to it. On the other hand the "opposition," the liberals, offer us the same type of "solution" that they tried the last time they were in power—and it didn't work then. Why should it work now?

Well, where do we go from here? Is there a solution to the dilemma posed? Must we continue to prop up the economy by the total waste of military expenditures or is there a way out of the Permanent War Economy? Do we have to continue along lines that threaten daily to engulf us in the horrors of H-bomb warfare and "massive retaliation"? The answer is a most emphatic no. The answer lies in the breaking away by labor from its ties to the existing major parties and the organization of a labor party which would represent the interests of the working class and its allies.

Such a move would be most certainly in our interest as students and young intellectuals. Our destinies are irrevocably tied to those of the working class. We are naturally its allies. Our right to jobs, the things that we have to offer to society, our skills, are the very ones that would be most fully appreciated by a labor party organized in the interest of workers, farmers and consumers.

The American economy is certainly capable of production at a high capacity. It requires, however, that it be organized in the interests of those people who would benefit by production for use and not production for profit. If labor would press for its demands, would require that the economy provide for full employment, would press for equitable taxation and so on, it would soon find itself divorced from the two old parties which offer it nothing in the way of solution to its problems.

And in that action it would discover itself with the amazing and vitally important power of improving its condition domestically, of fighting for and building a living and growing economy based upon its needs. Concomitant with that development of a labor-based domestic economy would develop the possibility for a truly democratic foreign policy which could make America in fact the leader of the free world and offer an alternative to Stalinism which would fire the imagination and capture the loyalty of the people of the world.

CHICAGO

On the Issue of Choosing Student Speakers —

U. of Chi. Students Battle Administration

By DEBBIE MEIER

All over the country liberals and conservatives are mobilizing against "McCarthyism." Each proclaims loudly about the dangers of McCarthyite excesses, the need for outright and free expression, the tragedy of student apathy and conformity, and other fine sentiments. But in the meantime some of these very same people are carrying on a subtler campaign of repression. It is this subtle campaign which is hardest to attack and, in the long run, even if it arises out of better intentions, equally dangerous.

A good example of it occurred recently at the University of Chicago, which is (relatively speaking) still an outpost of academic freedom and liberal administration.

As part of the National Student Association's Academic Freedom Week program at the University of Chicago, several campus political clubs decided to sponsor a symposium presenting various political views on the problem of academic freedom. Among the groups originally in on the planning were the Young Democrats, the Politics Club and the Students for Democratic Action. They decided to invite one speaker from the Young Republicans; the Politics Club was permitted two speakers, one presenting the YSL position and the other the Socialist Party; and of course the SDA and the YD each included their speakers.

It was also suggested, and agreed by all three sponsoring clubs, that the Labor Youth League (Stalinist) be invited to send a speaker. The LYL is no longer a campus club, as it declined last year any effort to become a recognized club on the grounds that the Students Activities office was turning over to the FBI and other investigators the names of its members (ten names must be filed with the Student Activities office in order to become a recognized student organization). Nevertheless, despite the fact that all three groups were clearly on record in vigorous opposition to Stalinism, each felt that the LYL, as a national youth group, should be invited.

Plans were initiated, posters were made, and publicity arranged. At this point the Director of Student Activities, William Birenbaum, came through with his surprise maneuver.

A week before the symposium was to take place, the chairman of the Young Democrats had a conversation with Birenbaum. Birenbaum informed him that (1) he saw no reason why the Labor Youth League should be heard at all, and (2) since the LYL wasn't a recognized student club they had no right to be heard.

This was an entirely amazing statement, as the Student Code, a handbook of regulations for student organizations agreed upon by the Student Government and the administration, explicitly states that recognized student clubs may sponsor whomever they wish on campus, and many clubs, such as the Politics Club for example, largely sponsor non-campus speakers from organizations which are not themselves campus groups.

STRATAGEMS

Birenbaum offered one way out (other than dropping the LYL altogether): on the bottom of the poster, after the names of the sponsoring organization, it should be stated explicitly that the three sponsoring organizations were willing to sponsor the LYL on campus, and secondly that it be made clear on the poster that the LYL was not a recognized student club.

Reasonable proposals? In a different atmosphere they might be, but then in a different atmosphere they would not be suggested either. The reaction was inevitable. The Young Democrats began to hesitate. What did Mr. Birenbaum have in mind? While they didn't mind actually sponsoring such a symposium to have it stated in such a way on the poster was distasteful to them.

A new stratagem was then suggested. The posters were revised in such a way that rather than having the six organizations represented, six individuals who happened to be members of six different political organizations would be presented. After all, the thinking went, could Mr. Birenbaum deny our right to sponsor an individual who was a Stalinist?

But Birenbaum was not stumped by this. His new proposal was that each of the three groups would have to submit to him a letter, signed by the executive boards

or their equivalents, explicitly stating that they were willing to sponsor a symposium which included a speaker who was a member of LYL!

Again, in an abstract way, a "reasonable" proposal. But by this time it was late in the week and the symposium was but a few days off, posters were not able to go up, a story in the *Maroon* was held up, and precious time had been wasted. And, not unexpectedly, the chairman of the Young Democrats grew increasingly worried. While he himself felt it was still a good idea to have an LYLER, he began to doubt whether he could, even if he had time, get the permission of his 15-man executive committee in view of Birenbaum's opposition. Finally, cautiously, courteously and regretfully he suggested that only the SDA and the Politics Club sponsor the meeting (although the YD would still send a speaker, of course, and the chairman agreed to continue to help plan the program.)

Even this did not settle the problem. The SDA chairman willingly sent Birenbaum a short note agreeing to have an LYLER, but Birenbaum was dissatisfied with the wording. The SDA reworded it, but Birenbaum decided to delay permission to publicize the meeting until he

had had a talk with the SDA chairman.

After several talks with Birenbaum, the SDA chairman, still feeling his position correct, agreed to (1) contact some of his members and (2) contact some of the ADA and SDA bigwigs who were in town for the ADA convention (so as not to embarrass them by ill-timed moves). Birenbaum explained that in view of the hysteria in the community, we must be especially cautious about the organizational commitments we make.

The SDA chairman, after getting the approval of all those SDA members he spoke to, arranged to meet with some of the national ADA leaders. By this time it was Thursday night and all possibilities for publicity that week seemed impossible.

The national ADA leaders expressed a new fear, besides that of sponsoring an LYLER speaker: fear of cosponsorship with the Politics Club, which after all was a socialist organization, and besides had in its members of the YSL!

Finally, Friday, the chairman of the YD called with the good news that his executive committee, meeting the night before, had voted to sponsor the meeting! Upon hearing this the SDA chairman made his final decision—go ahead!

BIRDS OF A FEATHER

An interesting sidelight was provided by the attitude of the LYL representative on campus to these events. When it appeared that the YD were no longer going to co-sponsor the symposium the LYLER informed the Politics Club that their speaker might therefore not want to appear. After three days of struggling for

their civil liberties, the LYL decided that such sponsorship for the debate might not be to their liking!

Why! He hinted that the Politics Club was a "Trotskyite" organization (composed as it is of SPers, YSLers, LSCers, independents, and a Young Democrat, in fact) and that they wouldn't speak on such a platform.

Thus we have the civil-liberties views of the Stalinists and of the authoritarian liberals side by side. (In the end, the LYL agreed to go ahead with the symposium without YD sponsorship.)

Birenbaum continues, as publicity is finally going up, to argue that his actions were in no way "irregular" or "unfair." True, he concedes, this procedure has never been required before. True, he was anxious to convince all the organizations involved of the possible inadvisability of having an LYLER on the platform. But it is only a necessary precaution to protect innocent members of the three organizations—from (one can only assume) the "deceitfulness" of their elected officers!

Yet, without doubt, its only effect, as Birenbaum was well aware, was to try to make it difficult (and would have made it impossible, were it not for the fact that liberals still exist of better mettle than Birenbaum or the ADA leadership) for the LYLER to appear on campus.

Its very subtlety is its very danger. It produces and adds to the "atmosphere" in which a student is fearful of speaking his mind, of acting "rashly," and in general of participating freely and principally in political activity.

OHIO

High Point on YSL Tour —

Oberlin Responds with Enthusiasm

By AARON ROTH

From all reports the YSL national tour is a huge success. In view, however, of the generally conservative atmosphere on most campuses today, the impact of the YSL at Oberlin College (Ohio) was one of the highlights of the tour.

In addition to dozens of "bee-hive" type discussions, with student audiences ranging in size from five to thirty interested listeners, the YSL speakers addressed two major meetings, with notable effect.

On Monday, March 22, Bogdan Denitch, editor of the *Young Socialist Challenge*, spoke to an audience of approximately 150 on the topic "Civil Liberties and the War Preparations." After a brief introduction by Scott Arden, YSL National Secretary, Denitch presented a socialist analysis of the state of civil liberties in America today as linked to the war economy. He stated that "it is essential that both an external and internal enemy be kept as live issues before the American public, if the government is to justify the war economy."

Denitch pointed to "America's need to find a scapegoat for her foreign-policy failures" as a second cause of the witch-hunt; and he added: "A witch-hunt is the last resort of a politically bankrupt regime." He stressed the importance of civil liberties for every shade of opinion, emphasizing the right of Stalinists to teach.

A lively and interesting question-and-answer period followed the talk, as a result of which a "four-way panel discussion" was arranged for the following afternoon.

The *Oberlin Review* reported that "Professors Kenneth Roose and Robert Tufts teed off Tuesday afternoon in a foursome rounded out by two visiting Young Socialist League representatives, discussing socialism and American foreign policy." It continued: "The speedily conceived, unpublicized 4:30 forum drew approximately 300 to First Church to hear replies to questions raised the previous evening by Scott Arden and Bogdan Denitch."

Arden opened for the YSL with a discussion of American foreign policy and its failures. He pointed out that a "proven-

undemocratic American foreign policy cannot effectively oppose Stalinism" and that the State Department's formulation of "Democracy versus Totalitarianism" is "made hollow by support of unpopular, and even openly totalitarian, regimes." He cited support of Franco, Tito, Rhee, Chiang Kai-shek and the French colonial regimes as examples of America's "democratic" foreign policy.

He argued that "it is essential to offer the uncommitted peoples of the world a viable ideological alternative to Stalinism." The alternative he offered was "A Third Camp, opposing the two existing imperialist camps, based on a welding together of Western European working-class forces and the colonial independence movements in Asia and Africa."

Denitch followed with a specific analysis of the American economy. He said: "A capitalist America is no longer able to ensure full employment in times of peace without a war economy that receives necessary political justification through the witch-hunt at home." He documented this, historically and statistically, and pointed out the dependence of European capitalist regimes upon American support.

ARGUE SOCIALISM

From this, extending his economic analysis into the field of foreign policy, he stated: "The Marshall Plan acts as a big stick to prevent any sort of social change in Western Europe." Calling for a social system where "the people exercise power not only in the political arena but in the economic arena as well," Denitch described the economic contradictions that result in the breakdowns of capitalism commonly referred to as recessions and depressions.

Professor Tufts, an economist formerly associated with the State Department, defended American foreign policy and asserted that "Our [American] influence on world affairs is marginal. We can persuade . . . we cannot coerce. The choices, in fact, are seldom clear and always difficult." He stated that since the end of World War II American foreign policy has succeeded on the whole in preventing Stalinist expansion, "except through force and violence." His tone scribbled the economic contradictions that was frequently deprecating and he at one point accused the YSL speakers of giving "the Communist Party line," and shortly later charged them with "saying

the same thing McCarthy says."

Professor Roose, also an economist and, reportedly, one of those consistent liberals who lost a teaching post several years ago for refusing to sign the California teachers "loyalty oath," spoke less emotionally and attempted to defend "the free enterprise system" as opposed to socialism. He cited "proper use of the taxing weapon and the continuation of a free-enterprise incentive system as two less drastic means of shoring up and effecting the revival of the private economy." In arguing the case for capitalism he implied that socialism meant simply dividing up the existing wealth more equally.

In the question-and-discussion period Arden took him up on this point and emphasized that "socialism means a system of production for use, as opposed to capitalism which produces for profit." He stated that socialism means "a great deal more than merely redistributing existing wealth" and cited several examples to show this.

Denitch discussed Roose's "alternatives" and dealt in some detail with the Keynesian analysis and its inadequacies, indicating that, as Keynes himself had admitted, no existing capitalist government could possibly apply Keynesian techniques on a wide enough basis to be really effective.

The formal discussion period was excellent, though brief, and it was extended informally for several hours. Student opinion indicated that on the whole the YSL's ideas were well received. There seemed to be a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the performance of their two professors, and particularly with that of Mr. Tufts. The most adverse criticism heard was that "both sides used clichés."

The over-all impression the YSL created at Oberlin could hardly have been better. A socialist discussion club is in the process of being formed and will probably start out with a substantial membership. The speakers were cordially invited to return, and it was not uncommon for a student to inform them, "I don't agree with you but I'm glad you came. You've got the whole campus talking and for the first time in years, everyone seems to be actively interested in ideas."

This sort of comment is perhaps the best indication of the effect of the YSL at Oberlin College.