

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

BRITAIN TODAY

**The British Labor Party Crisis:
Right, Left and Center**

... page 6

**Churchill: A Boner for a Birthday
The Third-Camp Idea in England
British Union-Busting in Kenya**

... page 3

DECEMBER 13, 1954

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-
LIGHT

A Testimonial to The Power of Words

We first want to throw the Spotlight on a great subject, ladies and gentlemen: the Power of Words. There will be three exhibits.

Exhibit I is from the *Nation* for December 4, illustrating a typical *National* type of agility with greased ideas. It occurs in that part of the magazine entitled "The Shape of Things," consisting of paragraphs of editorial comment—roughly similar to our Spotlight, in fact. We mention this because reading it fills us with admiration and a certain amount of temptation to learn how to juggle slippery ideas with equal talent.

It is entitled "Vishinsky Departs," and bitterly deplores the "bitter, even vindictive" reaction of the U. S. press to the old butcher's death. Even in papers like the *Times*, for example, we know, obits had played up the deceased's role in demanding the blood and gristle of the old Bolsheviks in the Moscow frameup trials; it's a far cry from the days of Walter Duranty to the days of the cold war, and the *Nation* is sad about how they treated the present corpse, even though in another day it never had nice things to say about the corpses that Vishinsky created.

Very well, but is it possible even for the *Nation* itself to run an obituary which doesn't mention the less savory details of the man's rise to fame? No; but there's where the fine hand comes in. They mention it, they do—by deploring the fact that the rest of the press "concentrated" on it. And no one can actually say they glossed over unpleasant facts out of sorrow over the bier.

More important, if the *Nation's* complaint is that no one found anything good to say about the late jackal of Stalinism, what are they going to find to say, themselves, that will be suitably complimentary, if not eulogistic? It's a problem. We can just see the *Nation's* Shaper of Things sitting in deep thought for minutes at a time wondering how to do it.

CRUELEST BLOW

Can he say that Vishinsky was a force for peace and détente in the cold war in these latterly happy days of UN good-fellowship? Apparently he can't bring himself to do so because of the common knowledge that Vishinsky had nothing to do with making policy in the Kremlin, but got it hot off the wires. Still it must be said that "the loss of Vishinsky may be unfortunate." (Not "will"—that's *Daily Worker* stuff.)

Why may the loss be "unfortunate"? Won't Malik represent precisely the same Kremlin policy? The Shaper of Things recognizes this.

Why then? Because (he squeezes out in his last paragraph) unlike lesser men, "Vishinsky could move along the lines laid down with an agility and inventiveness, backed by experience, that his successor cannot be expected to match. The West may yet have reason to regret his abrupt disappearance from the international scene."

What a final indignity to the shade of Vishinsky! This absurd nonsequitur is all that the *Nation* can grind out of its

(Continued on page 4)

The Senate Votes to Censure But McCarthyism Goes Free

By GORDON HASKELL

The Senate has voted to censure Senator McCarthy. There is no doubt that this is a blow against him and the reactionary forces he represents.

But it has left *McCarthyism* uncensured and uncondemned.

It has acted not as a legislative body charged with the duty of defending the rights and liberties of the inhabitants of this country from unwarranted and extra-legal government attack; but rather as a gentleman's club which sought to rap on the wrist a member who had taken to calling his fellow-members names in public.

The Liberal-Democratic and pro-Eisenhower press of the country has hailed the passage of the censure motions as if this were an act of political courage on

the part of the Senate which will have a deep-going effect on the morals of public life. That it took all the political courage they could muster for many of the senators to vote against the Wisconsin bully, no one will doubt. But the form this attack on McCarthy took is just another indication of what a scarce and precious commodity political courage is these days.

What was McCarthy condemned for? Was he pilloried for his blunderbuss and omnibus attacks on tens and even hundreds of men in government employment as well as in private life as "reds" and "security risks" and "Fifth Amendment communists" under circumstances in which they had no means of self-defense?

Not at all. After all, the Truman and Eisenhower administrations have created vast administrative procedures and machineries to per-

petrate the same kind of attack on whole organizations and their memberships under equally extra-legal setups. How could McCarthy be condemned for doing in his own back-alley manner what respected presidents and attorneys general have done in smoother and more urbane fashion?

Did the forces of high public morality vote to censure McCarthy for publicly lying about the number of "communists" or "subversives" or "security risks" whose names he "held in his hand" at one time or another when addressing the Senate or vast radio audiences?

HOW COULD THEY?

How could they? During the last election campaign both major parties charged each other with lying about the number of people who have been discharged from the government service for being "security risks" or "loyalty cases." Vice-President Nixon made the artistic jugglery of such figures a central attraction during his Western campaign to keep the Congress Republican.

To eliminate public lying from political life in this country would be to condemn both major parties and all their highest spokesmen to silence on the major issues of our

(Turn to last page)

Expel McCarthy?

A McCarthy-Type Proposal by Liberals

During and after the censure session of the Senate, a number of liberals, led by Senator Wayne Morse, have stated or suggested that censure should be followed by a move to expel McCarthy from the Senate.

This is a truly scandalous proposal. And it seems to be exactly the kind of scandal which one has come to expect from "men of principle" like Morse (and Humphrey and Douglas).

Neither these gentlemen nor the Senate as a whole have dared take up McCarthy on his venomous attack on civil liberties in this country. So they censured him for doing things which senators have been doing since time immemorial, as pointed out in the lead article on this page.

That may fall inside the realm of democratic political struggle, because a vote of censure is simply an expression of displeasure which in no way deprives the senator of any of his democratic political rights.

To expel him, however, is a different matter altogether.

On what grounds would they justify expelling him?

That he abused his senatorial privileges as an investigator? But why did not the Senate, which controls both the appointment of committee heads and the rules under which investigations are conducted, either remove him from that post or set up rules which would have precluded his abuse of witnesses? Because not enough senators can be found to vote against the seniority rule on committee chairmanships, regardless of the damage to the national interests caused by the incompetence, venality or wrong-headedness of any given chairman. Should McCarthy be expelled by a body which did not try to control him?

THE PROPOSAL TO EXPEL IS A CONFESSION

And how about the citizens of Wisconsin, and their right to be represented by a man of their choice?

We deplore the choice they have made. As socialists we are convinced that the political and economic system is rigged in such a way as to undemocratically limit the effective choices open to the electorate, and to give a privileged position to the candidates of the capitalist parties in general, and to those with the biggest financial backing in particular.

But when all that is said and done, Senator McCarthy won his seat under the same rules and the same party auspices as Senator Morse. The voters had just as good an opportunity to find out what he stands for, and to vote for or against him. He has not changed his stand or his methods much since the last election (and it would be a fine day if sena-

(Turn to last page)

HOLD OPEN
New Year's Eve
ISL PARTY
at
LABOR ACTION HALL
9:00 p.m. 114 W. 14th St.

Ruth Reynolds Wins Case In Puerto Rico High Court

Ruth Reynolds, who was framed up and convicted of conspiracy to overthrow the U. S. government in Puerto Rico, has been vindicated by a long-delayed decision of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, to which the case was appealed. Miss Reynolds, an American pacifist, had been accused of attending a 1949 meeting of the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party and there taking an oath for independence, with others, which the government claimed was a violation of the island's "Little Smith Act." A Ruth Reynolds Defense Committee was formed, and in January 1952 LA announced a cross-country tour by Conrad Lynn on her case.

Following is the statement released by Miss Reynolds on the Supreme Court decision.—Ed.

The New York Times informs me that the justices of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, after deliberating for one year and twelve days, have reached the conclusion that it would not have been criminal for me to have taken the oath I did not take on December 19, 1949, but for the taking of which I was sentenced to six years of imprisonment at hard labor.

For my parents, this decision represents the end of four years of unforgettable anguish; their suffering is the only torture for which my heart feels no forgiveness.

For my Puerto Rican friends, whose tears and prayers have accompanied me in this dark journey, it brings one moment of rejoicing in the midst of rejoicing in the midst of sorrow. For my American friends, whose zeal and loyalty have made this victory possible, it is an accomplishment which should breed faith for the more difficult tasks ahead. For me, personally, it is a hard-won admission on the part of our government that it has no right to prosecute anyone for devotion to the independence of Puerto Rico.

Juridical interpretations of this decision I will leave to lawyers who are qualified to make them. I am more concerned with moral interpretations, which appear to me to be, in this case, more far-reaching. For if the government now admits that it would not have been wrong for me to pledge life and property for the independence of Puerto Rico, can it sustain that it is wrong for anyone to do so? If 500,000 Puerto Rican Nationalists should meet tomorrow and take that oath, would the government not have to let them do it?

And if it is not wrong to pledge life and property for the liberation movement, can it be wrong to give them?

Is the government not admitting the invalidity of all its reign of terror, that make a Puerto Rican fear that imprisonment or economic reprisals may result if he so much as gives a nickel for a Nationalist's defense?

Is it not saying that cooperation with the liberating movement is no crime, and that therefore the current wave of prosecutions in New York and Chicago and Puerto Rico, on the basis that someone knew someone who knew someone who knew someone who knew someone who knew Lolita Lebron, is unjustified?

Is the government not now morally obliged to delete the phrase "as an active member and leader of the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico" from political indictments, and with it the whole Astol Calero type of testimony, which makes it criminal to sell a 5-cent Nationalist periodical today because a Nationalist allegedly shot a policeman in 1935?

Is not the Supreme Court saying that Puerto Rican patriots, and their associates, must be judged on the basis of their deeds, not on the basis of what their lives and property are pledged to?

Is it not admitting that the hundreds of men and women jailed in 1950, but who did not participate in the revolt, were unlawfully jailed, and that the whole episode is a shameful one in American history?

This decision cannot erase what has gone before. It cannot now save me from one moment of the 19½ months of imprisonment which the government now admits it had no right to inflict upon me. It cannot now turn back the calendar, and have published in November 1950 the manuscript that jailed me to prevent me from publishing, and which might have brought understanding where today are only suspicion and fear. It cannot now spare my parents the heartache that has made them old.

Military might accomplished its purpose in 1950, as it is accomplishing its purpose in 1954. Yet military might recognizes that might does not make right, and asks the courts to sanction its acts. This the court has, in this one case, at long last refused to do.

This decision represents one minor triumph in a long, hard war. It is important only as a portent for the morrow, as token that truth, if held too stoutly, can eventually conquer military might, and Puerto Rico can be free. In this struggle I pledge the Puerto Rican people today, as I never have before, my life, my fortune, and my sacred honor,

Ruth REYNOLDS

Nov. 19, 1954.

More Help Needed in Davidson Case Testing Rights of Non-Religious C.O.s

Bulletins of the Vern Davidson Defense Committee inform that new additions to the committee, in addition to A. J. Muste, include Michael Harrington, of the Young Socialist League and formerly with the Catholic Worker, and Steve Siteman, prominent in the Socialist Party. The Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors has sent moral and financial support and the National Service Board for Religious Objectors has expressed its hope that Davidson win the case.

The special feature of the Davidson case is that Vern Davidson is fighting for C.O. status on a non-religious basis.

The Defense Committee also announces that after December 1, its address

will be changed to 17 N. Venice Blvd., Venice, Calif.

The letter that follows, received from secretary David McReynolds of the committee, is for our readers.

Friend:

We know you are interested in the progress of the Vern Davidson case. We expect a decision in December or January and are optimistic about the result. We will let you know as soon as the ruling on the appeal is made.

Our lawyer, J. B. Tietz, has worked particularly hard on this case and we are grateful. But like everyone else, he has to eat, and we are short on funds to meet not only his fees, but the heavy expense of printing the transcript, etc.

We need your help badly. We are roughly two hundred dollars short of our goal. Many of you reading this letter have given already and given generously to support this civil liberties case. We turn to you again only because the need is so urgent.

I am troubled also because, having refused induction into the army in August, I will be arrested shortly and even with the delay of my trial cannot expect to be free more than two or three months. I would very much like to conclude the affairs of the committee while I am still able to do so.

Will you take the time today to send your contribution?

Fraternally,
David McREYNOLDS
Secretary

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

conscience as a good word for the old bloodhound, even as it condemns its colleagues of the press for being too harsh! What could be harsher?

TRUE LOVE CONFESSION

Exhibit II, by a coincidence stemming from the Fitness of Things, comes from a magazine that is being sued by the Nation for political defamation. This is the New Leader, which glosses over the sins of American imperialism with somewhat less skill than the Nation sometimes uses to cover up the dirty tracks of Stalinism.

A letter to the editor by ex-radical James Rorty presents the confession:

"At the risk of further distressing my friends, I now confess that I have never been a good positivist or materialist, have always been skeptical of the human end results of technological 'progress,' and have always been attracted by the religious concept of love as Mr. Kirk uses it. If love is in itself inadequate as the foundation of a social or economic program . . . it is certainly better in my opinion than the Marxist concept of the class struggle, which, as employed by the Communists, involves the systematic inculcation of hate."

We pass over (as Cicero used to say) Rorty's belated admission that he never was a good radical ("materialist"), though this could be used by some to prove that a real good radical could never have become a right-wing Republican; thereby allaying the fear of any present good radical who may wake up shivering some fine morning with the thought, "What if I turn out some day to be such as these!"

But determinedly passing over this and other digressions of an interesting and repellent nature, we come back to the Power of Words. Rorty is for Love, the religious concept of it anyway. We offer a paraphrase for the sinuous argument which he makes to prove the superiority of love over Marxism. We will prove the superiority of monarchism over republicanism:

"If monarchism is in itself inadequate and imperfect as the foundation of a social or economic program, it is certainly better in my opinion than the democratic concept of republicanism, which, as employed by McCarthy, involves the systematic inculcation of dictatorship and demagoguery."

The conclusion is obviously irrefutable. No doubt, scholars have a name for this sort of thing and we will send a free copy of LABOR ACTION to anyone who sends it in, with one LA masthead or reasonable facsimile thereof attached.

HINDU HUCKSTER

Exhibit III, to retain our international franchise, comes from India. We have often heard that the Hindu mind and the Gandhian tradition have much to offer us, and no doubt that it is as true as it is of most peoples and their contribution to the intermingling of cultures; but one thing is certain: Gandhi's No. 1 disciple and successor is not much behind the non-Hindu hucksters of Madison Avenue and Capitol Hill in using the Power of Words to deceive.

A couple of months ago Nehru was out watching sea maneuvers of the Indian navy, and in a speech declared that he hoped "the Indian navy, like the army and air force, would remain a symbol of India's unity, efficiency and good work" and that when he saw the navy at work "his heart was warmed." There would be nothing noteworthy about this at all except that this Nehru is supposed to be the devoted disciple of Gandhi, who usually preached absolute pacifism and the untouchability of death-dealing arms.

Even this would not be noteworthy, for it is an old story about disciples too. But in this same context, the same Nehru had the non-Gandhian gall to say also: "On this day we should pledge ourselves anew to do the task given by the Father of the Nation and to translate into action his great teachings."

India is a young nation but its leaders learn fast. In the United States Senate, Bill Jenner can quote John Stuart Mill on Liberty in favor of McCarthy, but it took more time for the U. S. to get that way.

Defense by Mistaken Identity

We now turn some space over to another columnist who is saying something that is rare among the liberals and

which is something that we would like to say just as sharply. Murray Kempton wrote on the case of Dr. Davis D. Henry:

"Dr. Davis D. Henry can now be president of the University of Illinois if he wants it. Dr. Henry, presently vice-chancellor of New York University, was an assured candidate at Illinois until his supporters ran into a rumor that he was a security risk.

"Dr. Henry has the old-fashioned virtue of dignity, and he told Illinois that he didn't want its laurels if their price was a public investigation. Now the Illinois trustees are begging him to reconsider."

"The charges against Dr. Henry were anonymous. The one to which the trustees gave the most serious attention asserted that, in 1947, as president of Wayne University in Detroit, Dr. Henry had been slow in ordering the dissolution of a campus chapter of American Youth for Democracy, a Communist Party youth group."

"The Illinois trustees preferred sending their own investigator to Wayne to taking the word of the presumably respectable citizen they were considering for the highest office in their keeping."

"The facts turned out to be that Dr. Henry had been as previous as anyone could wish in banning the American Youth for Democracy from his halls. He had written the Department of Justice in 1947 asking about its status, and been told, in an infrequent lapse in the divine powers of J. Edgar Hoover's subordinates, that A.Y.D. did not appear subversive."

"There followed a hasty letter saying that Hoover himself had labeled it such at a Congressional hearing. Dr. Henry then ordered Wayne's A.Y.D. chapter to dissolve, and seems to have beaten the attorney-general's subversive list to the draw by some weeks."

"Dr. Henry turned out on inspection to be a past member of the Detroit Rotary Club and to have the frantic indorsement of Harvey Campbell, president of that city's Board of Trade, a man who only lately ceased to be red-eyed from sitting up all night worrying about Walter Reuther. It had all been a painful misunderstanding."

"We have in short one of those empty victories for freedom of opinion which we win so often these days. To think how hollow it is, we have only to imagine the case of a Doctor X, who might have been president of Wayne in Dr. Henry's place."

"Let us suppose that Dr. X believed in freedom of education from federal control to the extent of not asking Dept. of Justice approval of an organization on his campus. Let us say that he assumed that the Justice Department's listing was relevant for federal employees, but not necessarily binding for private citizens."

"This Dr. X might have felt it his duty to warn the student body that the best authorities had found that A.Y.D. was a Communist front and then let its Wayne chapter exist as a monument to his faith that a bad idea does not flourish in the open air."

"It does not seem unfair to the Illinois trustees to suggest that Dr. X would not have been considered 10 minutes. And yet, we are imagining no whimsical non-conformist; we have only conjured up a careful, reasoning man who had tried to root his decision in what is, after all, a tradition in our culture."

"We have come so far from that tradition, all of us, that we defend most of the targets of our time, not by proclaiming that they are non-conformists and that we need non-conformists, but by proving that they are absolutely safe. The defense is to claim mistaken identity."

"The right of dissent, after all, rests on the notion that we can afford to grant each citizen the privilege of making a few mistakes. Did we think, when all this began, of the time which is with us, when this right could only triumph if the man who claimed it could show a slate free alike of mistake and dissent?"

WEEK by WEEK . . .

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

A sub is only \$2 a year!

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.

LONDON LETTER **Churchill:** **A Boner for His Birthday**

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Dec. 2.—Nobody really knows why, during a speech a fortnight ago at Woodford, his own constituency, Sir Winston Churchill revealed that in 1945 he sent a telegram to General Montgomery instructing him to pile up the arms of the two and a half million surrendering Germans, in case it would be necessary to rearm them against the Russians.

Even the most superficial examination of documents of that period published by Churchill and other allied leaders has revealed that the British premier was constantly aware of the expansionist designs of Stalin's regime. Roosevelt was not quite so sensitive.

However, during the final double-fronted attack on Germany, considerable apprehension was felt at the Foreign Office lest the Russians would not stop at the agreed lines and would occupy Denmark and even the Low Countries.

It would have been extremely tactless of the British government to make known its fears then, but it nevertheless acted on them, if we are to believe in the existence of the alleged telegram.

Needless to say, a storm of protest against Sir Winston Churchill's revelations came from the Labor Party. Many members of Parliament wanted to know why he had chosen this juncture, at which we were apparently getting on reasonably well with Malenkov, to say rude things about the Stalin regime.

Pravda came out with a violent attack, one stronger than the *Daily Worker*; but the *Labor Daily Herald* and the literary *New Statesman* attacked him in polite, but hardly less equivocal terms.

The *Daily Mirror*, whose circulation is 4,000,000, came out with two front-page attacks on Churchill's blunder, but still did not offer any convincing reason for it.

TORIES DISCOMFITED

By contrast, the Tory newspapers stressed how far-sighted Churchill had been. While negotiating with Stalin it was necessary to strengthen one's own position. Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam had shown how adept the Stalin regime was at making agreements in words while at the same time consolidating its political position by force. There is no doubt, they argued, that had Churchill's plan for a second front through Italy, or even Greece, been accepted by the American military authorities, the Iron Curtain would have fallen on the borders of Russia, and not half way through Germany.

In Parliament, Churchill asked the members to consider the interests of Russia as being far more important than the words exchanged about them. He implied that the Russian need for "co-existence" now was irrelevant to our rudeness or politeness to them.

With Churchill's birthday imminent, the Labor Party hoped to make capital out of this blunder to discredit him. The *Daily Mirror* suggested that he was getting old, and might go. Many Stalinist fellow-travellers started beating the big drum. Even the Tories were discomfited by what they considered an unnecessary and tactless liberty.

BOMBSHELL

Churchill's birthday came, and you probably heard as much about it as we endured. He is undoubtedly riding on a high tide of popularity.

Besides the congratulations from many heads of states he had 23,000 letters and parcels. A fund set up by Lord Moynihan collected a vast sum of money in small lots. The first check for \$420,000 was presented to him.

With his great historic sense, he has decided to endow his county house Chartwell as a museum. This very smart move is calculated to guarantee himself a place in history for all time.

Naturally, the Tory party is immensely pleased with Churchill's popularity. It is worth a few million votes. On top of this, he has announced an increase of \$1 a week in old-age pensions. Nowadays, the old are (indeed, must be) thankful for small mercies. This also will do the Tories an electoral world of good.

After Churchill had revealed the dis-

patch of the famous telegram, Lord Montgomery, presently in New York, confirmed its receipt and the wisdom of sending it. A search was made of the archives of the Foreign Office, of 10 Downing Street, and of Churchill's private files.

Then the bombshell exploded. To a crowded House, the day after his triumphant 80th birthday, Churchill had to admit that perhaps he had not sent the telegram after all. Now Montgomery, having admitted receiving it, was batting on a sticky wicket. Churchill asked him to search for it in his own personal files.

Whether or not such a telegram existed is inconsequential. It proved one thing we socialists said at the time, that even in those back-slapping, toast-drinking, days, both the heads of the great blocs were maneuvering into the most advantageous positions to continue their cold war which had been going on since 1917.

CASSANDRA, STILL

There is no doubt that they would have preferred a slice-up of the world in victorious style; but in the war of ideology, that could not be. Beside a number of purely military escapades, like Korea, Bukovina, the Baltic states, the Stalinist bloc has achieved victory in Czechoslovakia and China with the indispensable aid of an ideological attack. Against this the West is quite powerless.

In a more local sense, Churchill's revelation could have gained him no support, and the rather humiliating experience of having to apologize for it in Parliament did not do him much good either. Yet the figure of the tired, old, but good-humored leader might still appeal to the British electorate.

Recent events, discussed in London Letter point strongly to the likelihood of an election next May, in the sun of spring and the warmth of Churchill's popularity. Like Cassandra, we continue to warn the Labor Party of the necessity to formulate a new policy, instead of trying to win through on the expected blunders of its wily opponents.

THE TWO-AND-A-HALF CAMP

Britain: How the Third-Camp Idea Is Clasped To Various Bosoms in a Crushing Embrace

By PHILIP COBEN

LABOR ACTION readers really should be informed of some of the odd things that are happening to the term "Third Camp" in England.

In the background is a very healthy development: widespread interest in the idea as the result, in part, of a Third Camp Conference at Oxford which was modeled after the Third Camp Conference held in New York in which Independent Socialists took such an active part. Pacifist circles have taken it up quite enthusiastically, and this has helped too.

The other side of this wider popularity is some weird developments on its fringe. These have popped up particularly in some pacifist circles. *Peace News*, for example, writes: "Since the launching of the Third Camp [in England] there have been a host of people with 'private panaceas' hurrying to jump on the bandwagon—and there will no doubt be more. 'The Third Camp,' they cry, 'Why that is what I have been advocating for years in my movement for land-reform, tax-reform, currency-reform, diet-reform, religion-reform, marriage-reform, and what-have-you. Unless it takes my box of pills the Third Camp will die.'" (Tom Wardle, Oct. 22.)

These wise words did not stop Wardle himself, a leading pacifist, from proclaiming his own nostrum in the same article. What binds all "Third Campers" together, he announces, is their "repudiation of power as the determining factor in world and national affairs"—the "Third Camp" opposes all policies based on "power." It happens, of course, that this notion is not even common to all pacifists, let alone others.

There is perhaps even a danger that in England the term "Third Camp" may become the property of the panacea-mongers.

STALINOID CANT

Turning to more serious terrain, Professor G. D. H. Cole has been very active as a spokesman for a kind of "Third Camp" idea. He was, for example, one

of the main speakers at the Oxford Third Camp Conference.

But when we turn to Professor Cole's ideas on the subject, it is not at all certain after all that we are on more serious ground. We have immediate reference to an article of his entitled "Is a Third Force Possible?" (quoted here from *Review of International Affairs*, but apparently a reprint, perhaps from the *New Statesman*).

We are not talking now merely of the typically "neutralist" emphases of British and European leftists, which fill Professor Cole's article. That would be usual. For Cole, it seems, the "Third Force" or "Third Camp" of which he sometimes speaks seems to be exclusively a third bloc of neutralist governments uncommitted to either of the main two; and there is no hint here of the concept of a Third Camp movement of the working class and masses of people directed against the dominant social systems that rule the world. But this is the usual thing and not worthy of special comment.

Nor is Professor Cole a principled opponent of imperialist war. He is ready to defend Western Europe against Russian armies if it comes to that. This too is usual.

Nor should we be too surprised to find that this typically European socialist intellectual has all kinds of soft feelings about Stalinism.

He cannot see hope of a detente, he writes, "as long as the Americans . . . regard it as their mission to prevent the development of Communism in Asia." This is a peculiar kind of indictment, for Cole. On other occasions he properly has his own socialist recipes for preventing the spread of Stalinism in Asia.

He writes that socialists should not line up "against China as long as the Chinese are doing no more than range themselves with the opponents of imperialist rule." Is that all Mao is doing, in his opinion? If so, Cole is somewhat more obtuse than Bevan.

At another point he objects to America's "clear encouragement" to exiled groups to stir up trouble inside the Soviet Union itself. He does not indict the U. S. for its actual policy of encouraging only reactionary capitalist-restorationists. He falls into the Stalinoid cant. Perhaps it is slipshodness.

SOME COLE-ISMS

But then astonishment, even at Cole, must increase as one reads further that "One necessary step toward the creation of the Third Force in Europe is a lessening of anti-Communist feeling among democratic socialists." It is not an unknown thought—we know many European socialistic Stalinoids who would say the same thing, but not one who is greeted by many British left-wingers as a spokesman for the Third Camp, which presumably is directed against both Stalinism and capitalism.

The astonishing becomes the ludicrous, however, when we find out further from Professor Cole that the "Third Force," at least in France and Italy, cannot get anywhere unless it is supported by—the Stalinists themselves! that is, by the "second" force!

This is what he actually wrote: "A Third Force cannot be built without the united support of the working class, or at least of the great majority of it; and this means, in France and Italy, that no such force can be built unless the Communists can be brought to support it, if not to form part of it."

Just like that. It does not seem out-of-the-way to him, since he tosses it off like some of his other quick ones.

He does not explain why, in the U. S., where the majority of the working class is dominated by the Democratic Party, this outlandish "Third Force" of his must not have the support of Truman and Stevenson, by the same token.

After this, nothing will astonish from this Third-Force advocate, and so we can relate quietly that he ends this article by calling on "the Third Force" to "take its stand against exploiting capitalism, against feudalism, and against—"

You expect him to continue with "against Communism"? No.

"—against hysterical Anti-Communism. . ."

Certainly, we Independent Socialists wish no patent-monopoly of our own on the concept of the Third Camp; but also certainly, genuine Third Camp advocates in England have a task in keeping the lines clear from the charlatans and hopeless confusionists.

'White Man's Burden' in Kenya Requires Union-Busting Too

From the CIO News, Nov. 15

For nearly a year James Bury, a member of the CIO Packinghouse Workers and formerly a member of the Canadian Congress of Labor Executive Council and secretary-treasurer of the Vancouver (B. C.) Labor Council, has been in Kenya, Africa, as a representative of the Intl. Confederation of Free Trade Unions. Here are excerpts from an open letter he wrote delegates to the recent CCL convention in Toronto.

To understand the trade union situation here you almost have to get a picture of political developments. A civil war has been raging in Kenya since 1952. The Mau Mau attacks and the measures taken by the Kenya government against them have turned Kenya into one big armed camp.

Let me give you some examples. On April 24, after a series of Mau Mau raids, the administration began a mopping up operation. Over 30,000 suspected Mau Mau sympathizers were picked up by the police and army, of whom 19,000 were detained in camps for screening.

Half of the full time or part time union officials in Kenya were arrested and sent to camps, and despite repeated requests and interventions, we were able to clear only a quarter.

One of our local union officers was shot in the leg. He was sitting in the offices of the Kenya Federation of Trade Unions (affiliated to the ICFTU) when some trigger-happy policeman shot a bullet through a wall. The guy confessed, months later, when we presented the evidence against him.

Naturally, this kind of atmosphere not only hinders the growth of the trade union movement, but virtually paralyzes it. Many workers now feel that participation in it means a one-way trip to a detention camp. Actions of the police and army have given them plenty of reason for feeling that way. Some of our members have been beaten for holding union cards. Almost

every union leader has been tailed constantly by the police.

All this is a bit heartbreaking, because the need for strong unions is damn obvious, and the emergency has made my job so much tougher. Living conditions for Africans are hard to imagine. Of course I have no sympathy for the murdering tactics of the Mau Mau. But I can understand why they've made so much headway.

A small European settler group of 40,000 has monopolized all the good land in Kenya and almost five million Africans are trying to eke out an existence in native reserves. The administration has done little in the way of opening up more arable land through irrigation, nor has it taught the African more efficient methods of agriculture.

The minimum wage for industrial workers (often the maximum) is \$7 a month. Chances for advancement are practically nil. On \$7 a month, you're lucky if you stay alive.

I'm afraid it would require a couple of hours for me to tell how bad conditions really are. Take my word for it, they're lousy. And the Africans in Kenya are fed up. They no longer want to remain the hewers of wood and the drawers of water.

They see Africans in other territories governing themselves. But here 40,000 Europeans elect 14 members to the Legislative Council while only six Africans sit in Parliament—and these are appointed by the governor. The days of unopposed white supremacy in Kenya are over.

Despite the emergency, we are making affiliated to the federation. Nominally some headway. There are 10 unions, all the federation has 50,000 members, but job has been to act as a father confessor, by no means all of it is dues paying. My legal adviser and union representative. I've run schools for workers, helped in negotiations, set up new union constitutions and performed a host of other duties. Life, as I said at the beginning of this letter, is far from dull.

Don't miss a single week of
LABOR ACTION
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

BOOKS and Ideas

'The Camp of Liberation'

THE CAMP OF LIBERATION by A. J. Muste.—A "Peace News" pamphlet, 16 pages. Distributed by Fellowship of Reconciliation, 15 cents; in bundles of 10 or more 12 cents; in bundles of 100 or more 10 cents.

By **GORDON HASKELL**

In this small pamphlet A. J. Muste analyzes the struggle for the world which is going on between the two great war camps, and describes the need and the possibilities of the creation of a Third Camp, the "camp of liberation," as an alternative to both.

It is a simple pamphlet, evidently designed to introduce the Third Camp idea to wider circles of people to whom the very possibility of thinking in such terms is a novelty. In it the author strongly stresses the difference between the conception of a positive, militant and revolutionary Third Camp movement, and the passive "leave me out" attitude which dominates much of neutralist thought in Europe and Asia. He is particularly concerned to show that neutralism in itself is an illusion, and the notions on which it is based tend in the long run to slip the people who hold them into support of one camp or the other.

As an absolute-pacifist advocate of Gandhian techniques of non-violent po-

litical and social struggle, the author lays heavy stress on total disarmament and the applicability of these techniques to the present world scene. Whatever one may think of the contention that the adoption of the methods of non-violent struggle is integral to the formation of a really positive and revolutionary Third Camp (and neither this reviewer nor LABOR ACTION agrees with it), Muste's approach to the problem of militarism, disarmament and the like has little if anything in common with the kind of approach which is too often associated with pacifism.

He in no way fosters the illusion that the present American and Russian governments can be got to disarm themselves by mass appeals to their conscience. He stresses the fact that armaments are a necessary consequence of the socio-economic structures of both power blocs and the type of conflict which is raging between them, and hence that a political movement which hopes to prevent the ultimate horror of nuclear warfare must direct itself against these structures.

The Camp of Liberation is not only a good title for this attractively got-up pamphlet, but is a term the positive content of which may well bring its use into increasing favor in the Third Camp movement. The pamphlet may be ordered from the Fellowship of Reconciliation, 21 Audubon Ave., New York 32. We are informed that in bundles of 10 or more they may be had at 12 cents per copy.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Bouquet

To the Editor:

A new subscriber thanks you for assisting in my rescue from the comfortable and still-respectable recesses of the Democratic Party. You have verbalized a suspicion into a now-obvious truth: that my party offered no real alternative to its monolithic counterpart. Your analysis of the McCarthy censure hearings as a matter of transcendent irrelevance (paraphrase mine) is superb and puts the whole affair into a perspective which too many liberals, I fear, have lost.

Your paper, by any journalistic or philosophical standards, is excellent. For honesty, lucidity, historical perspective, balance, and even typography, LABOR ACTION ranks with the very best in American journalism. This from one who subscribes and reads such as *Harper's*, *Nation*, *Progressive*, *Reporter*, *Frontier*, *Atlantic*, *Saturday Review*, etc. No paper or magazine is read by me more thoroughly, and more rewardingly, than LABOR ACTION.

I must admit, however, that my anti-doctrinaire bias almost kept me from reading beyond your masthead. "Labor Action" as a title just does not express the scope of your editorial and news coverage. And your apparent basis for a democratic socialism appears to that amorphous designation "Labor." Has not history demonstrated that that classification is not significant? Is the fact that a man is a laborer the real common denominator? A man is young or old, married or single, liberal, radical, or conservative, all before he is a "laborer,"

which is, after all, a fortuitous circumstance. Rather, I feel, a political realignment or a socialist evolution (or revolution) is more properly based on the support of men dedicated to peace, justice, and freedom, regardless of occupation. What does the ISL think of my point? Perhaps, it is just a matter of semantics. Good luck to your excellent paper.

Sincerely,

J. G. S.

Seattle, Wash., Nov. 29

We'd hate to argue here with a new reader who likes us so much, but immediately we'd suggest only this: To find out why we lay the stress that we do on the working class, we'd urge that our correspondent get acquainted with the ideas of Marxism, which as a matter of fact is the basis of that "historical perspective" to which he refers.—Ed.

CORRECTION

The office of India's delegation to the UN informs us that Purshottam Trikand, one of the speakers at the International Freedom Day rally which we reported, is a delegate to the UN, and not an adviser to the delegation.

Holiday Book Sale

GIVE A BOOK FOR A GIFT

FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY, by Karl Kautsky \$3.00
KARL MARX, by Franz Mehring	3.50
THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV, by Victor Serge	1.50
THE BENDING CROSS, by Ray Ginger	1.00
HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THEORIES ("Vol. 4" of Capital), by Karl Marx	5.00
ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL, by Rosa Luxemburg	5.00
THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION, by Leon Trotsky	3.50
WHITE COLLAR, by C. Wright Mills	6.00
THE NEW COURSE, by Leon Trotsky and Max Shachtman	1.50
FROM HEGEL TO MARX, by Sidney Hook	4.50

All orders must be accompanied by payment.

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, New York City

YOU and SCIENCE

SHOULD SCIENTISTS GET DRAFT DEFERMENT?

By **CARL DARTON**

Going along with the problem of scientific manpower scarcity, recently discussed in this column, is the question of draft deferment for specialized personnel. As with so many scientific problems today, this question has far-reaching economic, social and political ramifications.

The technical and scientific journals have been full of discussions on the subject and now the general press has entered the controversy. The *New York Times* in a recent editorial writes:

"Can there be a more inexcusable waste of resources than to subject a brilliant young scientist or engineer to military duty unrelated to the technological defense of this country? The concept of equality of service must yield to the basic security needs of our nation."

The *Chicago Daily Tribune* in its editorial of November 3 states:

"Let's have a little more common sense in our preparedness program. If selective service must be continued, let's select men according to the way they can render best service to the United States. And let's resist every effort to develop a military establishment geared to the needs of wars that already have been fought."

With the support of the big newspapers there is no doubt that a number of bills affecting deferment of technical personnel will be reconsidered by Congress in the coming sessions. A review of the viewpoints and interests involved is now timely. How do the technical men themselves, as well as the industries, who are finding ever greater need for their services, and the military line up on this question? What should be the reactions of the great mass of non-technical workers?

ETHICAL OBJECTIONS

The scientists and the engineers are fairly well divided in their opinions. Within the past several months in the *Chemical and Engineering News* there have been letters of expression pro and con. These serve not only to highlight some of the issues involved but also illuminate the thinking of the technical man. Writes one chemist in the September 20 issue:

"The place of any person, scientist or not, in the military program must be decided in the light of two principles: that of maximum personal contribution and that of equal risk of life. This latter principle, fundamental to any conception of democracy and even to all Western thought, has been largely overlooked.

"By recommending that scientists should not be liable for military duty, or that they should have non-combat military duty, we are also, inevitably, recommending a differential risk of life in our favor. There are at least two ethical reasons why this should not be done: (1) The major Western religions hold that one personal life is as intrinsically valuable as another. This means that the slave's life is as valuable as the free-man's, the unskilled laborer's as valuable as the nuclear physical biochemist's. You have no right, according to this, to risk another person's life for him. (2) Among the beliefs on which this country was founded, and central to them, is one stating that each person has certain inalienable rights, among them 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'"

FOR DEFERMENT

Proponents within scientific ranks for preferential treatment for themselves take care of the moral issue by pointing out that stay-at-homes may be more vulnerable than those in uniform. Since this is a general popular conception we quote from another letter as follows:

"The realities of modern warfare have eliminated the need for such argument. The atomic bomb and biological warfare are the great levelers. No longer need the stay-at-home suffer moral discomfort (if he does) at the thought that the valiant provide the sacrifice that he might live. An atomic bomb is not so effectively used against an army in battle as against its source of supply. The practically ineliminable potentialities for destruction by the fusion bomb make it important against civilians, relatively unimportant against the military—particularly useless against military locked in battle."

We might add that this popular conception fails to recognize the development of the A-bombs as military tactical weap-

ons and the possibility of their limited use in "the next war." This supposed "leveling" of danger in favor of those in the armed services compared with civilians also fails to recognize the general dislocating effect of military life on the individual.

The second argument of the technical men themselves in favor of special treatment is that regardless of the sentimentalities of "equal service" they should be kept where they can do the most good. In today's warfare they feel this means working in the laboratory rather than "behind the gun."

The feelings of the scientists and engineers themselves are not likely to be too decisive in the matter. More influential, obviously, in deciding government policy will be industry and the military.

INDUSTRY'S STAKE

A 1952 survey of industrial and technical manpower vulnerable to call by the armed services shows the reason for industry's concern. Taking as the criteria the total of engineers and scientists who were members of the Reserves or National Guard, plus those in classifications 1A and 2A, the electrical machinery industries, for instance, could lose 35 per cent of its technical manpower upon war mobilization. In the same manner the aircraft factories could lose 29 per cent, and the chemical industries 22 per cent of its critical and difficult-to-replace technical manpower. Today these figures would, undoubtedly, be at least equal or higher.

It is small wonder, then, that such groups as the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States are interested in modifying the Armed Forces Reserve Act to favor preferential deferment of technical men. It is their aim to supervise the recall of reservists with "proper regard for the need of the 'production army' as well as the fighting forces." There is no question of the ethical and moral issues here, but merely how best to keep the industrial machine (and profits) going.

The military, however, will not readily yield its increasing control over the manpower, technical or otherwise, of the country. Not only does this include its direct control through the Reserves and Selective Service but also its own ever-expanding technical facilities.

SOME QUESTIONS

Added also is its ever-deeper penetration into university and industrial laboratories through its present and projected defense contracts and security programs. With the arms race dependent upon scientific and "pushbutton" warfare, the military itself are increasingly putting their uniformed technicians and engineers to work in their trained capacities within their own ranks.

With this battle of the military and industry for the services of scientists and engineers and their preferential treatment, what should be the position of the less favored workers and the trade unions? One background fact has been expressed before in LABOR ACTION: the college-technical and scientific population is overwhelmingly from the upper and middle classes and any preferential deferment of such specialized personnel tends to have a class bias automatically.

With this stacking of the cards against the lower-paid workers, should trade-union workers campaign for the more equitable distribution of scholarship among the lower-income groups and thus place a greater percentage of their children among the scientists, technicians and engineers? Should there be a federal program of student aid? Should the trade-union position be that of "no draft favoritism for any occupational group"? Or should socialists concentrate their efforts against all warmaking policies without considering such immediate problems as deferment of specialized personnel? These are all pertinent questions which cannot be overlooked.



LABOR ACTION

December 13, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 50

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**

Assistant Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: **L. G. SMITH**

YSLer Debates Stalinist at CCNY

NEW YORK, Dec. 2—City College was the scene today of the first debate to be held between the Young Socialist League and the Stalinists. Over 80 students jammed the meeting room to hear Max Martin of the YSL clash with Sanford Rose, who spoke for the Stalinist group on campus, the Marxist Discussion Club.

The large turnout resulted from an off-campus leaflet distribution by YSLers. Despite the fact that their group was sponsoring the event, the Stalinists did not distribute leaflets for the meeting and in general did little to attract outsiders to it, making certain only that all of their supporters turned out for the debate. Martin and Rose contended over the question, "What Are the Origins of the Cold War and How Can It Be Ended?"

Martin led off with the first 20-minute presentation and presented the Third Camp socialist position on the question. "The irreconcilable conflict between Russia and the United States," he declared, "is no mere accident of misunderstanding, but has its roots in the imperialist clash of their social systems."

He pointed out the reactionary and illusory nature of the proposal for ending the cold war by a deal to divide the world between the rival imperialisms. He pointed to the struggles of the international working class and the colonial peoples against both camps of exploiters as the road to a world of peace, freedom and plenty.

The 1953 uprising of the East German workers, he said, was the kind of action which is a significant and meaningful step toward preventing World War III.

TWIST IN THE LINE

The line taken by the Stalinist speaker, Rose, was extremely interesting as an indication of their current pretense at a political position, at least on the campus. This new Stalinist political line has some appeal to many students today and is undoubtedly responsible for the slight revival of strength which the Stalinists have had on campus in recent months.

The line which Rose presented was the current CP stress on "coexistence" and "big-power negotiations." What is interesting, however, is that this program was not presented in the framework of partisanship for Russia. On the contrary, Rose went out of his way to dissociate himself from any of the specific Russian proposals for a settlement with the United States, and in general muted identification of his political line with that of the Kremlin.

"We don't ask you to agree with the Russian proposals," he said, "just let them sit down and negotiate."

Presented in such a fashion, the Stalinist line does not appear to the average student to be very much different from the "coexistence" ideas of many liberals and anti-Stalinist neutralists, a shade more critical of American policy perhaps. Given the various "coexistence" illusions now in vogue among all sections of student opinion, the ignorance of a new generation of students about Stalinist hypocrisy, and the seeming "reasonableness" of the Stalinist line, the CP youth can make some headway among students who are critical of Washington. Indeed there was evidence that some members in the audience were so affected.

Despite the fact that the debate was therefore not an unqualified success for the YSL, it had considerable value. It enabled the position of Third Camp socialism to be put forth at City College for the first time. It also put the YSL in contact with several Stalinoids and others.

The more traditional task for the YSL of demolishing pro-American illusions must now be supplemented (at least at City College) by that of debunking the Stalinist pretensions to "sweet reasonableness" as well as the idea of coexistence.

DISCUSSION: Two Views on the Question — Have Fascists the Right to Organize?

The comrades of the Berkeley unit of the Young Socialist League have raised an objection to *Challenge's* defense of the right "of fascist students to organize." We welcome this discussion article for it gives us an opportunity to explain our attitude toward this problem, one which has disoriented many socialists and liberals in the past and which still serves to confuse the thinking of some people on the question of the rights of Stalinists. At the same time it enables us to put forth our views on this matter in greater detail than heretofore and to clarify those aspects of these views which may have given rise to misunderstandings.

To begin with, what precisely do we mean when we speak of the "rights" of fascists, or of those other totalitarians, the Stalinists?

We clearly have in mind the right of all, including totalitarians, to hold opinions, even obnoxious ones, and to express their views in meetings, newspapers, etc., that is, through the exercise of the rights of freedom of speech, press and assembly.

When we defend the right of fascists to organize we mean their right to organize for these purposes, for the expression of their ideas, for those activities which all have to be allowed to engage in, if a society is to be a truly democratic one. We oppose therefore any attempts by the government to circumscribe or limit or do away with anyone's right and ability to express his ideas, as the government is doing today.

ACTS AND OPINIONS

The Berkeley comrades state that defense of civil liberties involves defending the right of fascists to teach or hold government jobs if they have the necessary competence, their right not to be dismissed from such positions for their political opinions. They draw the line, however, at "organization," and raise the question of fascist violence in this connection.

Obviously the YSL does not defend fascist violence and terror; on the contrary, it struggles against them and urges the labor movement to do likewise. Nor do we defend the right of fascists to organize violence against radicals and workers. We do not protest action by the government against such activities nor the government's punishment of fascists for acts of violence. Indeed we call upon the state to take action against fascist hoodlums (pointing out to the working class, at the same time, that it cannot rely upon the bourgeois state to defend it against fascist attack and that it must rely instead upon its own efforts).

Coming Event

The Young Socialist League will participate in a symposium sponsored by the War Resisters League on Wednesday, December 15, at 8:15 p.m. Representatives of Students for Democratic Action, the McCarthyite Students for America, the WRL and the YSL will discuss "American Foreign Policy." Comrade Sam Taylor will present the YSL viewpoint.

The symposium, which will be chaired by Bayard Rustin of the WRL, is being held at the home of John Haynes Holmes, 28 East 35 Street, New York City. All *Challenge* readers in the New York area are urged to attend.

Point of View from Berkeley

The Berkeley unit of the Young Socialist League wants to call the attention of the YSL and its friends to a mistaken plank in the recent program advanced by the *YS Challenge* of October 4, 1954 ("A Program to Defend Democracy for All"). In section II, sub-point 4, there is the following incorrect statement:

"We defend the right of Stalinist and fascist students to organize, and we shall participate in the struggle to convince the student body that they must reject the leadership of these, or any other anti-democratic groups, freely, openly and democratically."

While socialists support the principle of academic freedom, that teachers—including fascists—should not be deprived of their jobs for political beliefs, as opposed to academic incompetence proven in the classroom, *we are not defenders of the fascists' right to organize.*

Does this make socialists hypocrites with regard to civil liberties? Not at all. The crux of the matter is: What are we talking about when we characterize a group as being fascist? Is a fascist group merely another color in the political spectrum, albeit on the extreme right? Or is there some special feature of fascist groups that singles them out from, say, Stalinist groups, which are also undemocratic?

The socialist movement, and most particularly the Trotskyist section of it, has always distinguished the fascist parties by their violence and vigilante tactics in their efforts to smash the strength of workers' organizations or socialist parties which attempted to lead the working class. Fascist groups use violence, not as an incidental step at certain periods of their growth, but as their hallmark and attraction to those who would join the fascist movement. If they are successful in initial efforts to destroy physically their most self-conscious enemies, further resistance becomes more and more difficult. The fascist movement must be smashed in the egg and by means of di-

rect and violent tactics of workers, socialists and others who would prevent the immediate curtailment of whatever freedom exists in the social arena.

Socialists do not therefore call upon the state or the police of a capitalist country to do this job, since there is generally much sympathy to the efforts of the fascists among sections of the bourgeoisie, but upon workers and socialists for this job. In addition, whatever powers to "suppress" fascist or other political groups are placed in the hands of the state will not only not be effective, but will be used in their most rigorous form to smash workers' or socialist organizations, the true enemies of the capitalist state.

Socialists defend the Stalinists' right to organize, not out of sympathy with their aims and influence—which we contest—but because the Stalinists, in their efforts to demagogically lead the working class, do not use violence to smash workers' organizations. They are a danger within the workers' movement, although advance agents of the bureaucratic Stalinist class across the ocean, who would eventually smash any independent workers' organizations after taking power.

Therefore, socialists (1) defend the rights of fascist intellectuals (including teachers) to hold government jobs; (2) defend the rights of reactionary groups which are sympathetic to past fascist regimes—although these are a real danger today and must be combatted politically—to exist free from government interference; but (3) do not defend the rights of genuine fascist action groups (such as Students for America in Los Angeles, or G. L. K. Smith in Detroit) to organize.

It is a mistake of no small proportions to allow our very real concern for the extension and preservation of civil liberties to blind us to the immediate consequences of a serious fascist movement in America.

Jack WALKER

Should the government arrest a fascist hoodlum for *beating up a trade-union militant*, we would not regard it as a violation of civil liberties, for nobody has the democratic "right" to engage in such actions, just as we do not regard government action against a Russian spy for espionage as a violation of civil liberties. Government action against a fascist or a Stalinist for *expressing fascist or Stalinist opinion*, however, is another matter.

The distinction, then, is between acts and expression of opinion.

The objection to our view seems to be based, however, on a denial that such a distinction may be possible in the case of fascists, on the argument that the existence of a fascist group is necessarily equivalent to the existence of fascist violence. The comrades say: "Fascist groups use violence, not as an incidental step in certain periods of their growth, but as their hallmark and attraction to those who would join the fascist movement."

Now it is true that from their very inception, fascist groups tend to perpetrate violence and terror against socialists, radicals, militant workers, members of racial and ethnic minorities, etc.

For this reason, the defense of the civil liberties of fascists is in good part an abstraction. Even if it were entirely an abstraction, it would still be important to set forth the distinction, making clear that we are for punishing fascists for acts and not for opinions. Actually, there is no reason at a given time why fascist individuals and groups cannot exist who have not committed and do not

commit acts of violence. We are sure that, in fact, there are such.

QUESTION OF LABEL?

It is at this point that what the comrades from Berkeley have in mind is not entirely clear. It may be that they withhold the label "fascist" from all but those who are actually engaged in violence and have committed violent acts.

Several remarks in their penultimate paragraph indicate that this may be the case. The "reactionary groups" whose rights they are for defending may be ones that we would call fascist. In that paragraph they further speak of not defending the rights of "genuine fascist action groups," perhaps making thereby the same distinction we do. In that event, there is really no difference of view on the question of civil liberties for fascists, but rather one on what groups to call "fascist."

On the other hand, it may be that the Berkeley comrades hold the opinion that fascist students do not have the right to organize even if they have not engaged in and are not engaging in violence, on the ground that the overwhelming probability is that sooner or later they will do so. In this event, the YSL viewpoint and theirs do differ.

Their argument would then be that an inevitable or probable future violence by fascists justifies a present denial of their civil liberties. Such an argument plays into the hands of the witchhunters, who frequently adduce the same argument in favor of suppression of the Stalinists.

We are against denial of civil liberties

(Continued on page 7)

The British Labor Party Crisis

LEFT

RIGHT

AND CENTER

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

London, Dec. 1

Is Bevanism dead, as the wishful thinkers of the capitalist press, particularly its Liberal representatives, would have us believe?

This point of view, expressed for instance by the *Manchester Guardian* and the *London Daily Mirror* at the Scarborough Conference of the Labor Party, confuses as usual the wishful thinking of the sophisticated sections of the capitalist class with the actual reality. Events over the last few weeks have borne out quite conclusively that Bevanism, far from being dead, is very much alive and a constant threat to the official leadership of the party.

The right-wing leadership of the party won a Pyrrhic victory at Scarborough over the opponents of German rearmament. We have referred to this fact in a previous London Letter.

Despite the tremendous pressure from the official leadership of the Parliamentary Labor Party, only 124 of the Labor MPs voted for the London Nine-Power Agreement on Germany in the group's vote, while 72 opposed it. Moreover, for fear of revealing the real position within the Labor Party at large, the party Whips on the advice of Attlee and Morrison instructed the Parliamentary Labor Party to abstain on the vote in Parliament for the Nine Power Agreement! Seven Labor MPs disobeyed the instruction (six voted against the agreement, and one, John McGovern, voted for it).

The Economist this week has some unkind words for the Parliamentary Labor Party leadership for allowing itself to be "stampeded" into abstaining on the vote for German rearmament as expressed in the terms of the London Agreement. The expulsion of the seven MPs from the Parliamentary Labor Party but not from the party itself is sure evidence of the authority and respect that these MPs command in the Labor Party. Only if the leadership of the Labor Party is prepared to cut off the living body of the Labor Party at its base level—i.e., at the constituency party level—would it proceed farther than it has done in disciplining the Bevanites and their offshoots.

All of this brings us to the great dock and bus strikes, which have a bearing on the question.

Impact of the Dock Strike

The two general unions, the Transport and General Workers Union (TGWU) and the National Union of General and Municipal Workers, are the real power behind the official leadership of the Labor Party. Without their bloc votes at the Labor Party conferences, without the substantial financial backing they give to Transport House, the Bevanite leadership would have been in the saddle years ago. In this sense they are the chief obstacle to a socialist forward thrust within the Labor Party and the trade unions.

The recent dock and bus strikes have, between them, done more to undermine the basis of the TGWU than years of Bevanite propaganda within the constituency parties.

The TGWU is divided into trade groups, such as Docks Section, Passenger Workers Section, etc. Through these sections, Arthur Deakin is able to establish ascendancy within the Trade Union Congress and thus the Labor Party. Any undermining of the authority of the TGWU leadership within these trade groups has repercussions throughout the whole trade-union movement. A mass movement away from the TGWU, into the Stevedores Union for instance, can but lower the strength and prestige of the leadership of the TGWU.

And this is just what has happened on the docks.

Strikes of an intensity not known since the general strike have taken place in the face of the opposition of employers, the Dock Labor Board (which was set up by the Labor government) and the TGWU. The transfer of thousands of dockers in Hull and the Merseyside from the "white" union (the TGWU) to the "blue" union—the reference is to the color of the union card—has dealt a great blow to the official leadership of the Trade Union Congress.

This is particularly true in view of the opposition of the Stalinists to this transfer. The Stalinists fear this whole movement as it is a break not only from Transport House but is also quite independent of King Street [the CP]. The accusation that the dock strike was Communist-inspired is not taken seriously even by the *Manchester Guardian*! Only *London Tribune*, edited by the Bevanites, has had the courage to take up the cudgels on behalf of the Stevedores' leader and the busmen.

Behind the Right-Wing Drive

If we take the two issues together, the open and courageous support of the dockers and the continued opposition to German rearmament on the part of *Tribune*, the blunt warning of the Labor Party's National Executive Committee to the editorial board of *Tribune* can be seen to reflect a real fear that if the trade-unionists in this country line up together with a Bevanite movement supporting the wage claims and general interests of the working class, then the days of the Transport House leadership are numbered.

For once the authority of the "general" unions and their leaderships begins to wane, begins to crumble, the whole basis of the right wing party leadership will fall away with it. Instead, new forces, emerging out of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, the National Union of Railway and the National Union of Mineworkers, will take over the leadership of the Trade Union Congress.

It is against this background that the drive of the right wing against the party as a whole has to be viewed.

There can be little doubt that some of the leaders of the Transport and General Workers Union, also the Steelworkers and Municipal

Workers, are not at all anxious to see a new Labor government. They made it quite clear some years back, when the Tory government first came back to office. For them, it was "business as usual"—come Tory, come Labor.

The prospect of a Bevanite Labor government, or even a Bevanite-influenced Labor government, is for them a more unhealthy prospect than the continued functioning of a Tory government, with a real bias toward the Deakin-Williamson type of "neutral" or "semi-political" trade-unionism.

Not unnaturally, their faction within the Parliamentary Labor Party, led by George Brown, is anxious for a showdown with the Bevanites, for their expulsion from the party—even if this means decapitating the constituency parties or cutting them to pieces. This right-wing faction was very critical of the Attlee-Morrison decision to abstain on the Nine-Power Agreement and the willingness of Attlee-Morrison to be "pushed around" by the Bevanites (as they see it).

This faction wants *Tribune* suppressed; it wants a Labor Party manipulated by the TGWU to replace the present "anarchic" situation, where the Attlees and Morrisons have to take into account the pressures from below.

Center vs. the Right

Attlee and Morrison, on the other hand, want to take office. To do this they need a well-functioning Labor Party—wards, trade-union branches, and rank-and-file men and women to do canvassing and the donkey-work of the party. Quite naturally, they find themselves at loggerheads with the present drive of the Trade Union Congress leadership to rid the Labor Party of "Bevanites," "Communists" and "Trotskyists"—not because that is not their own ultimate object also but because the present situation is not ripe for such a drive.

The difference between Attlee and Deakin is, therefore, not fundamental. It is a difference over timing the drive against the left wing.

The retreat of the NEC before *Tribune's* counterblasts pinpoints the differences that are undoubtedly at the root of the present conflict between the Labor Party and the Trade Union leadership. When the liberal bourgeois press—the *Observer* and the *Manchester Guardian*—have to rebuke Transport House for their illiberal and undemocratic behavior in relation to the Bevanite "minorities," then the Labor Party leadership, abnormally sensitive to criticism from its friends in the bourgeois parties, sits up and takes notice. Unfortunately they are less sensitive to criticism from below.

And to cap it all, the recent Churchill bombshell (on arms to German troops in 1945) has knocked the right-wing Labor leadership for six. The whole basis of their argument for German rearmament has gone up in smoke. How they can extricate themselves from this embarrassing situation, without immeasurably adding to Bevan's support and strength, it is difficult to see.

A Road to the Future

What is important for all socialists to recognize is this: the official leadership of the Labor movement is not as monolithic as would appear on the surface. A concerted drive of the type Michael Foot has conducted in *Tribune* on the side of the dockers and busmen, and soon the railwaymen, taken as part of a general drive against the unofficial coalition policies of Attlee and Morrison (as on German rearmament), can throw the official leadership on the defensive.

A policy of evasions and equivocations can only show the green light for further attacks of Transport House against democracy within the party.

The Stalinists are entirely out on a limb in these struggles, currently supporting the adventurist (if heroic) decision of six Labor MPs to defy the Labor Party Whips. Like the official bureaucrats, the Stalinists want an adventurist break of the left wing from the Labor Party which would tend to rely on CP trade-union influence to keep it moving.

A resolute opposition to such adventurism, a firm reliance on the forces within the Labor Party and the trade unions can lead to a position where it will be the Gaitskells who leave the Labor Party rather than a small sect of Sidney Silvermans. Socialist ideas can find a mass basis in such a forward development. This much is certain.

Holiday Sale

GIVE A BOOK FOR A GIFT

CAPITAL, by Karl Marx (3 vols., Kerr; like new)	\$20.00
HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION, by Leon Trotsky (One-vol. ed)	12.00
STALIN, by Leon Trotsky (U. S. ed)	3.00
HANDBOOK OF MARXISM, ed. by Emile Burns	6.00
COMING STRUGGLE FOR POWER, by John Strachey	1.50
THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA, by Leon Trotsky	5.00
AN AMERICAN LOOKS AT KARL MARX, by William J. Blake	5.00
WORKERS BEFORE & AFTER LENIN, by Manya Gordon	2.00
HISTORY OF GREAT AMERICAN FORTUNES, by Gustavus Myers	1.25
AMERICA'S 60 FAMILIES, by Ferdinand Lundberg	1.50
BONAPARTE, by Eugene Tarlé	7.00

All books on this list are single copies, sold on a first-come first-served basis. Most are used, but all are in excellent condition. All orders must be accompanied by payment.

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

PRO AND CON: DISCUSSION

Third Round:

Israel, Zionism, and the Arab Question

Challenge —

(Continued from page 5)

To the Editor:

I have just read in LABOR ACTION for Oct. 25 the translation of my letter on Zionism and the Arab question, and the reply by Hal Draper. This reply obliges me to write once more (I hope it will be the last) in order to state my point of view precisely.

First of all, I spoke in my letter of Lebanon [in French *Liban*—Trans.] and not of Libya [in French *Libye*—Trans.]. This error of the translator led Hal Draper to believe that I was referring to Libya, evidently a mistake. [The translator apologizes profusely, though we add, to cover up his confusion, that it was a question of deciphering handwriting as well as of translating.—Ed.]

For Hal Draper, the central question is the following: Is it necessary to destroy the state of Israel by armed force? And he sees no solution other than that if one is opposed to the very existence of the state of Israel. I regret to say that the alternatives seem to me to be false ones. By no means do I propose a recommencement of the armed struggle between the Arabs and Israel; I very strongly wish that it should not happen. But I am for the fusion of the Arabs and the Jews of Palestine into a single people, and Draper seems to be in agreement on that. How is this fusion to be achieved? For that we have to rely on the socialist and internationalist propaganda on which we agree, it seems to me. But Draper does not seem to see that such a fusion will necessarily end in the destruction of the state of Israel—which is that of a religious group—and its replacement by a state of Palestine. How can one suppose that the Arabs could accept as their own a state based on Jewish racism? A unified state—even if it is federated as Draper proposes, which seems to me an inadequate solution—could not be Israeli but Palestinian. That seems to me evident, and I do not understand how Draper can suppose that the state of Israel could survive a fusion with Arab Palestine.

I know that LABOR ACTION condemns the anti-Arab racism in Israel; that has never been in question. But I said that Draper had not spoken in his reply to Maksoud about the expulsion of the Arabs of Palestine; and that is for me the center of the problem.

And Draper still does not answer the question: Does a population removed from all parts of the globe have the right to colonize a country? If one recognizes the Jews' right to establish themselves in Palestine, it is inevitable that they should take the Arabs' lands and that they should drive them out besides.

There is a curious contradiction in the position of Draper and LABOR ACTION. Draper declares that he agrees with me on the return and the indemnification of the expelled Arabs, the reunification of Palestine, the right of Jews to leave Israel if they so wish, complete equality for all the peoples. Very well. But he does not say a word about limitation on Jewish immigration into Israel. Is he in favor of letting this immigration go on? If he is, there is a contradiction in his ideas, for immigration necessarily pushes the Jews to occupy the Arabs' lands and to increase their territory at the latter's expense. The role of internationalists is, then, to alert the Jews who want to emigrate to Israel, and to make them understand that by acting in this way they are working against socialism.

Between Draper's position and mine, then, there are very important divergences:

- (1) The state of Israel, in my opinion, must be replaced by a state of Palestine.
- (2) Jewish immigration into Palestine must in my opinion still be stopped before it is too late, that is, before it ends in an armed conflict which I do not wish any more than does Draper.

Very fraternally,
J. GALLIENNE

Damascus, Syria, Nov. 23

But if at war's end there was a special problem of an uprooted people in Europe who were being strangled to death before the eyes of the world (a problem which, I am afraid, plays no role in Gallienne's considerations) and the need for a socialist policy which could take account of their plight as well as of the real crimes of the Zionists against the Arab people, then what about today? Obviously this special problem has diminished substantially and no longer calls for action in the same way.

Then what about the problem which, Gallienne says, I omitted?—namely, "limitation on Jewish immigration into Israel." That is easy, but further on, Gallienne refers to "stopping" Jewish immigration; and in his first letter he demanded "the end of the Jewish immigration into Palestine."

The question arises: Is Gallienne really talking only about a "limitation" on Jewish immigration, or is he demanding a ban on Jewish immigration (the latter being a not unpopular slogan in his part of the world)?

The fact is that the Israeli Zionist government has itself, these days, adopted a policy of limited immigration, against extreme-Zionist demands for unlimited mass immigration. But that is tactical for them. Zionist immigration policy is ultimately directed to expansionist and anti-Arab ends in its very bases. Gallienne would have been perfectly correct if he had limited himself to this point.

It follows, in my view, that a socialist anti-Zionist policy in Israel would certainly concern itself with the limitation (not stoppage) of Jewish immigration. What would be the socialist criteria as against the fundamentally expansionist aims of Zionism? I suggest these:

- (1) Priority for resettling the Arab refugees and expellees over against any and all Jewish immigration.
- (2) The fixing of a quota for immigration on the basis of the economic and social absorptive power and needs of the country, not on the basis of the Zionist aim.
- (3) Whether a given higher or lower immigration rate would help the productivity of the country, or depress its living standards and burden its resources, is to be determined by competent economic technicians.
- (4) If a federated Palestine is to be possible, it will undoubtedly have to be based on prior agreement on immigration quotas, through peaceful negotiations and a will to come to agreement. Such agreement with the Arabs would be impossible or unstable as long as Zionist policy and ideology rules Israel.

These are some thoughts on criteria for limitation of immigration. I should like to think that here too Comrade Gallienne means the same thing we do when he himself uses the word "limitation."

By the way, I note that the "curious contradiction" in our position turns out to exist in an answer I do not give to the above-mentioned unclear question.

Hal DRAPER

REPLY: ISRAEL AND JEWISH IMMIGRATION

Comrade Gallienne's second letter, above, is welcome; it is clear that his views are not quite as different from the ISL's as seemed to be indicated in his original letter. One reason seems to me to be that he was not familiar with the ISL resolution and policy (on Palestine federation, for instance), as was Maksoud, and as I assumed he was too. Another reason is that in his first letter he seemed to be solidifying himself entirely with the line of the Arab socialists as expounded by Comrade Maksoud in the LA discussion. We had challenged Maksoud on the war-against-Israel line. Gallienne had not differentiated himself.

(1) In his present letter he discloses that in demanding the "destruction of the state of Israel" he means absolutely nothing more than the fusion of Israel and Arab Palestine into a "state of Palestine"—that he agrees with this demand of ours which we counterpose to the Arabs' perspective. We assume also that he means a voluntary fusion.

Very good. To be sure, to use "destruction of the state of Israel" as the term to designate the peaceful fusion of two peoples is a very ferocious way of talking politically. To be sure, it is also a very strange and misleading sort of ferocious talk when there are so many people around in Comrade Gallienne's part of the world who by no means have his peaceful interpretation of the words.

But notwithstanding, there is certainly no doubt that our proposal—and Gallienne's—for a fusion of Jews and Arabs in a united Palestine would mean the end of Israel as the present sovereign "Jewish state." That is why we raised it. The center of our attack on Zionism is on the concept and practise of the "Jewish state." We are for transforming Israel into a "bi-national" state precisely in order to make possible Jewish-Arab fusion.

As for the federated form: Gallienne is beside the point when he comments that a federation would be "inadequate." It is our proposal not because it is an end in itself but because we are convinced that it is the only practicable initial form for such a fusion. Gallienne should remember that we are talking about two people who right now are closer to going to war again than they are fusing voluntarily. In a Palestine which is reunited federally, one section would of course still be called "Israel," quite probably. We trust that this nomenclature will not

repel Gallienne too violently. In any case, it is another reason against talking in terms that sound like "destroying Israel," and letting it go at that.

Our own thinking has been, most often, in the framework of asking this question: What would be a revolutionary socialist program for an anti-Zionist movement within Israel? Perhaps Gallienne has devoted more attention to another important question: A revolutionary socialist program for the Arab world. The two cannot be identical, of course, but they must not be contradictory. They must be compatible at the worst; complementary, at the best.

(2) Now in the course of this thinking, we have paid a great deal of attention to attacks on, and demands about, the Israeli crimes against the Arab refugees and expellees. For the second time Comrade Gallienne complains that I did not mention this in my reply to Maksoud, and for the second time I am forced to reply that it had nothing to do with our differences with Maksoud. Comrade Gallienne makes no connection with anything; he just notes. It isn't very helpful.

(3) "And Draper still does not answer the question: Does a population removed from all parts of the globe have the right to colonize a country?"—Such obviously loaded questions are also the reverse of helpful.

No one has "the right to colonize a country."

What Gallienne intends is a question about the right of immigration, which I discussed at length in the polemic with Maksoud. It is Comrade Gallienne's way of making an argument: in this case, he is asserting in effect, immigration is identical with colonization. All immigration of Jews, or only Zionist-type mass immigration? He does not say.

Is it possible to develop a socialist policy which will reconcile the right of Jews to immigrate to countries of their choice (including Palestine), with the fight against the Zionist aim of carving a Jewish state out of the Arab world? Well, this is exactly what we tried to do; exactly what I tried to explain in the discussion against Maksoud; exactly what is set forth even more cogently in our resolution.

But all Gallienne does is simplistically to identify any immigration with colonization, and this adds nothing that I need discuss again.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet books, publication date Dec. 22:

- W. W. Rostow & others: *The Dynamics of Soviet Society*, Mentor, 50¢. David St. Lever: *A Treasury of Wisdom and Inspiration*, Signet Key, 35¢. Georges Simenon: *The Brothers Rico*, Signet, 25¢. W. C. MacDonald: *Law and Order Unlimited*, Signet, 25¢. Charlie Wells: *Let the Night Cry*, Signet, 25¢. Charles Furlow: *Search for the Sun*, Signet Giant, 35¢. M. F. Caulfield: *The Black City*, Signet, 25¢. Adam Knight: *Kiss and Kill*, Signet, 25¢.

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. 18-48 If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue. RENEW NOW!

to fascists and Stalinists, not because we feel concerned with their rights but because of the political consequences of granting that they lack such rights, consequences that can and do redound to the harm of the progressive forces in the country and to the state of democracy in general.

GERMAN ANALOGY

The question of Germany is frequently raised as an analogy at this point. This misses the mark for the German situation is not analogous to what we are talking about.

Socialists and others in pre-Hitler Germany demanded, and correctly, that the government do something about Nazi terror, not Nazi opinions. Analogously we demand that the government outlaw Jim Crow acts, not that it make Jim Crow opinions punishable. The difference between acts and opinions is the key to our attitude toward the rights of fascist students to organize.

A fascist student group which sponsors campus meetings to disseminate fascist ideas is one thing; one which beats up, let us say, Jewish students, is another. (Incidentally, we lack adequate information to judge as to which of these two categories the Los Angeles section of Students for America, which the Berkeley comrades refer to, falls under.)

ROLE OF THE STATE

One further point requires some comment and that is with reference to whether socialists "call upon the state or police of a capitalist country to do this job," that is, to act against fascist violence and terror and to defend the labor movement against it. As has already been stated, socialists try to educate the working class not to rely upon the bourgeois state, to organize their own defense instead. This does not mean, however, that socialists do not and should not ever ask the capitalist government to take such action. Many times it is desirable to make such demands of the government (while continuing to educate the workers about the government's unreliability) either in order to expose the government, or else because in specific contexts the government may actually take such action. As mentioned above, German socialists did call upon the government to act against the Nazi movement.

In arguing against calling for governmental action, the article from the Berkeley unit states: "In addition, whatever powers to 'suppress' fascist or other political groups are placed in the hands of the state will not only not be effective, but will be used in their most rigorous form to smash workers' or socialist organizations, the true enemies of the capitalist state."

But we are talking of the power of the government to take action against acts of fascist violence, a power which the state already has, and which frequently it does not use against such spreaders of fascist terror as the KKK.

To deny the right of fascists to organize for the purpose of expressing their views and to grant the government the right to suppress groups or punish them for holding certain political views would and indeed does lead to the results quoted. Which is not the least reason for our opposing them.

Max MARTIN
For the Editors of Challenge

Labor Action FORUM
New York

THURSDAY, DEC. 16 at 9
ANDREW MITCHELL
Reviews Silone's
"A Handful of Blackberries"
THURSDAY, DEC. 23 at 9
BEN HALL on
Racketeering in the Unions
Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

There's No Angel Around
to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.
A sub is only \$2 a year—
Subscribe now!

Senate Votes Censure — —

(Continued from page 1)

times. And to select only the crudity with which McCarthy has perpetrated his frauds for condemnation would be to publicly proclaim that it is not the big lie which is repulsive to the morals of our national leaders, but only the sloppy one.

Did the Senate condemn McCarthy for his whopping contribution to the atmosphere of fear and insecurity in this country, in which all one has to do is to shout "communist" to create a panic among teachers, government employees and large segments of the population in general?

How could they? The Federal Bureau of Investigations has done more to create this feeling of insecurity and fear through its far-flung prying and nosing into every facet of the public and private lives of the American people than McCarthy could dream of doing. And the Congress has appropriated every penny which the FBI has squandered on such work.

COMMON GROUND

Why should McCarthy be censured for acting on the assumptions which have been repeated publicly for at least a decade by that most untouchable of all high-muck-a-mucks, J. Edgar Hoover himself? How could he be condemned for his no-holds-barred, or "Indian Charley," attack on Stalinism if this presents such an imminent peril to the capitalist system as seems to be implied in the adoption by the last session of Congress of laws to illegalize a whole political movement?

Did the forces of law and order in public life vote to censure McCarthy for setting up an illegal espionage center to gather secret data from government workers which he could use in "digging out communists" or in harassing the Eisenhower administration in any way he saw fit?

Expel McCarthy? —

(Continued from page 1)

tors could be deprived of their seats just because they took an opposite stand in the Senate to that on which they had got elected!).

No one wants to see McCarthy retired from public life more than we do. But to propose simply to throw him out of the Senate, not for any legal crime, but because we object to his politics both in form and content, is a violation of that democracy which he may hold in contempt but which we hold dear.

And why do these liberals propose to throw him out? We can only guess at the answer. But our guess is informed by our observation of their relations with McCarthy over the years.

They want to throw him out of the Senate because they don't have the intestinal fortitude to stand up to him, day after day and month after month, and slug it out with him politically.

Of course, that way they would educate the electorate and the country at large. That way they would rally the forces of progress in the country in the same way that McCarthy is rallying the most militant forces of reaction.

ANTI-McCARTHYITES IN THE BOG

It is true that in any real political fight they are at a terrible disadvantage when they come up against McCarthy. The disadvantage we are thinking of is not at all that he fights dirty while they are gentlemen. The disadvantage is that they dare not challenge the ground on which he fights!

They dare not stand on a ground of democratic principles, of respect for the civil liberties of Stalinists and radicals, of confidence in the ability of the majority of the people to recognize and reject Stalinism when a better alternative is offered them.

Of course, it is hard to fight a venomous swamp moccasin if you insist on sinking into the bog up to your armpits before the battle begins. The authors, supporters and defenders of the "anti-communist" law passed in the last Congress would find it much more convenient to throw McCarthy out of the Senate than to have to argue with him on what line of action flows logically from the assumptions on which their own law was based.

But that would be another big step on the road to the destruction of democracy in this country. Once one starts throwing men—even a McCarthy—out of the Senate because one disagrees with them, no matter how violently, instead of defeating them in elections, the political atmosphere in the country would be poisoned even more than it is now.

McCarthy and McCarthyism can be defeated politically, though not by methods hitherto used by the brave liberals who now propose to throw him out. But the proposal to throw him out is itself one more evidence of the acceptance of anti-democratic methods by the leading anti-McCarthyites.

They might have, but they thought better of it. After all, hypocrisy can only go so far before it exhausts its usefulness. Every senator gathers information where he can for his own purposes. If the departmental "leak" were eliminated, information vital to the elimination of bureaucratic abuses as well as to the in-fighting among the vested interests represented by each senator would be unobtainable.

DRIPPING HANDS

The list could go on and on. The point is clear enough. McCarthyism, all that is reactionary and evil in it, has eaten its way into the general consciousness and has corrupted public morality quite aside from an independently of the person and the works of the man himself.

The hands of Congress are dripping with the gore of McCarthyite legislative deeds. The men who were called upon to vote for censure dared not lift their hands, thus polluted, to point their fingers at him.

For that they had not the courage. To attack McCarthy on the grounds of McCarthyism would mean to defend civil liberties in this country against the Senate itself. It would mean to condemn the administration's whole loyalty and security program as an hysterical nightmare into which injustice, arbitrariness and contempt for the rights of the individual are built in as integrally as the hull on a battleship.

It would mean to stand up and condemn the blacklisting, blackmailing and firing of people from government and private jobs for the sole "crime" of invoking their constitutional rights under the Fifth Amendment before some congressional committee or administrative tribunal. It would mean to defend the rights even of actual proved, admitted Stalinists to freedom of speech and assembly and political organization, of which rights they have been progressively despoiled under the Smith Act prosecutions, and to which rights a final end is to be put by the infamous Humphrey law passed by the last Congress.

For all that, the worthy senators had no stomach.

But they felt that something must be done about McCarthy. He had become a real problem to the Republican Party in particular. Since he got through the army hearing without any irreparable damage to his position, the Eisenhower wing of the party decided that he must be cut down to size if he was not to endanger the unity of the party and hence its waning prospects for 1956.

So they found some charges which con-

stituted an offense to the dignity not of ordinary citizens but of senators. They condemned him for refusing to appear before the Senate committee which investigated his finances a few years ago, and for denouncing the Watkins committee and the censure procedure in ungentlemanly tones.

It should be noted in connection with the first charge: the findings of the committee which McCarthy refused to honor with his presence have been in the hands of the Department of Justice for many months now. The failure of that department to act can only be accounted for on the following basis: (a) No illegal activity was actually proved, in which event McCarthy had a point in denouncing the committee's report as a political attack on him. (b) Even though illegal activity was proved, the Justice Department is reluctant to prosecute either because they really don't want to kill McCarthy's value once and for all, or because too many important people might be involved, or because the practices are too widely known to be engaged in by government officers to permit the selection of one of them for special action.

MUTED PITCH

On the censure votes, the Republicans in the Senate split right down the middle, while the Democrats lined up solidly against McCarthy. This symbolizes the deep split in the Republican Party on the one hand, and the fact that the Democratic Party, however it may disagree within itself on questions of policy, is willing to make a united political demonstration against the man who accused it of "twenty years of treason."

It is true that not a single senator proposed to censure McCarthy for McCarthyism. (In all fairness it must be said that Watkins is reported to have stated in the debate on the Senate floor that we must put an end to labeling people "Fifth Amendment communists" just because they avail themselves of their constitutional privileges. That comes the closest of anything that happened in the Senate to a remark, if not an action, directed at McCarthyism as a political ideology.)

But such are the times in which we live that we must be thankful that half the Republicans and all the Democrats were able to screw up their courage even to this low and muted pitch. For it is quite evident that the senators did not line up so much on the basis of their convictions on the appropriations or legal correctness of the censure motions, but on whether or not they were willing to stand up and be counted against the most extreme, know-nothing, chauvinist, bigoted, reactionary segment of political opinion in this country, whose standard-bearer is McCarthy.

PLAYING TO THE GALLERY

And what did McCarthy himself have in mind? Throughout the censure debate he acted in his typically arrogant, contemptuous, provocative manner. Even after it had become evident that the vote would go against him, he made it virtually impossible for the wavering senators to stay on his side of the aisle. He gave them no help at all. He acted exactly like a man who is unconcerned about what was going on in the senate, but was playing to a more important audience outside its walls.

That audience was listening. It gathered at Madison Square Garden in New York to demonstrate its strength, and it collected signatures to petitions all over the country. But despite the time given its organizers by the famous elbow incident, it showed itself to be relatively feeble and quite unready to form the hosts of a new political party.

Just what McCarthy may have concluded from this episode about his future line of action, only time will tell. It will be worth noting whether, once relieved of his committee platform in the new Congress, he will spend most of his time assembling and organizing his movement in the country at large, or will seek to reintegrate himself into the Senate which has now chided him for rudeness to the club.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

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