

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 15, 1956

FIVE CENTS

British Labor Shifts Left as Bevan Wins

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Oct. 7

Blackpool is one of Britain's best-known holiday resorts on the northwest coast. It has lots of bright lights, plenty of fun and laughter and invigorating seaside air. As a cure for depression and doldrums Blackpool ranks high.

Last week the Labor Party paid a trip to Blackpool for its annual conference and came away fresh, full of fight and enthusiasm.



BEVAN

But the cure was not due to the physical attractions of Blackpool; it was due to the fact that the party conference continued on the leftward turn which marked out the Trade Union Congress early in September and so filled party workers everywhere with the hope that the Labor Party is finding its way back to a point nearer to that from which it departed around 1950.

The symbol of this leftward turn came on Tuesday morning when the delegates assembled and anxiously awaited the re-

(Turn to last page)

VOTE SOCIALIST! Write in Darlington Hoopes and Samuel H. Friedman for Pres. and Vice-Pres.

ISL vs. the Subversive List:
THE GOVERNMENT SUMS UP ITS CASE

... page 6

Sweden's Social-Democrats Mark Time

... page 3

An Experiment in Conformism and Dissent

... page 4

Packinghouse Unions Win a Joint Strike

... page 2

John L. Under Fire at Miners' Convention

... page 2

THE STEVENHOWER CAMPAIGN:

Even the Promises Are Getting Thinner This Year

By GORDON HASKELL

If ever a political campaign seemed designed to demonstrate the built-in irresponsibility of American big-party politics, the presidential campaign of 1956 is it. It is not so much that this campaign is unique in this respect, as that it repeats with such deadly and unrelieved monotony what has happened so many times before that it seems almost impossible the point will not be driven home to a significant section of the population.

The Republicans hope to hang on to as much of their 1952 victory as possible on the basis of three "issues." These are the economic boom, the fact that there has been no shooting war since the Korean truce, and the personal popularity of Eisenhower.

The Democrats hope to return to their status as the majority party not by contrasting their actual political record of the past four years with that of the Republicans, but by appealing to the general idea that they are the party of the common man while the Republicans represent big business and the "special interests."

Stevenson is seeking to give this idea a revival by his "policy papers" dealing with aid to education, health insurance, and the like.

The programs outlined in these "New America" papers are all very well in themselves. They represent relatively cautious proposals for the expansion and supplementation of existing programs in various fields of social policy.

But the point is that they have absolutely no relationship to the real program of the Democratic Party, that is, to what any reasonable person could expect a Democratic administration to legislate and administer if it were overwhelmingly elected by the American people. It is just the old-fashioned business of campaign promises unrelated to past or future performance.

And the promises themselves are thinner than ever.

Of course, it is hardly to be expected that the Democratic senators and congressmen who have had ample opportunities in the past to enact legislation along the lines of Stevenson's "New

(Continued on page 3)

Why They're Talking 'European Unity'

By HAL DRAPER

A terrific light has been cast in the last couple of weeks on the conception of "European unity" as it has been bandied about for years in Europe's ruling circles.

Nothing better than the Suez crisis could have been devised to bring out in full color the fundamental difference between two ideas of European unity: what it means to socialists and what it means to the European bourgeoisie.

As a result, as one correspondent put it, there has been more talk about European unity in a week than in the preceding two years.

Socialists have always viewed European unity as an historic conquest of a socialist United States of Europe, to which they looked forward. As long as each state, in this small continent crisscrossed by national boundaries, remains dominated by a capitalist class interested in maximizing its own profits and power within its own tight borders, in a competitive struggle of imperialisms, it would be entirely utopian to think that they can be induced to give up their precious national sovereignty (and its prerequisites) for the sake of some fair ideal.

But still Europe is driven toward

some kind of unification simply by the state of weakness and debility which is its contemporary lot: due to destruction in the war, due to the revolt of the colonial world against its once profitable exploitation, due to the overshadowing power of the two giants of the cold war, the U. S. and Russia.

And so ever since the end of the war there have been intermittent bursts of aspiration toward a united Europe, while at the same time every proposal for a real step in that direction has gotten nowhere. As a matter of fact, even other kinds of steps of a unificatory nature have been torpedoed by the clash of national-capitalist interests: the ill-fated European Defense Community project, for example, even though this took off from vital military considerations.

We have here a typical contradiction of the system: this capitalist Europe must unite, and it cannot unite.

Every now and then, it is the first part of this contradiction that is moved by events into the spotlight of consciousness; and then there is the burst of unity talk. That is what is happening now, but in such a way as to clarify for a long time what the European bourgeoisie means by unity.

LIBERAL IMPERIALISTS

It hit the news first in the reports out of a quaint gathering in Stresa, Italy, of a so-called "Liberal International." This is an imitative name, significant of a yearning if nothing else, given to a periodic coffee-clatch of center parties from some West European countries.

The main theme of its first session on September 13, reported the press, was that the unification of Europe was the "real answer" to Nasser on the Suez Canal dispute. The organization's president, Senator Motz of Belgium, launched it:

"Would Col. Nasser have dared nationalize the Suez Canal, would the Algerian rebels have thought of gaining something by taking up arms? Success-

sive speakers answered M. Motz's rhetorical question with a resounding 'no.'

"The efforts of Arab-Asian nationalists to oust Europeans from influential positions in those parts of the world are seen by the liberals as the newest and most challenging reason for accelerating West European unity." (N.Y. Times, Sept. 14.)

That's about as clear as you need it. The connection between Suez and European unity does not run through slogans about international morality; it runs through Algeria, through the whole Middle East and Asia; in short, through the feeling that only a stronger Europe can collectively defend its imperialism against assault by its victims.

It is "liberals" who tell us that.

DIVISION OF LABOR

"Signor Cocco Ortu [an Italian liberal delegate] said the Liberals' duty was to try to convince the newly independent nations that excessive nationalism did not pay..."

That suggests a reasonable division of duties. It is the duty of Eden and Mollet to mobilize troops, fleets and helicopters; it is the duty of Dulles to think up legal formulas to tie up Nasser; and it is the

(Continued on page 7)

Packinghouse Unions Win in Joint Strike

By KEN HILLYER

Chicago, Oct. 3

Packinghouse workers won a historic battle last week and laid the basis for even greater gains in the future.

The settlement of the Swift & Company strike which began on September 20 followed earlier settlements with Armour and other large packing firms.

The strike, conducted jointly by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and the United Packinghouse Workers, marked the first time these two unions had worked fully together in united negotiations. It was supported by the united labor movement; the Teamsters cooperated to make it effective.

When the United Packinghouse convention endorsed unity with the Amalgamated Meat Cutters recently, 800 delegates cheered the slogan on a giant banner: "Merger Means More Pay." The strike became a living demonstration of the power of unity and a refutation of those who have minimized the significance of the merger.

For many years, minimum wage rates in packinghouses and steel mills used to be identical. But when divided unionism proved unable to handle the meat monopolies, the lowest wage rate of meat workers fell 13 cents behind steel. Basic labor rates before the strike were \$1.69 per hour with an average of \$2.06. A far higher proportion of workers in packinghouses were paid at the minimum rate than in other mass production industries. Meanwhile profits were soaring:

Wilson and Co.: Earnings for the period ending June 30 were \$5,112,000, compared to \$3,231,000 for the same period last year.

Swift and Co.: It made taxable profits of almost \$42 million in 1955, an increase of 12 per cent over the previous year. But its six-month report for 1956 shows a rate of profit tripling that of 1955!

Armour: Its profits increased six times from 1954 to 1955. If the current rate of profit for 1956 holds up as expected, it will go 18 times higher than the 1954 figure.

These profits have come from two sources: (1) constant increases in productivity; (2) decreasing prices paid to livestock farmers. The union points out that although the companies paid the farmers less for their meat, the consumer paid as much as ever in the butcher shop.

The two unions now move toward organic unity. Merger had almost been completed when a rift developed over terms; the Amalgamated unexpectedly demanded that the new constitution obliterate all union officials to take a Taft-Hartley-type oath, but the UPWA demurred. A compromise was reached when it was agreed that all officers required by law to sign affidavits do so in order to qualify the union for services of the National Labor Relations Board.

Conventions of both unions have since voted overwhelmingly for unity; a definitive date will soon be set.

GAINS

The unions failed to win one of their big demands, a modified union shop; but in the whole the settlement was a labor victory.

Wages: A 10-cent increase this year and annual increases of 7½ cents in the next two years. Inequities in rates paid to women and certain labor grades were corrected. Geographical rates below the prevailing standards were raised. Bonuses for Saturday, Sunday and night work were extended.

Seniority, health, pension, and insurance clauses were strengthened.

Severance pay for workers eliminated by automation was negotiated for the

first time. The principle of a guaranteed 36-hour week for workers scheduled to work in any given week was established.

Vacation pay was extended. An escalator clause was adopted, similar to one recently negotiated in the steel industry.

Because the strike came during the election campaign, it offered some interesting sidelights.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson threw in his two cents, warning that if the strike continued too long, livestock farmers would get lower prices. But this crude attempt to play farmer off against worker was answered by the unions.

In a special letter to farmers, the unions made clear that their strike was limited to the Swift chain, and "the other packing companies have more than enough extra capacity to take care of livestock which Swift customarily buys in the public markets and directly."

And the letter took the opportunity to make other things clear: "soaring profits have come from low prices paid farmers for livestock. Big profits have also been taken out of the hides of the plant workers in higher labor output, through automation and speed-up. . . . Contrary to any packer propaganda, we believe the interests of plant workers and working livestock farmers are basically the same."

Adlai Stevenson had an excellent opportunity in his farm speech to tell farmers that their interests were the same as workers, both victims of the meat packers. But instead he confined himself to describing how city folk did not understand farm problems and were propagandized against the farmer. He handled the strike like the civil-rights issue: he ducked lest he be "misunderstood."

STRIKE TACTICS

The strike threw light on some interesting questions of union tactics. In the past, Packinghouse Union leaders insisted that only an industry-wide strike could be effective. This time they tried a "one at a time" tactic and it succeeded. (Incidentally, the acceptance of an escalator clause was also a new departure for them.)

It was erroneous, in the past, to insist "in principle" upon industry-wide action exclusively. Under Truman, for example, the Packinghouse Union called an industry-wide strike and waited hopefully for the Washington administration to get them a good settlement. But when Truman ignored them, they were forced to call off the strike without winning any of their main demands. The union was humbled and weakened, accepting terms far below the national "pattern" in mass production.

This time "one at a time" proved successful but it would be just as wrong to make some kind of eternal principle out of it. The living situation will determine the correct line.

"One at a time" takes advantage of the competitive pressures acting on each company; industry-wide action brings the pressure of united class action where employers are solidly united against labor and at the same time tends to raise questions of politics and government intervention. There is no "one road" good under all circumstances.

The meat unions will now begin to consolidate their victory. The next task is the building of a strong united democratic union to attract the tens of thousands of workers in independent unions and other thousands in unorganized plants.

The 1956 strike opens the way to a big advance. Every union militant will cheer the joint victory of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union and the United Packinghouse Workers Union and look forward to their unity.

John L. Under Fire At Miner's Convention

By GERRY McDERMOTT

The recently concluded United Mine Workers convention was the liveliest one in recent years. That is to say, there was some opposition to John L. Lewis, for a change.

To be sure it was not like the old days in the twenties when opposition leaders rushed the platform and were thrown back bodily into the front row, and when Lewis once stated, "May the chair observe that the delegates may keep raising points of order until they meet each other in hell, and the chair will still not recognize them." But still there was some controversy, some new and some old.

The principal source of opposition to Lewis is in the Monongahela Valley of southwestern Pennsylvania and northern West Virginia. In this area, located as it is on a fine freight-carrying river and containing the famous Pittsburgh Seam of high-grade metallurgical coal, are the largest and most modern coal mines in the world, the highly mechanized and rationalized mines of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Company, giant of the industry, and of other big Northern producers. Unlike the mines of only ten years ago or so, these hire large numbers of men; the Robena Mine in southwestern Pennsylvania hires a thousand.

Thus there are big locals in this area, and quite a number of locals are under the same management in many cases. Such locals or groups of locals provide a base for opposition to the International.

Much of Lewis's success in dominating the union in the past is due to the fact that the locals were very small, as compared with other unions, and provided no base of operations for an opposition such as Local 600 in the UAW, Local 5 of the Rubber Workers, Locals 201, 301 or 601 of the IUE, etc.

For the past few years, these locals have engaged in many wildcat strikes, much to Lewis's displeasure. A few years ago, when soft-coal production was way down, the operators were worsening conditions wherever they could. The big locals fought back with the traditional tactics of the miners: roving bands of pickets in cars would close down all the mines in the valley over a dispute at one mine.

DEMAND AUTONOMY

The UMW contract with the operators provides that the UMW Executive Board can fine a local or individuals for wildcat strikes, and that this fine will be deducted from the workers' pay checks. Lewis has indicated that he is really going to crack down by this means on future wildcats.

A resolution was introduced at the convention denying the Executive Board the right to levy fines. It was defeated after Lewis made a fire-eating speech accusing the wild-cat leaders of being young "hot-rodders" who stay out too late the night before and don't want to work, so they call a strike. Or, he said, some of the leaders were older men who drink too much and call a strike when they don't want to work. Lewis said he would be "breathing down their necks" in the future.

The other fight came over an issue as old as Lewis's presidency of the union, and that goes back to 1917. That is district autonomy—the right of districts to elect their own director.

At present, only 13 of 30 districts have that right—in the other districts, Lewis appoints the director. For at least thirty years, the cry for district autonomy has been a rallying point for progressives in the union. In recent years, it has not often been heard.

At this convention it was raised again with some vigor. Lewis replied with his usual arguments, that they could have autonomy when they demonstrated "responsibility"—i.e., when they don't use their autonomy.

Demands for autonomy came from District 31, northern West Virginia, and from Districts 2 and 5 in western Pennsylvania. District 2, in the twenties under the leadership of John Brophy, was the seat of a strong socialist opposition, and some of that sentiment still remains.

For example, the St. Mary's (Pa.)

local, long an anti-Lewis and pro-socialist stronghold, introduced resolutions calling for the formation of a labor party and for government ownership of the coal industry. Both were defeated.

SNARLS AT REUTHER

Lewis used the debate on autonomy to take a crack at Walter Reuther and the UAW. He has no love for Reuther, and is especially peeved because a recent history of the UAW published by that union does not mention the considerable role that Lewis played in the early days of the union. (As a matter of fact, the omission of Lewis from the history is something of a disgrace to the Reuther leadership.)

At any rate, Lewis told the convention that if they wanted more democracy, they should go to the auto workers. "Every morning they issue a 7000-word statement about democracy and in Thanksgiving week, they talk about the economic problems of the organization. So there is about 11 months for democracy and one month for eating money. They will get all the democracy they want in the UAW—I do not know whether they could keep up with the reading or not. They would be told how to settle the situation in Persia, Cambodia, Viet Nam or Goa, but not much on how to get as much wages as the UMW are going to get."

This ill-tempered outburst was the sort of thing the old-line AFL leaders said about Lewis in his better days. That's probably where he learned it.

As the convention closed, Lewis was able to announce a new contract and a wage increase which brings the miners basic wage to \$22 a day. (That isn't so much if you work only two or three days a week, by the way, as is true of many mines.)

Lewis is still on top. Whether the 76-year-old president will stay there will depend on what happens the next time there is a big wildcat. The big advantage Lewis has, of course, is his control of the Welfare Fund. He can expel and has expelled a miner and thus make him ineligible for the great benefits provided under it.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the future of the UMW is with the big modern locals, and that sooner or later they will take over leadership of the union and lead it into the AFL-CIO where it belongs, among the vanguard of American labor.

Shachtman in Chicago

Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, will give two addresses in Chicago this coming week.

On Wednesday evening, Oct. 17, he will speak on the elections at the University of Chicago, under the combined auspices of the university Socialist Club, the Socialist Party, the ISL and YSL, who hold a joint "Socialist Forum." Place is Ida Noyes Hall, 1212 E. 59 St.

On Friday evening, Oct. 19, he will speak at a Labor Action Forum to give a report on the Washington hearings in which the ISL has been fighting the Attorney General's List. This will take place at Roosevelt University, 430 S. Michigan.

YOU'RE INVITED

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

Swedish Election Shows S-Ds Marking Time in 'Welfare' Rut

By TRYGVE CHRISTENSEN

Oslo, Oct. 1

About 80 per cent of the Swedish electorate of 4,800,000 cast their votes on September 16 for the lower house of parliament, an election which is held once every four years. The Social-Democratic Party (SDP) retained its long-dominant position in Swedish politics, winning 108 out of 231 seats.

It is expected that the Social-Democrats will continue their coalition with the Farmers Party which won 19 seats, suffering a loss of 7. This so-called red-green coalition has had its joint total of 136 seats reduced to 125, still a majority of the total of 231 in the lower house.

In the less important and indirectly elected upper house, the SDP enjoys an absolute majority, 78 of 150 seats. In both houses, seats are apportioned on a basis of proportional representation which favors the large parties.

The figures below show party strength in seats in the lower house as a result of the recent elections compared with the previous election in 1952.

Party	1956	1952
Social Democratic Party.....	106	110
Farmers Party.....	19	26
Liberal Party.....	58	58
Conservative Party.....	42	31
Communist Party.....	6	5

The election campaign was characterized by a lack of excitement and by low attendance at political meetings. With respect to the domestic program, all parties, with varying emphases, supported the SDP basic planks of full employment, shorter work-week and improved pensions.

In addition, the Farmers Party supported high fixed farm prices, a policy which, some times in the past five years of the red-green coalition, has caused the SDP trouble through increases in the cost of living.

The opposition Liberal and Conservative Parties accept the "Welfare State" philosophy of the governing coalition but proposed an increase in "freedom of enterprise," an end to the acute housing shortage, and lower taxes. The great emphasis laid on lower taxes by the Conservative Party is believed to be one reason why it gained 11 seats in the

election. A token income-tax cut introduced by the government prior to the election probably staved off greater defections.

The CP, strong in the remote sections of northern Sweden, proposing higher wages and lower living costs, picked up another seat.

In regard to foreign policy, all parties unanimously support the traditional "alliance-free" policy of Sweden. Sweden was fortunate in avoiding World Wars I and II and, despite pressure brought upon her, did not enter NATO. However, both the Conservatives and Liberals favor a more clear-cut ideological allegiance to the West while the CP endeavors to tilt the "Middle Way" to the East. The government and the CP were attacked by the Conservatives and Liberals recently when information was announced revealing another spy-ringing in Sweden, allegedly directed by the Russian embassy in Stockholm.

COALITIONISM

The strength of the SDP at the polls is not surprising; it is rooted in a long history of parliamentarism and class-collaboration.

Briefly, the SDP, which had adhered to Marxist theory in its earlier days, chose to collaborate with the Liberal Party in a coalition in 1917. From 1921-1925 SDP Prime Minister Hjalmar Branting headed a series of minority governments which took no steps to socialism.

After suffering losses in the 1928 election in which the SDP offered the voters a program with some socialist content, the parliamentarist SDP in 1932 presented a reformist program of economic recovery within the capitalist framework, not unlike the New Deal program. This non-socialist program was successful with the voters and the SDP increased its number of seats in the 1932 elections, but did not win an absolute majority.

From 1932 until the present day the SDP has formed the government with the exception of a 3-month interval in the summer of 1936. During the period from 1932-1939, except for the afore-

mentioned interval, the SDP governed either as a minority government with shifting support or in a coalition with the Liberals or Farmers.

During this period, the SDP introduced old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, higher prices for agricultural products, and subsidized low-cost housing, but not socialism. The reduction in the large numbers of unemployed was aided by the international armaments race.

In 1939 after World War II had begun in Europe, the SDP formed a broad, class-collaborationist, national government, including all parties except the CP. This coalition was continued throughout the war (in which Sweden was neutral) despite the fact that the SDP had won an absolute majority in both houses of parliament by the early forties.

In 1945 this coalition was dissolved so that the SDP, with its absolute majority, could launch a program of nationalization and social reforms, a program which was soon swept away on a tide of inflation. The Liberal Party in the 1948 elections, utilizing the inflation issue, won an increase of 31 seats, thus breaking the absolute majority of the SDP.

The SDP in 1951, in order to establish a working majority, finally made cause with the Farmers Party in the formation of the red-green coalition which has not yet been upset. The SDP has not, during this coalition, endeavored to establish socialism; it has merely added high, fixed farm prices (the price of coalition) to its "Welfare State."

TRADE-UNION BASE

The great base of the SDP is now and has been the trade-union movement, which has been highly successful in organizing.

Recent estimates reveal that 95 per cent of the manufacturing, building and transportation workers are organized, while in the white-collar and government fields union organization is about 80 per cent. The dominant Federation of Labor has about 1,400,000 members while the White Collar Federation has approximately 335,000. Another 100,000 white-collar workers are members of independent unions; and the anarcho-syndicalist Swedish Workers Central Organization has about 17,000 members. (This anarcho-syndicalist group split from the Federation of Labor after the great general strike of 1909 was lost.)

With the exception of the anarcho-syndicalist leadership, all top Swedish trade-unionists support the moderate SDP. The CP does not control and never has controlled a single national union.

A joint committee from the SDP and the Federation of Labor coordinate activities and programs of both organizations. A large percentage, perhaps two-thirds, of the total SDP membership are not individual memberships but rather members who are collectively affiliated to the SDP through majority votes in the local unions.

Of course an individual worker may "contract out" if he wishes, but this is not too common. While the collective affiliation of SDP membership provides the party with a steady financial base, it does not provide active party members.

BUREAUCRATIZED

Rank-and-file apathy and bureaucracy (opposite sides of the same coin) are big problems in the Swedish labor movement.

Centralization of decision-making has gone a long way in the Federation of Labor. Local union workers do not determine their contract conditions or whether or not to strike. National union and Federation officials have relieved them of this responsibility, sometimes permitting the workers referendum which is only advisory in nature. In recent years national union and Federation bureaucrats have dropped the class-conscious slogans of fighting trade unions for the more responsible slogan of increased production.

A review of the SDP record reveals that it has, in association with the bourgeois parties, established a "Welfare State" with a multitude of social reforms

financed from a progressive taxation scheme; it has emphasized the full-employment society and a form of Keynesian partially planned economy.

In regard to two fundamental aspects of socialism, namely collective ownership and democratic management, here is the record.

(1) On collective ownership, figures recently released this year show Swedish employment to be divided among the three sectors as follows: private 84 per cent; public 13 per cent; cooperative 3 per cent.

The public ownership sector is primarily located among public utilities such as the post office, telephone and telegraph, municipal transportation and the railroads. According to Tage Lindbom's *Sweden's Labor Program*, published by the League for Industrial Democracy:

All government ventures into business, it is of interest to note, were made either by non-labor cabinets or with the support of non-labor parties. In recent years, moreover, no serious proposals have been made to restore private management in any public utilities."

(2) On democratic management or workers' control of industry, the SDP has a spotless record. It has done nothing.

In short, the Social-Democratic Party has not brought any kind of Socialist society to Sweden.

Promises - -

(Continued from page 1)

America" papers will speak up now and tell the voters that they are against the program of their standard-bearer. They know what the function of these press releases is, as well as he does. But the voters, it seems, are supposed to take it seriously, no matter how many times the same game is played at their expense.

On most issues of foreign policy, this campaign has witnessed a watered-down and politened-up version of the old "you helped the Communists most" theme of four years ago.

Stevenson warns against anyone being fooled by the Stalinist sweetness-and-light campaign, and points out that American foreign policy has been running in a blind alley for some time now. Eisenhower replies that things are certainly better in this respect than they were four years ago. Neither even attempts to grapple with the fundamental questions of a reorientation of American foreign policy to meet the old problems which it is encountering in a new form now.

WHAT "NEW AMERICA"?

Stevenson shows that he is far from being naive politically by seeking to undermine some of the Republican "peace" capital with his vague expression of a hope that the draft can be ended some day, and his less vague but still far from concrete proposal on the ending of H-bomb tests. How this squares with the record of the Democrats in Congress, who have denounced the Republicans more than once in the past four years for cuts in the military field, is a matter, it would appear, for the voters and not the candidates to worry about.

Fundamentally, the point is not really whether Stevenson is sincere in his proposals. There is no reason to believe that he is really any less for these things than the next man.

The point is that the organization of American politics is such that the election of Stevenson would mean, above all, a victory for the Democratic Party, and the relations of forces in that party are such as to preclude his "personal" program (if that is what he is trying to run on) from being put into effect. And as long as it remains organized the way it is now, no politically effective means exists for effectuating such a program, let alone a better one.

This is not going to prevent the labor movement and the organized liberals from working like beavers for Stevenson's election, and from kidding as much of the electorate as they can reach, and even themselves, into the idea that what is at issue in this campaign is really a "New America" versus the Cadillac Cabinet.

LABOR SCOPE

Canada's Socialist CCF and the Trade Unions

Union members in the United States will be interested in the relationship between the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation of Canada, a socialist party with real strength in the working class, and the unions. An active Canadian UAW member writes the following:

"Prior to the founding convention of the CLC (Canadian Labor Congress) which did not support the CCF *in toto*, only the Canadian Congress of Labor (CIO) had endorsed the CCF as "the political arm of labor."

"The Trades and Labor Council (AFL) as a body never took such action; one or two affiliates, notably the Typo and Litho locals in Ontario, had gone on record for it but most of the other AFL affiliates remained aloof. The Catholic Confederation in Quebec, while left-of-center in leadership, had not officially endorsed the CCF and, of course, the Railway Brotherhoods took no part in political action.

"Mine-Mill, UE and other so-called independents, corresponding to the affiliates ejected from the CIO in the U.S., followed the CP party line and supported the Labor Progressive Party (CP of Canada) either openly or *sub rosa*.

"While our national organization supported the CCF, it was a matter of local autonomy whether or not this policy was followed.

"Steel locals, for the most part, were bludgeoned into support, as were some Packinghouse locals. In UAW, our Canadian body (District Council 26) supported such action but the response of

the locals was spotty. As far as I know, ours is the only International with a compulsory fund set up for political action. Five cents per member is set aside each month in a 'Citizenship Fund' to be used for political education and activity but it may be spent only with the consent of the Regional Director. Unless there is a determined group in any local that will push for spending from this fund in support of the CCF, there is very little political education or activity. Other groups might succeed in passing motions to support the Conservatives, Liberals, or LLP here (or Republicans, Socialists, or any non-Democrats in the United States) but in all probability there would be no authorization from the Regional Director and consequently no political action.

"I am sorry I can't give an estimate of CCF membership—I have seen no figures on actual paid-up membership for some time—and then of course the party does influence some people who are not actual members. Saskatchewan is its strongest province and it has a comparatively large membership in British Columbia. In Ontario, the biggest manufacturing province, one would expect a large CCF membership; but the reverse is true in comparison to the large number of working men and women. There is a concentration of members in Cape Breton, part of Nova Scotia, but in the other provinces the membership is small. Winnipeg, in Manitoba, at one time had a strong CCF concentration, but I believe that in recent years it has deteriorated."

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

CPer Debates Stalinoids On Future of the Party

By GEORGE HANLEY

New York, Oct. 8

Early in September an informal committee was organized by John T. McManus, Paul Sweezy, Clifford T. McAvoy and Michael Bartell in an attempt to link these independent-Stalinist leaders into a coalition aimed at a unity drive between the American Communist Party and the Stalinoid trends in this country. They hoped to make the most of the crises and confusion that has wracked the CP since the Stalin down-grading campaign began, and to utilize the "united front" policies of the 20th Congress of the CPSU as a lever for admittance.

The assumption was that the current leaders of the American Stalinist movement had been so widely discredited that they could easily be deposed in favor of a new "progressive" leadership. The recently published Draft Resolution of the CP came as a dash of cold water on the Stalinoids, with its abstract allusions to past errors and outlawing of internal factions and publications.

This situation was sharply aired at the forum held at Jefferson School on October 5, to debate the draft resolution.

John McManus blasted the document as "Sewer-socialism... offering no leadership to a bewildered American Left... not recognizing the socialist currents in the mass movement in the United States."

Joseph Starobin—who defected from the CP only a short time ago—denounced the document as "a compromise, stacked with duality," and went on to advocate a return to Browderism. He averred that

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF LABOR ACTION, published weekly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1956.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Labor Action Publishing Co.; Editor, Hal Draper; Managing Editor, None; Business Manager, L. G. Smith, all of 114 West 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

2. The owner is: Labor Action Publishing Co., Max Shachtman, Gordon Haskell, Herman Benson, all of 114 West 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was 2158.

HERMAN BENSON

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 28th day of September, 1956.

TONY CAPPELLO, Notary Public, State of New York No. 31-5603100. (My commission expires March 30, 1958.)

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.

20-42

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

RENEW NOW!

"the main task for socialists is to agitate for 'peaceful coexistence.' Then, as American capitalists find the Soviet Union surpassing them in production and international prestige, socialist competition will force them to revert to domestic socialism." He renounced any ideas of "socialist inter-nationalism" because "each country must find its own socialist pattern through 'competition' with other countries who are looking for their socialist pattern."

Sidney Stein (released on bail from the latest New York Smith Act persecution) then rose to defend the resolution he had helped to draw up, with blatant demagoguery, presented in the manner of Orwell's "Big Brother." He announced that the American road to socialism was through "a people's coalition against the monopolies," and attacked McManus for not recognizing the emergency need to defeat the "Eisenhower Cadillac Cabinet."

He rebutted the "sewer-socialism" charge by asserting the liberal, collaborationist policies were the only way to prevent "further isolation of Communists from the labor movement." He felt that it was unfortunate that many people had misinterpreted the draft resolution, but assured everyone that "the National Committee will clarify problems and mistakes soon."

One could find nothing in this latter statement to justify the promises in the foreword of the resolution of increased inner-party democracy.

STALINOID ROLE

In case the Stalinoids had not yet gotten the point, however, Stein ranted on in an angry voice: "No nebulous socialists will lead the new American socialist current... the Communist Party has and always will be the only strong and capable socialist current in the United States!"

In two significant revelations of policy, Stein declared that "a re-evaluation of Browder is needed," and that "Foster will not hold the Party back—even if he wants to!"

In the summary period that followed, McManus perhaps fearing the CP might cut the ground out from under his livelihood, the *National Guardian* capitulated to Stein, and discovered that "American socialists need the Communist Party because it is the only socialist party in the United States that defends the rest of the socialist world."

Starobin, on the other hand, completed his rejection of the CP with a comment about its continued "dogmatism and sectarianism" and challenged "new social processes at work to organize a new socialist Left in which old-guard Communists could participate but not lead."

Stein met this final blaspemy by warning "everyone here tonight that further criticism will only aid destruction of the Communist Party"; and in an effort to bribe those potential critics, he related that he would propose an amendment to the resolution, asking expelled CPers to come back to the fold.

After this "debate" it should be clear that the Stalinoids don't stand a chance—either through coalition or infiltration—of seizing control of the CP or its remaining cadres. The only function they can serve is to catch disillusioned Stalinists on the rebound and keep them tied to Stalinist politics.

YOU and SCIENCE

Experiment in Conformism and Dissent

By GENE LISTER

What role can the radical as a social dissenter play when he is isolated and his opinions stand almost alone in a sea of conformity? What are his chances of making his small voice count when he is an overwhelming minority?

An interesting discussion of this question is given by an article in the November 1955 issue of *Scientific American*, "Opinion and Social Pressure," by Solomon E. Asch.

Dr. Asch describes a series of experiments in which a small social group, in this case college students, duplicate society as a whole in exerting influence upon a lone dissenter.

The nature of the experiment is described as follows:

"A group of seven to nine young men, all college students, are assembled in a classroom for a 'psychological experiment' in visual judgment. The experimenter informs them that they will be comparing the length of lines. He shows two large white cards. One is a single vertical black line—the standard whose length is to be matched. On the other card are three vertical lines of various lengths. The subjects are to choose the one that is the same length as the line on the other card. One of the three actually is of the same length; the other two are substantially different, the difference ranging from three-quarters of an inch to an inch and three-quarters.

"The experiment opens uneventfully. The subjects announce their answers in the order in which they have been seated in the room, and on the first round every person chooses the same matching line. Then a second set of cards is exposed; again the group is unanimous. The members appear ready to endure politely another boring experiment. On the third trial there is an unexpected disturbance. One person near the end of the group disagrees with all the others in his selection of the matching line. He looks surprised, indeed incredulous, about the disagreement. On the following trials he disagrees again, while the others remain unanimous in their choice. The dissenter becomes more and more worried and hesitant as the disagreement continues in succeeding trials; he may pause before announcing his answer and speak in a low voice, or he may smile in an embarrassed way.

"What the dissenter does not know is that all the other members of the group were instructed by the experimenter beforehand to give incorrect answers in unanimity at certain points. The single individual who is not a party to this prearrangement is the focal subject of our experiment. He is placed in a position in which, while he is actually giving the correct answers, he finds himself unexpectedly in a minority of one, opposed by an unanimous and arbitrary majority with respect to a clear and simple fact. Upon him we have brought to bear two opposed forces: the evidence of his senses and the unanimous opinion of a group of his peers. Also, he must declare his judgments in public, before a majority which has also stated its position publicly."

This is the setting for a series of psychological experiments varied to study the ability of the individual to stand up

for his own beliefs against overwhelming odds. What makes these experiments so striking is that the dissenter is entirely correct.

In all Dr. Asch reports the statistical results from a total of 123 "minority but correct" subjects from three different colleges. For each, two alternatives were open: he could act independently, repudiating the majority, or he could go along with them against the evidence of his senses.

A large percentage did take the easier way out and yielded to social pressure; in fact over 36 per cent of the subjects changed over to the opinion of the incorrect majority.

Individuals varied in the degree of resistance to conformity. Students interviewed after their tests illustrate many of the traits which are all too evident in society as a whole. Many lacked the courage of their convictions and readily agreed that "I am wrong, they are right"; many went along merely to be with the majority; other dissenters quickly changed to hide some imagined deficiency in themselves.

MEASURING SOCIAL PRESSURE

As a part of the study Dr. Asch varied the size or unanimity of the majority. When a subject is faced by only a single individual who disagrees he continues to answer independently and correctly. When the opposition is increased to two the pressure increases so that the minority subjects accepted the wrong answer 13 per cent of the time. But with a majority of three, the pressure against the one increased the error to 32 per cent. Further increase in the majority did not increase the weight of the pressure very much.

Further variations of the tests are of interest. In one, the minority subject finds a partner who either does not know the prearranged agreement or is instructed to give correct answers throughout. Thus the pressure on the dissenting member is reduced greatly so that even the weakest ones do not yield as readily. Here an interesting question arises: Is the partner's effect merely a consequence of his dissent in general or is it related to his accuracy?

This question was answered by an experiment in which an individual was instructed to dissent from the majority but also to disagree with the subject. It was even possible to study the roles of the "compromising" and "extremist" dissenters.

While a mild (in this case planted) dissenter helped the subject to a degree, an "extremist" produced a great freeing of the subject and increased accuracy to a large degree. This illustrates the valuable role of a man who, though isolated, stands firm in a correct position and thereby in a crucial situation exerts an influence for independent thinking.

Such a conclusion may not be new to any socialist who knows his history of past struggles for social justice. However, it is interesting to see how it is confirmed in an experiment which strips the dissenter's situation down to its elements.

\$10,000 for Letters on Defense of Liberty

The Fund for the Republic has announced an "American Traditions Project" in the form of a contest offering \$10,000 in prizes "for letters giving true stories about Americans who, by their deeds, expressed that love for freedom which lies at the heart of the American way of life... particularly in conflicts or disputes which may never have reached the headlines."

The letters, limited to 1000 words, may be "about groups or individuals who successfully stood up for the right to think and read freely and to follow the dictates of conscience, or who applied the Bill of Rights to human situations, in the face of considerations of 'expedien-

cy.'" The incident must have happened within the past 5 years.

Letters must be mailed before November 15 to the Project's address, Box 1803, Grand Central Station, New York 17. Supporting documents or photostats may be sent but will not be returned.

The judges' panel of seven consists of a trade-union leader (James Carey), a general (Dean), a college president, a retired company president, a Protestant Episcopal and a Catholic bishop, and a politician (Sam Rosenman).

First prize is \$2500, second \$1000, third \$500, and ten prizes of \$100; also each winner will designate a tax-exempt organization to receive an amount equal to his own prize.



LABOR ACTION

October 15, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 42

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WALKINS 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

Associate Editors:
GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Young
Socialist

CHALLENGE

October 15, 1956

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

BC At It Again: Suspends Student Critic

By JACK LEVINE

Academic freedom at Brooklyn College has once again suffered a severe blow at the hands of the college administration. The latest event in this school's dark history is the suspension of Arthur Steier for the remainder of the term.

Steier, *Challenge* readers may recall, helped to found the movement for the restoration of student government at Brooklyn in 1954. This group, functioning off campus, distributed a series of leaflets known as "Common Sense," which dealt with the club-government system at Brooklyn and other abuses of campus democracy.

During this same period Steier sent a number of personal letters to President Harry Gideonse in which he accused the Office of Student Activities of being "unscrupulous," committing "vile indecencies" and taking actions that were "a sham and a disgrace by any standard of respectable education." He requested Gideonse to repudiate the tactics the O.S.A. had used in interfering with Steier and others interested in campus reform. As a result of these letters and his other activities, Steier was suspended from school during the spring 1955 term.

Steier was readmitted on probation in September 1955 and was prohibited from holding office, but not membership, in student organizations. During that academic year Steier tried to get his group, Students for Campus Democracy, through the restrictive club regulations so that it could function on campus. After many setbacks it finally received a charter late last term.

During that year, it should be noted, Steier's conduct and pronouncements were of a much more temperate nature. In addition there was a marked improvement in his academic work. In spite of this, on June 11, 1956, he received a letter from Herbert Stroup, Dean of Students, that banned him from membership in student organizations.

Thus, in spite of improvements, his actions were to be more restricted than ever, and he would be unable to finally assume the presidency of S.C.D.

THE "CRIME"

In the first issue of *Kingsman* this term, Steier stated:

"Dean Stroup's most recent abuse of his disciplinary powers is indicative of the discriminatory and vindictive policies which have become typical of the administration of Brooklyn College. The failure to state specific reasons which might justify such prohibitions of my extracurricular activities and the Dean's refusal to grant me a hearing before the Faculty Committee on Orientation and Guidance or a student committee of Executive Council [highest club government body] proves his avowed disrespect for the principles of due process and academic freedom."

Following the publication of the above statement, and Steier's presence at the S.C.D. table at the bi-annual club fair, he once again received a letter from Dean Stroup, on the second day of classes. It said, in part:

"In accordance with repeated oral and written warnings in the past by me and several other college officials, and because of your continued disregard for the rules and regulations of Brooklyn College, your continued indulgence in untruthful statements about College officers and the college, and your patent unwillingness to heed the injunctions of the college authorities, I am hereby suspending you beginning with the class sessions on Monday, September 24, 1956, for the remainder of the term."

Such a letter can only remind one of jailing without a trial for "crimes

against the state."

In spite of protests and inquiries from many sources, and an appeal to President Gideonse, no specific charges have been forthcoming from the dean's office, although Steier has repeatedly insisted he has no desire to be "protected" by the dean's withholding of his "confidential" information.

During the week following the suspension, no editorial appeared in *Kingsman*, and no action was taken by the Executive Council even to investigate the situation. In contrast to this, at City College (uptown, Day), where a real student government exists, an editorial supporting Steier appeared in the *Observation Post*, and the Student Council, by a 13-1 vote, sent a letter of protest to the Brooklyn College student body.

GIDEONSE'S REIGN

The O.P. editorial is reprinted below: "There are times when we would rather not admit association with Brooklyn College through even the vague municipal ties that bind us. Such a time has now arrived.

"The heavy-handed administration of President Gideonse ('administration' is the technical term; 'reign' might do just as well) has often seen fit to slap down any feeble student struggles for a measure of independence. The latest and most offensive blow is the suspension from school of Arthur Steier, a student who had the audacity to question the status quo.

"Steier has been trying for a long time to reform the archaic setup of

Brooklyn College's Student Council, which represents clubs rather than the student body. The administration, in the form of Dean Herbert Stroup, Dean of Students, suspended him in June for 'obvious and significant deficiencies' in his conduct—so glaringly obvious that they did not specify them. His chief deficiency seems to have been a blindness to the virtues of the present system there.

"We find it necessary to speculate on the qualities in Steier that angered the Dean because they are only hinted at, and might, indeed, fit anyone the college took exception to. Perhaps they keep these interestingly vague descriptions for just that purpose.

"After his suspension, he dared to give an interview to the newspaper, the *Kingsman*, which the Administrators found 'untruthful.' He also was alleged to have 'helped out' at a Club Fair, and this was interpreted as a dastardly breaking of his suspension. Thus he has been suspended from school. As before, the Administration has surrounded itself with platitudes and generalities as thick as a smoke-screen and just about as substantial. They find Steier 'maladjusted,' poor fellow. Everyone at Brooklyn is so smartly in step, so bubbling with good adjustment, and Steier can't manage it. At City College, he might only be advised to try a Guidance Counselor; at Brooklyn, an institution scornful of such frivolities, he got suspended.

"If President Gideonse can do this to a student on such grounds with impunity, then all we can do is await his coronation. But if, as we suspect there are people higher up with ideas of elementary fair play, then Steier will be restored to the campus he has tried to improve... his grievous error. We call upon the Board of Higher Education to prove that the vast difference of ethical standards between campuses can be shortened. We don't say that it can happen here—but

it must not be allowed to happen anywhere."

The preceding editorial is an excellent comment on the situation. One week after its appearance, *Kingsman* finally had opposing editorials on the case. The one "supporting" Steier, however, was unfortunately much too weak. One must wonder whether perhaps a few "hints" from the administration were responsible for the delay and "moderation" of the editorial.

"NO CIVIL RIGHTS"

The same week, at its second meeting, Executive Council considered the matter. Carefully following its rules it barred Steier from the meeting (since only students can attend), and refused to let an S.C.D. representative present Steier's case (only council members have speaking rights). Not so carefully, however, it allowed Dean Stroup to give an "explanatory" talk, and then decided to hold no investigation.

Stroup said: "You can't talk about civil rights in a college." You "only have institutional rights." "Our democracy is of a particular sort—outlined in the by-laws of the Board of Higher Education and in faculty legislation. It doesn't matter much whether you like it or I like it; this is the legal status of the college."

Earlier he had said that Steier was not suspended for being a campus radical. "We need radicalism; we need difference of opinion on campus."

Poor Dean Stroup, he's just a victim of Board of Higher Education by-laws. Perhaps the board was all set to pounce on him if he didn't take care of Steier for them. Maybe it was his neck or Steier's—and altruism has to stop somewhere. It must be that the administration really wants to encourage democracy, dissent, non-conformism, radicalism and even Steirism but the powers that be (B. of H. E.) just won't let them. Maybe Steier doesn't know who his real friends are...

F.O.R. Gets the McCarthy Treatment

Pacifists have virtually taken over the California public school system and are embarked on a highly successful effort to inculcate the minds of youth with internationalist-communist ideas. This is the conclusion that might be drawn by a hasty reader of the 14th Report of the Investigating Committee on Education of the California State Senate.

In the spring of this year the committee, headed by a veteran of the now-discredited Tenney Un-American Committee, Nelson S. Dilworth, came out with a 190-page document entitled, "Patriotism or Pacifism, Which?" Using every phony propagandistic device known before and developed during the McCarthy era, the report makes the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a pacifist, religious-oriented anti-Communist group, look as if it should head the list of "Communist front groups" on the Attorney General's List in red capital letters.

In June 1948 the Tenney California Un-American Committee overstepped its bounds and caused the Presbyterian Synod of California to adopt a resolution requesting replacement of Tenney. In 1949 Tenney resigned with all but three of his committee members. Nelson Dilworth was one of the three die-hards. This spring, working through another committee, Dilworth was back attacking the "reds."

Several interesting examples of smear technique deserve closer observation.

The committee gave a "sampling" of books distributed by the FoR. The literature list from which the "sampling" was taken includes 110 titles in nine categories. But the "sampling" of ten titles included all nine titles under the category "Race Relations."

The FoR significantly asks: "Was this preoccupation with the subject of race... an unconscious display of the investigators' own attitudes?" When we recall the situation of the Nisei and the Mexicans in California we wonder.

The secretary-emeritus of the FoR is A. J. Muste. "Used to be a preacher... before he went straight," according to *Fellowship*... said the Dilworth Committee, implying that the FoR is an irreligious, anti-Christian organization.

What actually happened is that Milton Mayer, pacifist columnist for the *Progressive*, in a biographical article about "A. J. in *Fellowship*, reports an anecdote told by a union official at A. J.'s 65th birthday party. The official was on strike in Paterson in 1931, when Muste was a

leader of the American Workers Party. He listened to Muste speak, then turned to a worker next to him, asking who the speaker was. The worker replied, "It's Muste. Used to be a preacher before he went straight."

Follow the logic? Yet there it was, in the face of what everyone knows: that Muste left Trotskyist ranks in 1936 to return to his previous radical-Christianity and pacifism.

Another cute one was to tie Kirby Page, a California pacifist, to Communism. Page wrote a book, *The Creative Revolution of Jesus*, in which he quoted from Myrdal's *American Dilemma*. Dilworth caught that fast, then quoted James O. Eastland, who called Myrdal a "Socialist who had served the Communist cause."

It happens that Myrdal was hired by the Carnegie Foundation, which also hired Alger Hiss. Are you still with us?

We could go on like this, but if you're interested in more, we suggest you get hold of *Fellowship* or the actual Dilworth report.

Among other men (non-pacifists, in these cases) attacked are Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam and that awful red Harry Emerson Fosdick (via the guilt-by-letterhead association method). Also the Workers Defense League, "formed in May 1936 by leading members of the Socialist Party."

Why the WDL? Here's a good example

(Turn to last page)

ISL vs. the Subversive List: The Gov't Sums Up Its Case

By ALBERT GATES

Two weeks ago Attorneys Joseph L. Rauh and Isaac N. Groner, Workers Defense League counsel conducting the ISL case against the Attorney General's List, received a copy of the government's "Proposed Findings of Fact" delivered to Hearing Examiner Edward Morrissey, who presided at the Washington hearings on the ISL case.

In the 60 days at its disposal, the government attorneys drew up a document 105 pages long. But like the case it presented during the hearings, the "Proposed Findings of Fact" is bare of facts.

It is quite apparent that for the attorneys of the Department of Justice, and the department itself for that matter, the hearings meant nothing at all. The "Proposed Findings" is, in its major form, a mere restatement of the original "Statement of Grounds and Interrogatories" presented by the attorney general two years ago before the hearings began.

What the government attorneys have done is to restate some of this "Statement." Having done that, they proceeded to "prove" their charges by quotations from Lenin, Trotsky, the Fourth International, Shachtman's pamphlet *The Fight For Socialism*, their witness Professor G. T. Robinson's quotations from Lenin (not what the professor said, for he said nothing, about the organizations, never having heard of them before the hearings), and their rebuttal witness James Burnham.

But what the government attorneys did not do is base their proposed findings on the evidence produced in the hearings. While they quote Burnham's "opinions" (not evidence) about the organizations, there is no reference to the actual presentation made by Burnham, nor to the facts which established him as an irresponsible, disreputable and unworthy witness.

Moreover, the "Proposed Findings" deliberately avoids reference to the witnesses who appeared for the organization. The document does not refer to them by name, nor to their testimony.

As our readers know, in addition to Max Shachtman, who testified for days on the theoretical and political positions of the ISL, the organizations had as witnesses Norman Thomas, Harry Fleischman (formerly national secretary of the Socialist Party), Dwight Macdonald, member of the editorial board of the *New Yorker*, and Daniel Bell, labor editor of *Fortune* magazine.

These were genuinely impartial witnesses who, though each of them is a political opponent of the organization, came to tell the truth about them from their personal knowledge over years of association and contact with them. The qualifications of these witnesses to testify about the politics of the ISL was infinitely higher than the silent informers who never did make an appearance in the hearings.

WHAT'S MISSING

Yet, as to these witnesses who came to the hearings as disinterested parties and testified, without being contradicted, that the government charges were false, the "Proposed Findings" make no reference whatever, neither to challenge their testimony nor refute it.

The obvious reason for that is that their evidence could not be challenged or refuted. And so, the government attorneys chose to say nothing about their testimony altogether, preferring to rely on quotations and the discredited testimony of Burnham.

Equally important, Shachtman testified for almost two weeks on every single phase of the theoretical and political views of the organizations. He explained in patient detail what the organizations meant when they said they followed in the traditions of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky.

He refuted the government's charge that the organizations advocated the overthrow of the government by force and violence, explained at great length the organization's fight for democracy and socialism, relating it to their main political orientation for the formation of

an independent labor party. Shachtman elaborated on the views of the movement over the years, showing its evolution to the present day, demonstrating that the government's position was absolutely untenable.

But to all that testimony, which took hundreds and hundreds of pages, the government had nothing to say. As a matter of fact, the government did not care what evidence and testimony was adduced by the organizations in their hearing. This was evident during the hearing; it is borne out by the "Proposed Findings of Fact."

An example of the kind of material the government relies on can be ascertained from the following. In its original Statement of Grounds, the government from the Communist Party. This charge was properly answered by the organizations when it was first made; but it turns up again in the current document. The government attorneys reiterate that the leaders of the organizations "were associated with Communist organizations and the Communist International, which advocated the employment of illegal means to overthrow the existing form of government in the United States."

This has been characteristic of the government in its case against the organizations. It has never charged directly that the organizations held such views. The charge is built up by inference, association and conclusions.

As a matter of indisputable fact, only two leaders of the ISL were in the Communist movement (Max Shachtman and

Albert Gates), and they were expelled from it almost thirty years ago! With charged that the leaders of the ISL came the same indifference to facts which characterized their general conduct in the hearing, the government attorneys just repeat the charge in the "proposed findings."

Interestingly enough, the aforementioned were associated with the Communist movement in a period which the Supreme Court, in the famous *Schneiderman* case, declared was not one when the Communist Party advocated force and violence!

It is very difficult to summarize the 105 pages of irrelevant material conjured up by a government interested not in establishing the truth about the organizations but in seeking to justify an indefensible position of the attorney general. Had the hearings been of a legal character, the case of the government would never have gotten off the ground. The attorney general would have been compelled to connect up the organization to the hundreds of quotations of Lenin and Trotsky dealing with the Russian Revolution, for example; this they could not have done, nor even attempted to do.

THE POLICE-MIND

Such "proof" as the government attorneys did adduce was largely silly and in part dangerous. One of the "evidences" against the organizations is that they participated in the Minneapolis Case defense committee. This committee was supported by thousands who believed the case to be a frame-up, or a conviction based on an anti-civil-libertarian and unconstitutional Smith Act. The case had national support on civil-liberties grounds alone, by large segments of the labor and liberal movements.

However, with the zealotry appropriate to prosecutors, the government attorneys make a big point of their findings that the organizations participated in a defense committee to help those

convicted in the Minneapolis case make their legal fight against the Smith Act, evidently on the premise that opposition to the Smith Act makes one a subversive!

In the "Proposed Findings" the government did exactly what it started out to do two years ago: set itself up as the authority on the precise meaning of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky. The socialist movement of the world considers these questions moot after years of dispute and debate, but apparently this caused no great difficulty to the government. It set its own standards and "proved" its case by its own standards, despite the fact that accepted authority rejects the government's standards. Actually its standards are the standards of a police-mentality and not political ones.

The same is true of its position equating democracy with capitalism and passing judgment on the meaning of socialism. It was this that led Norman Thomas to protest so vigorously to Attorney General Brownell, in asking what right the government had to set itself up as such a judge. But this position of the government is reiterated in the 105-page document on the "evidence" of the hearing.

LABOR ACTION reported in great detail on the hearings as they occurred. We showed how bankrupt the government's case was. The outstanding example of this bankruptcy was the fact that, although the government never lacked witnesses in its many cases, it had not a single witness in this case. Prof. Robinson was not a witness. He was a "quotation" man and quickly disqualified as an expert. Only in rebuttal did the government show up with a witness, another "expert," and this was the discredited liar Burnham. And that is all.

The "Proposed Findings" present no facts and no proofs. Innuendo, association by quotation, guilt by inference, above all, these are the standards of the government.

Attorneys Rauh and Groner are preparing both a reply to the government and a presentation of the organization's proposed findings. So far as the procedure goes, the hearing examiner, upon examination of the proposed findings, will make his recommendations to the attorney general who, in turn, will make a decision on the case of the ISL. After that, we shall see.

Rauh Hits at Slippery Usage of 'Communist'

Immediately upon receipt of the government's "Proposed Findings of Fact," ISL attorneys Joseph L. Rauh and Isaac N. Groner addressed themselves to Hearing Examiner Morrissey reminding him of their request, made at the beginning of the hearings, that either he or the attorney general, "or at the very least the Department of Justice hearing attorneys [define the] standards which would be applied in rendering judgment."

Since the first requests were denied, they point out that the government attorneys "use inconsistent standards, and demonstrate anew how impossible it is for the organizations to proceed without some definition by those who have the duty of judging."

The letter to Morrissey cites the different definitions of "communist" or "Communist" (with a big C or little c), showing that government witnesses have given inconsistent definitions. On this point, Rauh and Groner say:

"The word has been used or defined to mean parties with the word 'Communist' in their title; groups seeking to give aid and comfort to the current aims of the Soviet Union; and groups expressing adherence to Titoism or Trotskyism. Also, 'communist' has been applied to anyone who states that he believes in 'Marxism' and/or 'Leninism,' or that historically the October 1917 Russian Revolution was a worthwhile enterprise whose leaders should be revered. Does 'Communist' or 'communist,' as it will be applied in these proceedings, mean any of these; or does it mean those who advocate the attainment by persuasion of a society in which each would contribute according to his ability and receive according to his needs; or does it mean something else again? The government's Proposed Findings apparently utilize at least each of the definitions noted above in relations to one or

more 'Grounds,' obviously without any pretense of consistency or rational explanation."

The letter points out that the same is true of the standard of "seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means," and declares that it is "impossible to tell from the government's Proposed Findings how the recitals contained therein would lead anyone to this conclusion..."

The problems of replying to the government through the organization's Proposed Findings are rooted in this absence of standards on the meaning of "unconstitutional means." Does it have to do with belief, historical prediction, advocacy, clear - and - present - danger? These are mutually inconsistent standards, Rauh and Groner point out, since "almost all are used as the unstated logical foundation (if any), at one point or other in one or more 'Grounds' in the Government's Proposed Findings."

QUERIES—IN VAIN

After dealing with the point on means and ultimate ends, the ideal society, they write that the government "is proposing that holders of certain political opinions are listable as 'communists' or believers in 'unconstitutional means' those who believe in a socialist society, however constitutionally attained; and those whose opinions include anything less than affirmative support of American participation in the Korean War, and in World Wars I, II, and III also, and support of whatever is the current American 'patriotic' foreign policy..."

In a more pointed reference, Rauh and Groner write: "Is mere disagreement with prevailing government policy or even lack of enthusiastic support therefor, actually to be accepted as a valid standard for placing organizations on

the subversive list or permitting their names to remain on it, in the United States of America, in 1956?"

After dealing with the question of "standards" of the government on the meaning of Marxism, Leninism, Trotskyism, the letter to Morrissey asks:

"It was stated at the hearing that these organizations would have to be judged by what they have said and done. But the government's Proposed Findings are obviously not limited by any such standard of fairness. Is this or is it not the standard which is going to be applied here?"

The demand for the kind of standards indicated in the aforementioned requests was, in the opinion of the ISL attorneys, necessary in order that the organization's Proposed Findings might have some basic government position to deal with. Otherwise, these findings would have to meet an illdefined, free-wheeling, irresponsible government position, based on materials contrary to legal rules of evidence—which is what they must do now, since the hearing officer has ruled against the requests made.

In a brief reply to Rauh and Groner, Morrissey concludes with the following statement:

"The Hearing Examiner is of the opinion that Executive Order No. 10450 of April 27, 1953, in Sections 8 (a) (5) and 12 thereof, provides the definition of the type of organization contemplated by such order and that the rules of procedure of the Attorney General issued April 29, 1953... set forth the procedure for determination of whether an organization comes within such definition."

With that decision, Rauh and Groner must now prepare a reply and Proposed Findings on the basis of untenable standards and procedures established by the attorney general to try his own acts.

Talking 'European Unity' - -

(Continued from page 1)

duty of Liberals to "convince" the objects of these attentions that anxieties about their own national sovereignty are anti-Liberal. For—

"He cited the example of West European countries that had accepted the presence of foreign troops on their soil as part of the common program of protecting liberties. He declared this would have been unthinkable a few years ago."

People like Dulles could never think of this stuff. It takes Liberals. We Europeans, he tells the Egyptians, accept America's overlordship; you should accept ours; isn't that fair? (In turn, maybe Egypt would be allowed to impose its junior overlordship on the Sudan, with Liberal approval, for fair is fair.)

"We Europeans," to be sure, accept American overlordship with considerable bitterness and only because it is a nasty necessity to defend "our Europe" against a greater evil, Russia. Egypt is invited to bow to European troops not for its own benefit but for the occupier's.

It takes Liberals.

THE NEW FORM

But at least you see why these Europeans' longings turn so insistently toward ideas about pooling the remaining strength of Europe's decadent imperialisms.

Liberals and Social-Democrats in Europe tend to be the vanguard of this kind of talk about a European unity of imperialism, but so strong are the drives that the aspirations extend way up into the bourgeoisie and their parties.

They all sincerely would like some-

thing like European unity, but, since these hankerings are not stronger than their need to defend their nationally-sovereign capitalist interests, their very conceptions of European unity become means of furthering their respective national interests against the other fellow.

The intra-imperialist struggle duplicates itself in the new form of the discussion over European unity itself.

This is one of the most fascinating aspects of what is happening right now. Each one pushes a scheme for European unity (or rather, a plan for taking some immediate steps which are supposed to be in that direction) which is a reflex of the very reasons why such a capitalist unity is not in the cards.

"The impression is sometimes given that each nation conceives of European union in forms that best suit its own interests. For instance, France accepted the Coal and Steel Community, rejected the Defense Community, and now shows hesitation toward the proposed common market or customs union that would embrace France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg. Britain dislikes this common market but to protect herself she hints she might join it to some extent if an area of partly free trade were created." (Harold Callender, N.Y. Times, Oct. 7.)

Britain's proposition for a "step toward unity" in the form of merely a limited free-trade area is tailored to Britain's economic needs. This was made quite clear when Chancellor of the Exchequer Macmillan came out for it on October 3. For one thing, he pointed out

that it would maintain the Empire preference system of trade within the Commonwealth, a system which is of course designed to freeze out Britain's prospective partners in the "step toward European unity."

Board of Trade President Thorneycroft, at Macmillan's side in the press conference explaining the position, "commented on fears that the free-trade area would permit West German products to undersell British manufactures in the home market."

"He said Britain's exclusion from the projected six-nation European Customs Union would be more damaging..." (Times, Oct. 4)

As another dispatch put it, "The danger for Britain of a common market without Britain now seemed greater than that of a common market with Britain in it."

So Britain shapes a plan for a "step toward European unity" which tries to retain the upper hand both in Europe and the Commonwealth.

It is such considerations which bring it about that Tory MPs "regarded as belonging to the extreme right wing of the party" are the ones who have issued a sort of manifesto favoring closer British tie-ups with the Continent.

ADENAUER'S MOTIVES

For Chancellor Adenauer in West Germany, one very important motivation seems to be the need to have something to counterpose against the perspective of German unification. In general, Adenauer stands for a policy of unity with the Atlantic bloc at the expense of the possibility of German unity, an orientation under heavy fire particularly from the strong Social-Democratic Party. The more Adenauer poses as the paladin of European unity, the more he can use this to cloak the policy by virtue of which he remains in power.

This is what is behind Adenauer's speech on this point, and also behind the all-hails wafted to him by the U. S. press. On October 1 Adenauer made his pitch on the subject at a Hamburg press conference, just before addressing the Trade Union Federation which was going to clobber him in its resolutions.

Like the others lately, Adenauer's stress was on how European unity could protect European imperialism from defeats like the Suez affair, plus an attempt to undercut neutralist and anti-NATO sentiment in Germany with demagogic phrases about Europe's role as a "third force" between American and Russia. Much of what he said on the point accurately reflects real misgivings of the European bourgeoisie, which feels crushed between the two colossi of the cold war.

In German terms, Adenauer reportedly has felt betrayed by the rumblings about a possible U. S. reduction of troops in the country without consultation with him—and he so dependent on the NATO tie, too! His supporters have it rubbed into them that Germany is contemptuously regarded by the U. S. power as a tail to its kite. So he speechifies: *We must not be a tail to the U. S. kite... and everyone feels better.*

THE "THIRD POWER"

However, Europe can swing more weight only if it too is a power like the other two. A united Europe could be such a power, a third great power in the world where there are only two now. Hence the longing, the aspiration, articulated in these terms by the German chancellor.

Even as an aspiration, however, the sentiment should not be confused with the idea of a Third Camp, though the language appeals in that direction. The idea of Europe as a third power is to increase Europe's specific weight within the Western war camp, as against the U. S. within the camp.

Hence Dulles was entirely correct when he said the next day that Adenauer's conception of the European Third Power had nothing to do with a "third force" which would be "neutral as between the U. S. and the Soviet Union," let alone a Third Camp which would oppose both. As a matter of fact, Adenauer's remarks at his press conference had also made clear that "an 'independent' Europe was just what the United States wanted."

Here, incidentally, we touch on another internal contradiction within the problem of the U. S.'s relationship to its allies; or a united Europe would both solve many problems or the U. S. bloc and at the same time create new and serious ones, in terms of U. S.-Europe rivalry. Hence when Dulles says he "welcomes" the prospect, that enthusiasm is not unqualified; but the important thing is that the "independence" of a united Europe would be a very relative thing.

PUTTING OUT THE FIRE

This is the line on European unity which Adenauer seeks to put up against the German people's understandable and inevitable hopes for the reunification of their divided country and for social gains. This was acted out in part at the Trade Union Federation convention where Adenauer later spoke.

Deputy Chairman Georg Reuter made a slashing attack on the government's armament policy, which is expending sums that should go for social benefits to the masses. "People who are socially content are a stronger bastion than any number of divisions," he said.

"Herr Reuter... also is promoting another project the Chancellor regards dubiously. This is to establish personal contacts with East German workingmen in the hope of strengthening Germany's sense of unity."

With only 20 out of 430 delegates objecting, the trade-union convention came out against Bonn's foreign and military policies down the line.

There is a fire under Adenauer, and to put it out he trots out the phrases about European unity.

FIRST: INDEPENDENCE

This reminds us of another occasion, not long ago, when the slogans about European unity were unleashed in order to head off legitimate aspirations toward self-determination for a people. This was in the case of the Saar referendum in October 1955.

Here the slogans of European unity were put into play by French imperialism to do the Germans dirt. The overwhelming majority of the Saarlanders were for unity with their own national people, the Germans. Over them was a French-quisling government imposed by defeat in war. The pro-French side proposed a setup which, under the guise of "Europeanizing" the Saar, would keep it tied to French economy and control. This plan was blown up when it was massively rejected in the vote. The American press, with the liberal press in the lead, did its duty by greeting this "resurgence of German nationalism." It was of a piece with the performances pulled off in the Suez crisis, when the same very internationalist editorials lectured Nasser about how reactionary it was for him to want as much national sovereignty as the countries that are accustomed to exploit Egypt.

Thus the slogans of "Europeanism" become, like everything else that is handy, prostituted by imperialism to its own uses. But socialists know this: that there can be no healthy supra-national unity except through free agreement by nations that have full self-determination and unfettered choice. Thus it is no paradox that nations must first be sovereign and separate before they can consider uniting.

The small nations are at the point where they must defend their separateness against foreign oppression. The European oppressors are at the point where they would like to unite in order to prevent this. The pattern is a study in the dialectics of unity and split.

SP Slate in Illinois

The Socialist Party of Illinois has announced that it is running candidates for state governor and lieutenant governor. The party's state convention nominated Kellam Foster and Donald R. Anderson, respectively, for the posts.

Because of the state election laws which have kept it off the ballot in two presidential elections now, the SP is asking voters to write in the names of candidates.

DISPATCH FROM DUBLIN

Irish Labor Party: A Sketch

By M. M.

Dublin

To describe the Irish Labor Party within its present limits as analogous to the British Labor Party would be inaccurate indeed.

Ideologically and organizationally they differ as do the economies from which they derive sustenance. The Irish Labor Party with its rural bias is in a much weaker position organizationally than is the urban-based BLP.

In the British Party there is a constant stimulus from trade-union consciousness flowing over into social-democratic political forms; this gives the BLP its stable proletarian character. This element is absent from Irish Labor politics today. What trade-union militancy did emerge in the early days of the petty industrialization of the larger towns was siphoned off into the all-class crucible of the independence movement.

In the early days of the Second World War when a radical ferment was induced by attempts to cripple the unions by legislation, the Irish Labor Party made some remarkable headway throughout the country. Tragically, however, a bitter personal feud at the top of the Trade Union Congress was manipulated by the Tory-nationalist party of De Valera; and the TUC and the Labor Party split down the middle. What was termed the nationalist wing—which had initiated the break—rehabilitated the decadent Fianna Fail party of De Valera for a further period.

Ideologically the Labor Party, from its birth at the Trade Union Congress of 1912 till the middle '30s, bore the imprint of James Connolly's socialist philosophy.

After Connolly was executed for leading the first workers' army against the British imperial power in Ireland in 1916, the tempo of the direct-actionist struggle for national independence tended to blunt the edge of the class struggle. Bourgeois revolutionaries and patriotic mercenaries dwarfed the post-Connolly mediocrities of Irish Labor.

The new Irish state born in 1922 found the revolutionary middleclass in political control. Their quid pro quo for their revolutionary activity was economy hegemony. They evolved away from the social implications of the Proclamation of 1916—inspired by Connolly—and became the integrated ruling capitalist class that we know today.

Side by side with the growing conservatism of the petty bourgeoisie, the non-descript Labor leaders became equally conservative in their social and political attitudes. Bit by bit, the revolutionary socialist theses of Connolly were expunged from the Labor and trade-union movement. The socialistic demagoguery of De Valera underscored the bankruptcy of the Labor leaders. The country settled down to the sodden rule of the middle class for 20 years.

During this time the Catholic hierarchy emerged as a major political factor in the recession of the Irish Labor Party as an independent socialist party. It was the Irish National Teachers Organization (no doubt acting on the instruction of the hierarchy) that, at the 1938 Labor Party conference, sponsored the motion to remove the constitutional aspiration that the "aim of the party is the establishment of a workers' republic."

The adoption of that motion formalized a political reaction that had long since been a fact.

Today the Irish Labor Party is a caricature of a social-democratic party. Though partly based on the trade unions, it is nevertheless, in the matter of political and economic theory, far to the right of the Trade Union Congress, though the TUC has a working agreement with it.

How long this *modus vivendi* will continue is hard to say. The unity of the trade-union movement is proceeding apace and the balance of forces may well alter politically inside the Labor Party when full unity is consummated.

For Irish socialists this development offers a fruitful field of work. Greater trade-union influence in the party will be a means of correcting the non-class mentality that has condemned the Irish Labor Party to the role of providing a lucrative living for a select bunch of unscrupulous politicians exploiting the devoted allegiance of workers who were nurtured in the Connolly tradition of independent labor politics.

British Labor Shifts Left - -

(Continued from page 1)

sult of the voting for party treasurer. For the past three years this key post has been the focal point of the right-versus-left conflict within the Labor Party; with Aneurin Bevan as the nominee of the left and Hugh Gaitskell as the nominee of the right. This year Bevan again entered the lists on behalf of the left wing, but his main opponent was George Brown, a Labor MP of the extreme right wing who had been chosen to contest the election in place of Gaitskell who is now party leader.

OVATION

As the chairman of the Standing Orders committee mounted the platform, an expectant hush fell over the hall. Then he gave the news for which everyone was waiting: "Elected, Bevan, A."

A momentary gasp in the conference hall and then rapidly a tremendous ovation. For a full minute delegates cheered, clapped and stamped their feet in the most impressive spontaneous demonstration a Labor conference has witnessed for many years. Bevan, rising from his seat near the front of the hall, acknowledged the ovation and clasped his hands above his head in the manner of a prizefighter who has just KO'd his opponent.

Bevan's score was a total of 3,029,000 votes; his main opponent Brown polled 2,775,000 votes; two other candidates could only muster 686,000 votes between them. Thus Bevan had a majority of more than quarter of a million over his right-wing opponent compared with a deficit of 4 1/4 million when he was beaten by Gaitskell last year.

Bevan's majority would have been even more impressive had not the Amalgamated Engineering Union cast its

620,000 votes for one of the candidates who also ran, in complete disregard for a 25-to-1 vote by its delegation to cast the votes for Bevan.

Care must be taken not to over-emphasize the significance of Bevan's elevation to one of the key post of the Labor Party leadership, for there is still a very long way to go before the policy of the party swings far enough to the left to line up with the feelings of the average rank-and-file party worker. But at the same time Bevan's victory marks a definite change in the balance of forces within the party.

COMEBACK

In recent years the leadership of the party at the center has been concentrated in the hands of the right wing out of all proportion to its actual support within the party as a whole; and the right-wing leadership showed many signs of using its dominant position to stifle left-wing expression within the party. This reached the point where, only 18 months ago, the more rabid right-wingers were advocating the expulsion of Bevan from the party along with his more vocal supporters.

From this point Bevan has managed to make a comeback to the top ranks of party leadership. And, what is most important, he has done this the hard way by fighting for a position which could only be captured after he had gained large-scale support from the trade-union section of the party in addition to that of the local party organizations, which have generally supported him all along.

This meant carrying the issues into the trade unions themselves, with the result that many union leaders who have consistently supported the right wing in defiance of the feelings of their members have found themselves faced with considerable agitation by their rank and file. After three years of trying, Bevan's tactics have paid off as union after union responded to pressure from below and announced its intention of casting its voting strength behind him.

In securing victory in this manner and on his own terms, Bevan has established in no uncertain fashion the right of the left wing to exist and advance its views within the Labor party. He has mustered sufficient support to make certain that the right wing can no longer use a preponderance of power at the center to stifle left-wing views within the party. And by fighting his way onto the National Executive Committee he has secured a more even distribution of central leadership between the left and right wings of the party.

NEW SEATS FOR LEFT

Bevan's election was not the only indication of this process. In the election for the other executive committee seats, the results pushed home the strength of the left wing.

Every single one of the seven seats which are elected by votes of the local party organizations only was secured by a left-winger. Last year the left held six of these and the right held one (Jimmy Griffiths.) When Griffiths was elected as deputy leader of the parliamentary party earlier this year he automatically got a seat on the NEC, and Sydney Silverman was co-opted to the NEC as the runner-up in last year's elections. This year Silverman obtained this seat in his own right, and thus the right wing does not hold a single seat out of the seven.

In the trade-union section, Roland Casasola, Walter Padley and Harry Nicholas secured seats for the first time in place of members who have retired. Casasola is now well on the left, although he has the unfortunate habit of playing clap-hands with the Stalinists. Padley is a member of the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers which this year made Bevan's victory certain when it decided to give him its 350,000 votes. Nicholas is assistant secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union which, as mentioned in earlier London Letters, is at the moment undergoing a shift to the left.

An indication of the current mood of the TGWU can be gathered from the speech made by its general secretary, Frank Cousins, during a debate on a resolution which said that only the return of a Labor Government can guarantee Britain's future.

The Labor Party, said Cousins, should not apologize for its socialism. He dis-

agreed with critics who said that nationalization could not work; it worked very well. Nor did he think that nationalization should be limited to those industries which did not operate very well under private enterprise.

Dealing a back-hander to those engaged in rethinking the party's future expression of socialism, Cousins said: "There are those to whom the old type of socialism was quite a good type. Don't let us talk about making it appeal to people, but let us talk about it honest to people."

Contrasted to the usual contribution of previous TGWU secretaries—such as Ernest Bevin and Deakin—this was music to the ears of the rank-and-file delegates, who many times interrupted his speech with applause.

With the conference barely concluded, it is impossible at this stage to give a complete summary of debates and decisions taken during the week; this will be done in a following London Letter. Sufficient to say for the present that the position of the left in the party is now stronger than it has been for many years.

And, coupled with this, there is every indication that the right wing has accepted this fact and, instead of trying to fight against it, will come to terms in a working agreement which, while not ending the ideological battles, will place much more emphasis on a militant fight against the Tories than has been apparent in the past.

This is in line with the traditional character of the party as a mass party of the working class which contains all the currents of opinion found within the working class and, while conducting fierce debates within itself, is united in its determination to turn the Tories out. Small wonder that the Tory press and party is black with gloom this weekend.

CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 5)

of circular reasoning: The report states that the WDL was formed out of the activities and interests of the FoR. The WDL (pro-socialist) is left-wing. Proof? A person active in it had "been active in left-wing circles, such as the FoR..." Get it? That's what makes the FoR left-wing... because there are FoR members in it.

The effects of this report are as yet uncertain. But the motives are clearer.

It would be overly simple to attribute the Dilworth report just to headline-hunting, although this undoubtedly plays an important part. Also, FoR's reasoning that this is part of an effort to discredit the "left" and all dissenters to current American pro-war policies by associating them with subversion, Stalinism and un-Americanism does not seem to go deeply enough.

Although the FoR mentions the "basic hostility that members of such committees ordinarily display toward the whole conglomerate of political conviction gathered under the general head of 'the Left,'" the question why this "basic" hostility is never asked. This is perhaps because our pacifist friends do not like to talk about class war, to which they are opposed just as to any other kind of war.

Unfortunately the American ruling class, as represented in state legislatures by such men as Tenney and Dilworth, is far more conscious of dangers to itself than any other social class. This is the why of the basic hostility of such committees as Dilworth's toward the Left.

When the FoR asks why Committees to Investigate Education do not investigate the infiltration of militarist propaganda into public schools by super-patriotic groups, the question is asked for rhetorical reasons only. Recruiting propaganda and super-patriotic censorship and violations of civil liberties do not represent a threat to the American ruling class. Such propaganda strengthens the status quo.

Pacifism does represent some threat because it raises questions as to the need for war, for war appropriations, and as to the causes of war. This is a threat to the status quo. Therein lies the explanation of such investigations.

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—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

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

Uncle Tom in Congress

In a stinging Open Letter, the NAACP of Chicago has addressed itself to the only Negro congressman from its area, William Dawson (Dem.).

It is put in the form of a call to Rep. Dawson to speak up and put "America first and party second," but the body of it adds up to an exposure of Dawson's remarkable record in opposing action for civil rights.

(1) We wondered, writes the NAACP, why you, Dawson, were so silent "when the young son of one of your constituents [Emmett Till] was brutally murdered in Mississippi and his assailants set free, Mississippi style."

(2) "We listened in vain for your protest and insistence for action in the shooting of Gus Courts and the slayings of Rev. George W. Lee and Lamar Smith..."

Dawson did not even send an answer to the NAACP when that organization wrote to him on these events. It was suggested that perhaps he was "working behind the scenes," says the NAACP Open Letter.

(3) Dawson refused to introduce any civil-rights legislation in the last session of Congress.

(4) Asked about the 8-point legislative program of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, Dawson replied that he had not read it.

(5) He derogated legislation to protect Southern Negro rights on the ground that the president had authority to act without legislation; but admitted that he never urged the president to act under this authority.

(6) He spoke and voted against the Powell Amendment in Congress—"the only Chicago area congressman who did."

(7) At the Democratic Party convention, he was on the Platform Committee and the Drafting Committee and went along with the "meaningless platitudes, outright evasions and surrender to the Confederacy." (As a matter of fact, although the Open Letter does not bring it up, it was Dawson who was trotted out immediately after the collapse of the liberals in that farcical "debate" on the civil-rights plank, to make a speech halting the platform.)

What it adds up to is a portrait of the Democratic Party's leading Uncle Tom.