

LABOR ACTION

INSIDE SECTION

Special Young Socialist League Pamphlet

THE DEFENSE OF MAN

Max Shachtman — Norman Thomas

What Program For Democratic Socialists?

... page 3

MARCH 24, 1958

TEN CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

On March 12, the Senate passed a bill whose purpose, according to the New York Times, was "to stimulate construction of 200,000 new housing units." The impression which has been created for the public is that the bill will reduce unemployment by 500,000. But a glance at the bill shows that it will make more headlines than houses.

The bill has three main provisions. First, \$1.85 billion is provided for Federal purchases of home mortgages from private lenders. Second, the interest rate on VA loans is raised from 4.5 per cent to 4.75 per cent. Third, minimum down payments on homes are reduced. This is far from a real public housing bill; it is designed merely to "encourage" both borrowing and lending and to make more funds available to private lenders.

The first provision is as superfluous as Herbert Hoover. The banking system doesn't need this extra \$1.85 billion in reserves in order to make additional loans. Because of the declines in inventories, investment, and general business activity, the banks will not suffer from a shortage of loanable funds in 1958 as they did in 1956-57. In fact, interest rates are already falling because of the reduced demand for business loans.

The second provision, raising the interest rates on VA loans, is therefore locking the door of an empty barn. Much of the reduction in housing construction in 1956-57 can be plausibly traced to a reduction in VA loans. Tight money in those years raised interest above the VA maximum and therefore lenders avoided VA loans because other types of loans were more profitable. But the fall in interest rates which has occurred, and which will certainly continue, reverses this situation. It is no longer necessary to raise VA rates since the other rates are falling to meet them. Thus this provision only has the name of action.

The third provision reduces minimum down payments along the following lines: 1) for houses costing \$13,500 the down payment is reduced from \$825 to \$405; 2) this \$420 reduction applies to all houses over \$13,500; 3) for houses less than \$13,500 the reduction is less than \$420, eg, a \$12,500 house requires \$375 down instead of \$675. This is the only provision of the bill which could possibly have any significant effect. Whether it does have any effect depends on the psychology and financial position of would-be homebuyers, something which is difficult to gauge (even in round numbers like 200,000). While the other provisions only do what the recession is doing anyway, this one may at most slightly offset one of the bad effects of the recession, the reduced willingness to buy homes because of reduced income or the prospect of it.

The New York Times headline reads: "SENATE VOTES 1.8 BILLION TO SPEED 200,000 HOUSES," and a sub-head refers to "Major Anti-Slump Bill." One can only think that the Senate, which has been called "the greatest deliberative body in the world," is also great at the very undeliberative shell game. H. G. R.

Congressional Tempo Quickens as the Economy Slumps

POLITICS AND THE RECESSION

By GORDON HASKELL

With every week in which the recession continues to deepen, its political impact becomes more marked. In Washington the measured, stately bi-partisan dance to tunes called by the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition which has dominated Congressional sessions in recent years gives way to bugle calls for action and the tumult of partisan strife. Congressmen and senators who, until a few months ago, were noted for the alarm with which they viewed any slight imbalance in the federal budget, now jostle each other in the rush to place bills in the legislative hoppers calling for billions in tax cuts, plus other billions for public works, highways, extension of unemployment compensation payments, and the like.

Sober political observers know very well how to distinguish the sound and fury emanating from Capitol Hill from solid legislative achievement in the interest of the unemployed and the economy as a whole. They know that many of the bills now being presented by individual congressmen and senators are just for the record, and bear little resemblance to what will finally be enacted. They know, also, that as the "Spotlight" item on this page illustrates, one must look closely at every piece of legislation enacted to detect what may often be meager substance graced by a flamboyant title.

But when all this has been pointed out, the fact remains that the present animosity in Congress reflects a deep, slow but certain change in the political mood of

the country. The complacency, conservatism, lack of interest in political affairs which has been so widely remarked in America during the past decade is slowly giving way. The five or six million unemployed, the other million on short weeks, or threatened with unemployment, the additional millions who, though personally secure at this stage, remember what a real depression can mean—all are forced to one degree or another to look up from the narrow personal interests which have preoccupied them in recent years, and to take a look at the state of the nation of which they are a part.

HOW DEEP?

No one really knows how deep the recession will go, how long it will last, and to what extent the economy will recover after it has run its course. By the same token, no one can really predict the depth and exact form the political reaction to it will take. But a few factors should be born in mind as we watch and participate in the unfolding events.

First of all, the political reaction to a continuing recession will take time to develop. It is quite natural for people, even unemployed people whose personal plight has grown desperate, to wait and see what will be done for them. There is a lot of talk about the downward phase of the recession ending this spring or summer. There is talk of the billions to be poured into the economy through tax cuts or public works, or other means if things don't level out by the end of March. It is natural for people, grown unaccustomed to the idea of any personal or collective initiative in politics to exhaust every personal and public resource available to them, while waiting hopefully for a change for the better from above.

Secondly, there will be a tendency to exhaust all remedies apparently available through present political structures and channels before seeking new ones. The

Democrats, whatever their joint responsibility with the Republicans for permitting things to go this far may be, are taking the initiative in Congress, and will no doubt go the Eisenhower administration one better on every counter-recessionary proposal. If the economy is still in bad shape as the Congressional and gubernatorial elections draw near in the fall, they can be counted on to promise programs much bigger and better than those which have already been passed, or which actually will be passed once the elections are over. The chances are, however, that the immediate result will be a large increase in the Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, in Democratic governorships, and of a relative increase of the number of more liberal Democrats within these majorities.

SOCIALIST VIEW

Unless things develop far faster than it seems likely at this time, it is after the November elections that serious strains may be expected to develop within the Democratic Party. Their nature will depend on the further course of the economy. If the emergency measures proposed now and enacted in the interim prove sufficient to check the recession and return the economy to some approximation of full employment, the political situation inside the Democratic Party may well be stabilized at a "normal" state of tension and friction. But if the recession proves really stubborn and durable, and it becomes increasingly evident that emergency programs must give way to institutional changes, the bonds of expediency and mutual advantage which have held that party together so long might well prove inadequate to further contain the conflicting elements within it.

There is no point now to speculating on what may happen at that time. The significant thing for socialists to recognize is that wherever the tempo and

(Turn to last page)

AUTO WORKERS

Recession Hits Auto Negotiations Hard

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, March 16

The bare statistic that there are now 415,000 unemployed workers in Michigan, according to the conservative estimate of the Michigan Employment Security Commission, tells only one part of the story of the economic crisis taking place here, the impact of which has already affected the political, economic and labor-management relations far more than anyone thought possible a few months ago.

The sudden upsurge in unemployment came as a result primarily of General Motors, Ford and Chrysler layoffs due partly to the UAW's demand that those who are employed work a 40-hour week and due also to cutbacks in production schedules. Ward's Automotive Reports has now

revised its total yearly forecast to 4.7 million cars as compared to its prediction of two months ago that the industry would sell at least 5.3 million cars in 1958. Most auto industry leaders and economists had projected approximately 6 million cars. Nor did UAW economists foresee a drop as severe as that which has taken place.

The first and perhaps most interesting

change that this economic crisis has made is in the thinking and confidence of auto industry leaders. There exists much evidence that they are demoralized and certainly no one in the industry is making the slightest claim that auto can perform the function it did in the 1954 recession when a great expansion in auto credit was one of the factors that aided in the recovery from that crisis. Industry leaders were very pleased to see that Walter Reuther went along with the suggested proposal to cut the excise tax on cars which amounts to almost \$150 per car, and this has made a significant change in their outlook toward 1958 contract negotiations that begin soon.

The demoralization of the Republican

(Turn to last page)

The Class Struggle Rears its Ugly Head On The Picket Line - - And in the Halls of Congress

The KOHLER STRIKE

By BEN HALL

Nothing in the Kohler strike is unprecedented and nothing new in the facts put on record before the Senate Committee. The strike has gone on for four years; by now, the plant is working at reduced capacity with scabs and imported strike breakers. It has turned into an endurance contest; the union has already spent ten million dollars and counts on a nation-wide boycott. Four years ago, an NLRB trial examiner began hearings on UAW unfair practices charges against Kohler; they dragged on and on; At last in October 1957, he issued findings, declaring the company guilty. But it continues to drag; the recommendations must go before the full Board; and then probably to the courts. It's a long strike, a tedious quest for justice in the serpentine red tape of governmental procedures.

The history of American labor is a catalogue of Kohlers, the continuous and repetitious story of fanatical strikebreaking. But now, there is the powerful UAW. And if the Senate Committee turns belatedly to the Kohler strike it is not to bring justice to two thousand workmen. Right-wing Republicans are out to undermine that power which has kept Kohler from inflicting an all-out and final defeat upon his workers. The exposure of rackets has turned against anti-union inquisitors and they would like to get off into some other subject. At first, unionism in general was discredited; but in time, the long range effects became clear: not all labor but the most conservative labor officials were being discredited, especially Republican stalwarts like Dave Beck.

On to Kohler Strike!

But the downfall of labor's right-wing meant strengthening Walter Reuther and those whom Goldwater looked on as dangerous radicals. The senator didn't start all this to raise the moral authority of the UAW inside the labor movement. Let's get on to the real thing! On to the attack on the UAW and so to the Kohler strike! They will find nothing of use. But the extreme right awaits a chance to "expose" Reuther and his associates, if not for what they did in the Kohler strike then for what they once were a long, long time ago. For that, the Kohler strike provides a handy start, they think.

Herbert V. Kohler, the bathtub baron, detests the UAW with the zeal of a man who is convinced that unionism undermines his democratic right to decree the destiny of 2,000 men who must work for him. According to the *Wall Street Journal*, another cause of his passionate dedication to the open shop principle is the conviction that unionism foments the class struggle. He, on the contrary, desires class peace; and he enjoyed that peace for twenty years between the smashing of one strike in 1934 and the beginning of another in 1954. How he pursued that elusive peace with shot-gun and tear-gas is the tale of the Kohler strike.

In 1934, an AFL strike was broken after private Kohler police fired into a crowd of strikers, killed two and wounded 47 others. This time, Mr. Kohler demanded the same service from a local sheriff who refused to play the assassin's role and for that was dumped by his Republican party.

In 1951, the UAW won an NLRB election at the Kohler plant and accepted an inferior agreement in the hopes of getting a start for unionism. But the company began preparations to oust the union while it was still under contract. It secretly purchased shot-guns, hundreds of rounds of ammunition, and tear-gas shells. It reworked twenty-year-old clubs left over from the '34 strike into short billies for '54. It installed gun emplacement towers equipped with floodlights. Later, when the contract had expired but the strike not yet begun, the company armed a small private army with modern weapons including machine guns under pretext of preparing a Civilian Defense Program.

Union Buster

This is a company, it should be clear, that decries union "violence." As the strike went on and the union reduced its wage demands, the company fired 90 strikers including all officers and local leaders; it demanded that scabs get preferential seniority and insisted that it would rehire without loss of seniority,

only workers with more than 15 years seniority. Kohler offered the union only 3 cents after the union had cut its demand to 10 cents; but after negotiations were suspended, he gave his scabs an increase of 10 cents an hour. He demanded, in case of layoffs, the right to select 10 per cent of the victims at his own discretion and the elimination of contract clauses which provided for arbitration as a last resort. In every case, the company rejected all arbitration. When Emil Mazey suggested that the Senate Committee or some other body arbitrate the issues even now, the company turned down his proposal flatly.

It could hardly be clearer. Here is a man that simply and crudely is determined to smash the union in his plant.

But none of this interests the right wingers who are eager to turn their attention to the Kohler strike. Senator Knowland, for example, retained his equanimity through all this; but when the press interviewed Walter Reuther in the Senate Caucus room on February 26, he suspected a subversive trespass on government property and instantly demanded a Senate investigation. Some things are trifling and others momentous; and Mr. Knowland has his scale of values.

Considering the provocation, the strikers did little enough; but, to the eternal credit of democracy and human nature, they were not idle. When the strike began in April, 1954, the union local kept the plant closed for 54 days by mass picketing. But on May 21, under the terms of a state "Little Taft-Hartley" law, the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board ordered the end of mass action; in September, a circuit court judge issued an injunction restricting picketing and strike activities; by May, 1955 16 strikers were found guilty of contempt. The state's attorney general had ruled that the police of Kohler Village, under the thumb of the company, were authorized to have machine guns. On July 21, the governor warned that he would call out the state militia if strikers committed what he called "illegal acts." In all this time, federal contracts were being awarded, over union protests, to the struck Kohler plant.

In July, 1955, a Norwegian freighter docked in Sheboygan harbor with clay for Kohler. The mayor, elected with union backing, reportedly refused to allow the ship to unload. It sailed to Milwaukee where the state CIO threatened a city-wide work stoppage and the ship took off for Montreal. Here, police smashed a picket line and the clay was unloaded and shipped by rail back to Sheboygan. Later, railroad workers refused to transport the freight past picket lines but supervisory rail personnel took over. On August 4, 12 unions were charged with violating the Taft-Hartley law and the NLRB opened hearings on secondary boycott charges.

No Quarter Given

The Committee heard testimony on the high rate of silicosis among Kohler foundry, grinding and enamel shop workers; but workers were afraid to file compensation cases against their employer. The few who did found the company fighting them to the end. In one case Lyman Conger, general counsel for the company, testifying against a worker at a compensation hearing maintained that the man's lung condition was not the result of Kohler silica dust but stemmed from his grade school days when he inhaled dust while cleaning blackboard erasers.

After the strike had begun, the company hired spies who walked in the picket lines and worked in the strike kitchen. To build up a spurious record of violence and vandalism against the union, Kohler tried any absurdity. A

neighboring farmer discovered that one of his cows was cut and concluded that the mutilation came from barbed wire; he thought no more about it until a Kohler attorney visited him to suggest that it was probably the work of a Kohler striker retaliating because a member of the farmer's family was a scab. Another case created a temporary sensation when a scab reported to police that he had been blackjacked by three strikers. But detectives discovered that his injuries came from a drunken fall; he admitted the hoax and was sent to jail. He was allowed to serve his sentence by spending the nights in jail and the days working in the Kohler plant!

In all this, Goldwater and his inquisitorial associates hope to find a few union transgressions that can justify their attack on the UAW. But, to defend the record of Mr. Kohler will not be easy, as the UAW will demonstrate.

However, that is not what the Senators really have in mind.

On February 13, John J. McGovern, McClellan Committee counsel, approached Russ Nixon, Washington representative of the UE and asked him to give information that might be used against Reuther and the UAW, assuring him that it would be kept strictly confidential. Nixon flatly refused to serve as an informer. But the incident points up what the right wing wants.

Goldwater's Real Aim

They would like to prove that the UAW is "subversive." Robert Burkhart, UAW international representative once assigned to the strike, was questioned eagerly about his marital affairs but Goldwater was particularly interested in his membership in the Socialist Workers Party from 1944-47. The SWP, said the Senator was "solely devoted to violence and revolution" and the whole thing is only natural, he opined, because violence, says he, is the cornerstone of UAW activity.

The Committee heard that Kohler had hired spies to follow Emil Mazey, UAW secretary-treasurer. But tempers rose among its members only when it was revealed that the company had a staff of photographers assigned to take pictures of the Committee's investigators talking to Joseph Rauh, UAW attorney. And right at the hearings too! That was too much for Senator McClellan who called it a "low" and "rotten" trick.

The incident reminds us of what Goldwater and his friends have in mind. Just a few candid shots! But let us remember what strange hobbies were popular in years past. Busy photographers, sleuths, telephone tappers, dictaphone operators, eavesdroppers, spies, provocateurs, and script writers have been at work for a myraid of agencies, committees, and departments—private and public, municipal, state and federal. They have gathered testimony (sifted and selected); collected pictures (movies and stills); worked up stories (truth, fiction and fabrication); files, cross references, and dossiers.

You may have imagined that only Russian spies and Communists were on the list. But you are wrong. A prized place among the dossiers is the neat pile relating to the activities, past and present, of UAW leaders where truth is compounded with falsehoods to make lies.

And to show that all has not been a total waste of the taxpayers or stockholder's money, a bulging file . . . is doubtless devoted to Walter Reuther himself. Wonder what's in it?

The "Inside Dope"

We can't know for sure all the scraps and falsifications that have been gathered together in his unprotecting file. But we have been informed of some of it; and not by secret agents. Our source of information is Clare Hoffman, representative from Michigan, who placed twenty closely printed pages into the Congressional Record on August 2, 1955. Like Goldwater, Hoffman is especially eager to discredit the Kohler strike. But his real motive was unfolded in the title of his contribution to the Congressional Record. "The Real Walter Reuther and His Purpose—The Establishment of a Socialistic Government." It is a bizarre compendium of current events, dead history and selected police-spy recollections. It records Reuther's early socialist past; it refers to the letter to "Dear Mel" allegedly written by Walter and Victor Reuther from Russia on January 20, 1934; it quotes tid-bits from the reports of stool pigeons assigned to attend Socialist Party meetings in the thirties. It recounts the strike activities of Emil Mazey and tells how he led soldier demonstrations in the Pacific at the end of the war. And it sweeps on fanatically to this conclusion:

"Walter Reuther . . . has no respect for the law but . . . he is a sincere, never-give-up Socialist, if not wholly converted to communistic ideas." It refers to "his determination that employers and investors shall, by law or by force, be compelled to give up an ever increasing portion of their earnings. That determination, carried to its logical conclusion, would because of a lack of funds for replacement or for the creation of new industrial plants, destroy our economic system."

Mr. Hoffman came only briefly to the senate hearings and he had no chance to tell his tale. But he and Goldwater are two of a type. They are weary of hunting out mere gangsters and racketeers, an occupation which profits them little. They are impatient to get on with the real thing: to prove what their distorted minds have concluded, that Reuther and the UAW are nothing but dangerous radicals. And that, by the way, is just what these congressmen think about organized labor in general.

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

Max Shachtman

and

Norman Thomas

What Program For Democratic Socialists?

Norman Thomas and Max Shachtman shared the platform in Chicago on February 28th at a meeting sponsored by the Democratic Socialist Forum attended by close to 300 people. This was not a debate, as both speakers emphasized, but rather a discussion where each speaker could outline his views on the kind of organization and program needed to rebuild the socialist movement in the United States.

As the chairman, Dr. George Watson, dean of students of Roosevelt University, pointed out, "This is not a debate but a constructive discussion on 'What Program for Democratic Socialists'..."

When both speakers had completed their presentations it was strikingly evident that, notwithstanding some differences in emphasis here and there, they were in basic agreement on a broad program for the unification of the democratic socialist movement in the U.S. around the base of the Socialist Party.

MAX SHACHTMAN

Speaking first, Shachtman said that although the socialist movement in the U.S. has reached its lowest ebb, a great many people remain inspired by socialist ideals. The problem is how to reconstruct a new socialist movement which can begin to solve the problems of achieving peace, problems of production and distribution, and the problem of attaining equal rights for all.

The kind of socialist movement I want to build, Shachtman continued, must be a democratic socialist movement. It must stand for democracy in foreign affairs. This means the application of the principle of self determination for Hungary and all the Soviet satellites, for all those countries still under colonial rule, for Algeria, for Okinawa. I want to dissociate myself from any party like the French SP which carries out such a policy against Algeria.

Such a democratic socialist movement must combat the witchhunt here in America, he emphasized, and not tolerate it. It must fight for the restoration of the rights of the Communist Party victims of the Smith Act. It must carry on an unceasing fight to remove from this land the blot of Jim Crow. It must fight for democracy in the union movement, to free it from arbitrariness and bureaucratic practices.

DEMOCRACY

The kind of socialist movement I want, Shachtman continued, must have no doubts about democracy as the road to socialism. The position on this question is the acid test for all who join it. It must be honestly capable of denying that totalitarian Communism has anything to do with socialism, as an ideal, as a movement, or as a society. It must maintain its word that socialism can be attained only through democracy and that democracy can be fully realized only through socialism. Only as consistent champions of democracy shall we deserve to win.

I want to build a movement, Shachtman said, which is broad, inclusive, and

democratic; which has freedom in its own ranks and is doggedly insistent on preserving its unity. I do not want a movement of sects again. We must learn to cooperate with all labor, radical and liberal elements if we are to build a movement.

I want to build an opening to the right, he continued, to reach those people without whose support we cannot build a socialist movement. I have no illusions about the Democratic Party. I am for labor and liberal elements forming a third party. But my views are not shared by those whose support we need. I want to co-operate with these elements and let them learn from experience. I cannot and will not support capitalist candidates and parties. Neither do I want to isolate us by running candidates at this time.

FRIENDLY CHALLENGE

I want to issue to the liberal and labor elements a friendly challenge to make a real fight for their labor and liberal views within the Democratic Party, a challenge to elect their candidates in the Democratic primaries. I would like the socialist movement to take the position that any local or state socialist body which want to do so should be permitted to help labor and liberals in these primaries. In time, it is my belief, labor and liberals will see that their only road is independent political action.

Shachtman placed heavy emphasis on the need for the socialist movement to establish the closest ties with the trade unions, and to include a maximum number of trade unionists in its ranks. He added, however, that he wants to welcome professional people, educators and intellectuals into the socialist movement, and most particularly students and other young people without whom the movement has no future possibilities.

We are working to realize an old and noble ideal of mankind, he concluded.

The noblest of its ancient aspirations... human equality, freedom and brotherhood, the true freedom from want and fear that we are convinced socialism will assure; the struggle against social iniquity, against exploitation and the terrors of the old world wherever they manifest themselves. That is the most rewarding struggle of all and the greatest justification for human living. We seek people who cherish emancipating ideas and the ideals of emancipation, and who are prepared for the joy of sharing these ideals with others. That is what the socialist movement is.

NORMAN THOMAS

Norman Thomas followed Shachtman, and opened his speech by stating that "I am going to talk about the difficulties of doing the things which Max has stated so well, in general terms, as needing doing. We have got to face those difficult things rather than content ourselves with the kind of statement which Max Shachtman has given them, generalities which I certainly applaud."

Unity of the socialist movement cannot be based, Thomas continued, on any rigid creed. It must transcend sectarianism. In the days of socialist strength there were pretty wide divergencies, temperamentally and otherwise. But as Max has made plain, there are certain limits. I want no one in a democratic

socialist party who says: "Well of course Stalin was terrible, but Lenin was all right."

Now Lenin was a great man, Thomas continued, as Stalin was not, and there were great things he said and did. Make no mistake about it, he was one of the men who moved history. But in Leninism were to be found many at least of the seeds which quite logically led to Stalinism.

FAIR PLAY

We will get nowhere in America, he said, unless it is understood that the democracy we stand for is a democracy that is triumphant in its belief that by democratic processes in this country, which are not the processes of intrigue and violence, we can get power. Power not for ourselves as a clique, but power for the people. This I think is fundamental as an attitude if there is to be a union which is to be valid and worthwhile. And the principles of fair play and common honesty ought to apply to the comradeship inside the party itself.

Thomas then went on to point out that socialists must recognize that although the present social system in Russia may permit planning and advances along certain lines, it is administered by a dictatorial elite, and cannot permit the life to which socialists are devoted, the life of liberty, equality, fraternity and the use of the great resources of earth and man's skills not primarily for power, but for the satisfaction of men.

In general, Thomas stated, he agrees with Shachtman's idea of a labor party, but with these cautions: he does not want a party like the British Labor Party controlled by the block voting of unions, the vote being cast by the union leader. He believes the party should be modeled more along the lines of the Canadian Commonwealth Federation with a broader base than organized labor and controlled by the votes of individual party members.

OPEN SOCIALISTS

I also agree with Max on electoral tactics, Thomas went on. I like his idea of a challenge to labor and liberals. You've got to find a way to keep a party strong and active even when it is not the right juncture for running candidates for every office. We've got to find a way to be openly socialists in unions.

Thomas then discussed problems of international socialist solidarity in a world in which the socialists in each country have to get the political support of the people on the basis of their own short-term interests. He discussed problems and forms of social ownership, and the relationship between the long-term goals of the socialist movement and its short term political possibilities.

We live now, he said. It is very dangerous to postpone the things that can be done now, unless those things directly contradict the possibility of something better. The socialism of the future has to be a socialism which is based on the common interests of all of us as consumers, he said. This isn't to deny the existence of class conflicts and the tremendous importance of organized workers, but it is to affirm that the socialism that is going to win in an age where the job will be done increasingly by electronic machines must think in consumer's terms, of leisure, of quality of goods.

ASSURANCE OF DESIRE

Of course I am for the largest possible unity of democratic socialists, Thomas went on, and not on a sectarian basis. I do not think we would accomplish very much unless we got a whole lot more with us pretty soon. And what we've got

to think about is the terms on which we get these more, and they are not terms of everlastingly going over our old history. They are terms of meeting our problems now in the language of the present. We shall have to work out difficult techniques. We cannot nominate candidates for as many offices as we once did.

And Thomas concluded: We socialists, then, will come before ourselves and the world with certain great assurances of desire and hope, certain great assurances of faith in democracy which have been justified despite the failures which we admit, certain great beliefs about the line on which we shall have to work, but we shall also have to come humbly as those who seek the road and seek it not by means which will turn to dust and ashes the things we would achieve, as so often has happened in history when great ends have been defiled and frustrated by the means taken toward them.

SHACHTMAN REPLIES

As had been arranged between the speakers before the meeting began, Shachtman took the floor for a few minutes at the conclusion of Thomas' speech in order to comment on it. He devoted his time to emphasizing that a renewed socialist movement had to be based on political agreement, and could not insist on conformity in the estimation of every historical event, including such events as the Russian Revolution which, Shachtman declared, was, in spite of the mistakes made by its leaders, a socialist revolution that did not have its logical outcome in Stalinism, but which was instead brutally repudiated and destroyed by it.

This meeting, which was attended overwhelmingly by young people, new to the ideas of socialism and the problems of the socialist movement, will form a significant landmark in the reconstruction of the American socialist movement.

CROSS CURRENTS

The Militant's Omission Or: "What Price Unity?"

In the last issue of LABOR ACTION we commented on the responses the Socialist Workers Party has elicited to its proposal for a "United Socialist Ticket" in the 1958 elections. In concluding we expressed the hope that the SWP would not "be willing to further dilute or even omit completely the references to the struggle for freedom of the peoples of half the world from their program in the interest of 'socialist unity.'"

From a different point of view, the same problem has been raised by Ben Stone in a letter printed in *The Militant* for March 10. He writes:

"... the question arises—can we unite on a minimum program with people who do not agree on the necessity for the elimination of the bureaucracy in the Soviet Union? I would like to hear more widespread comment on this."

While Ben Stone, and the rest of us are waiting for an explicit answer, some straws give a hint as to the direction in which the SWP's political winds are blowing.

In the same issue of the *Militant*, a report on a meeting in Los Angeles addressed by Vincent Hallinan, 1952 Progressive Party presidential candidate, and James P. Cannon, national chairman of the SWP, quote the former on the question of Russia as follows:

"A new order is sweeping the world and its superiority to the old order is attested whether you consider its scientific achievements, its military successes, the rising standard of living of its people, its cultural advancement, or even its athletic prowess."

The Militant does not comment on this description of Russian society, nor does it record that Cannon or other speakers saw fit to refer to it. But alas, that is not all. The *Militant*, it appears, did not think the paragraph in Hallinan's speech following the one quoted above of sufficient interest to its readers to quote it. But the reporter for the *National Guardian* (March 17) covering the same speech did. This is what Hallinan added:

"The radicals in the U.S. have to cut themselves off from the past. They have to stop assailing the Soviet Union. They have to stop saying they love the people of the Soviet Union, but despise their rulers."

LABOR ACTION '18' YEAR

March 24, 1958 Vol. 22, No. 6

Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1874.—

Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—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: GORDON HASKELL
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON
Business Manager: Mel Stack

Editorial Board:
GORDON HASKELL
HERMAN BENSON
MAX MARTIN
SAM BOTTONE

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

March 24, 1958

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

TEN CENTS

WITH THE YSL

East Coast Educational Conference

On Saturday, March 15, the New York unit of the Young Socialist League sponsored an East Coast educational conference.

The conference consisted of two talks—on the German Revolution of 1918 and the current recession—and a party in the evening. The afternoon meetings were attended by approximately 45 young people, with about 100 at the evening party. Students from Yale University, Wesleyan College, Sarah Lawrence College, Columbia University, Brooklyn College, as well as a carload of young people from Philadelphia were in attendance at the conference.

The speaker on the German Revolution, after relating the pre-war political background of German politics, and especially of the Socialist Party, developed the thesis that a socialist revolution was not at hand in 1918. He pointed to both the elections to the National Assembly as well as the composition of the workers' councils. In both cases, while there was an overwhelming majority of the people in favor of the democratic revolution, the socialists remained in a

minority, all the combined socialist groups having a total strength of 45 per cent.

This speech provoked a lively discussion, with many points of view presented, ranging from support to the speaker to those who maintained that the electoral statistics were not an accurate reflection of the political mood of the people, that a socialist revolution was indeed in order.

The second speech dealt with the current recession and was given by Herman Roseman, a graduate student in economics in Philadelphia. Roseman presented a serious Keynesian analysis of the economic prospects before the U.S., predicting that the recession would ease up towards the end of the year but would never regain the boom phase just passed. Again the speech provoked much interest.

In the evening, a party was held at which people from various parts of the East Coast socialized together. With folk dancing and folk singing and refreshments, the party was a success. So was the conference as a whole.

Snapshot of Y.S.L.er's Activities...

IN NEW YORK...

*Bogdan Denitch debated Prof. Organiski at Brooklyn College on American foreign policy. The meeting was sponsored by the Brooklyn College Debs Society and was attended by 150 people.

*Last week the Debs Club at Columbia University (in which YSL'ers participate) sponsored a meeting with a representative of the Cuban Revolutionary Movement of July 24th. This meeting was likewise successful with over 85 students in attendance.

IN BOSTON...

*Members of the Young Socialist League have helped to form a socialist discussion group at Boston University. The club now has 20 members and is planning a meeting next week with Bob Bone, instructor at Yale, speaking.

IN WESTCHESTER...

*The Westchester unit of the Young Socialist League reports that it is continuing to grow at a rapid rate and will begin organizing meetings in the near future.

IN CHICAGO...

*The major event in the recent past was not a YSL function, but a meeting sponsored by the Democratic Socialist Forum. Max Shachtman and Norman Thomas spoke on What Program For Democratic Socialists. The meeting was attended by some 300 people.

IN PHILADELPHIA...

*In mid-Feb. Gordon Haskell, editor of LABOR ACTION, spoke on The Labor Movement and Civil Rights at a meeting sponsored by Students for Democratic Action at the University of Pennsylvania.

*This Saturday, March 22, Mel Stack will speak at a meeting sponsored by the Young Socialist League and the Independent Socialist League on the intellectual radicals of the 1930's, and also possibly at Haverford College on Foreign Policy.

This is a partial listing of YSL doings to compliment the other reports on this page. We haven't heard, as we go to press, from the other YSL'ers in Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Albany, Cleveland, and other areas. But we will report their activities in later issues of Challenge.

U. OF CALIF. • BERKELEY

Campus Political Party Formed

By SUE KEISKER

A year-long attempt to mobilize liberal student opinion in the campus arena at the University of California at Berkeley found expression March 1, in the formal establishment of a political party, SLATE. At this time delegates, numbering nearly one hundred, adopted a constitution, set forth general policy and elected officers.

Details of SLATE policy remain to be fully worked out, but a clear policy was stated on some issues.

● The right of citizens of the U.S. to enjoy fully the prerogatives of citizenship regardless of race, color, creed, sex or national origin. Integration in all public areas and an end to discrimination in housing, employment, etc.

● The right to free association, thought, speech, and movement for people of all countries as a necessary condition for political democracy throughout the world.

● The right of students of the campuses of the U.S. to freely form their beliefs, expressions and associations through:

1. establishment of political organizations on campus
2. abolition of loyalty oaths and campus security offices on campus
3. presentation of a diversity of political opinions on campus

● The right of students in all countries to freely organize for the purpose of political action on problems which they believe to be germane to the problems of their respective countries.

● The right of scientists, scholars and students to free cultural and academic exchange.

● The rights of students to a properly balanced education which fulfills their individual needs.

SLATE is expected to enter candidates for all student government offices

(Turn to last page)

Harrington Reports on Tour: Sees Basis for YSL Growth

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

During the last several weeks, I have had the opportunity to speak to four units of the Young Socialist League and to get an idea of developments at a series of universities. The general impression gained from this contact with the New Haven, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Seattle units is one of real optimism. If the YSL perspective of unity with the Socialist Party and Independent Socialist League (as part of an adult merger of the Socialist Party and Independent Socialist League) becomes a reality before the beginning of the next school year, there is every possibility that the united socialist youth organization will be the strongest and most effective political youth grouping in the United States.

At New Haven, the comrades of the YSL are quite active in aiding the George Orwell Forum at Yale University. The Forum itself is a broad organization of socialists and those interested in fostering the discussion of democratic socialism. In a very short period, it has succeeded in becoming the center of political debate on the Yale campus.

The first meeting, addressed by Bob Bone of the Yale faculty, drew over a hundred students. My meeting—a general discussion of socialist politics as they relate to our society and the intellectual's role in particular—was attended by nearly that many.

A group from Wesleyan in Connecticut attended both meetings of the George Orwell Forum and there is a real possibility of a discussion group being formed in the near future.

The Los Angeles picture was not so optimistic. The eternal difficulty of organization in Los Angeles—the enormous distances in that sprawling city—is still very much a factor. However, there are some positive elements at work. A dissent discussion group which appeals to organized and unorganized democratic socialists of every tendency is developing. A victory is being won at UCLA where Anvil will probably be sold in the campus book store. And the unit of the YSL is in the process of re-organization.

In the Bay Area (San Francisco and Berkeley) the YSL is in excellent shape. At my meeting on the University of California campus, I had the honor of being the first socialist speaker sponsored by a recognized socialist organization on campus. Thus, the YSL unit was the first to break through after the revision of the famous Rule 17 which had for so long inhibited student political activity. Around a hundred students at-

tended this meeting, an indication of the considerable success achieved by the YSL in this area. The YSLers there are also involved in SLATE, the new campus political party which is having a real impact at Cal. (For an account of SLATE, see Sue Keisker's article on this page—Ed.) Here again, there is a mood of optimism and of new possibilities.

Through the activity of one YSLer in Berkeley, I was able to speak at Oakland Junior College under the auspices of a current issues club. The meeting drew some forty students on short notice, and demonstrated a real interest in socialism at OJC.

The Seattle situation is also an excellent one. The Democratic Socialist Club is now organized and a campus force. At my meeting on the University of Washington campus, around forty students attended and this despite the fact that because of the short notice University rules prohibited campus advertising. An off-campus meeting near the University, at the Friends Meeting House, drew a similar number of people.

At Seattle, there is a real possibility that the Democratic Socialist Club will be a factor in student politics this spring. Arlon Tussing, newly elected chairman of the Club, recently proposed that the Washington campus do away with the anachronistic system of "class elections," i.e. popularity contests. He put forward the idea that Washington should develop a system of student political parties somewhat similar to those now in effect at the University of Chicago. The reaction to this idea was excellent, and it may well become an issue in the coming student elections.

All of this leads me to the conclusion that the optimistic perspective adopted by the YSL is based on an accurate reading of student and youth reality.

If all goes well, and in particular if socialist unity is achieved by Fall, we can look forward to a socialist youth movement which will be larger and more meaningful than anything seen in at least a decade in the United States.

UNIV. OF NEW MEXICO

Campus Group Sponsors Thomas

By PAULA BRAM

On March 7, 1958 over 700 people made their way through the worst snow-storm of the past two years in Albuquerque to hear Norman Thomas speak at the University of New Mexico. His talks were sponsored by the Collegiate Council for the United Nations, the only active political group on the campus, and was endorsed by the Administration of the University through the presence of university president Tom L. Popejoy on the platform with Thomas.

Thomas' talk got underway with a jab at the foolhardiness of any foreign policy which assumes that the stockpiling of nuclear weapons was an assurance of our determination to preserve the peace.

The talk centered around two proposals. The first dealt with a sincere attempt at disarmament beginning immediately with acceptance of the Russian proposal for a two year moratorium on nuclear weapons and an immediate cessation of nuclear tests on our part. When questioned from the floor about the possibility of disarmament when the economy of our nation is built on the necessity of producing armaments, he

(Turn to last page)

An Introduction to Democratic Socialism

The Defense of Man

We live in a time of turbulent and pervasive change. We live in a century which has experienced the horrors of two World Wars, which has known fascism and genocide, which has seen the bloody suppression of a socialist revolution in Hungary in the name of "Communism." And we live perched precariously over the abyss that is World War III.

These times have been cruel to hope. Many have withdrawn from all involvement and taken refuge in cynicism or in despair. Others have placed their faith in one of the two huge power systems which menace the world. And now that man reaches out toward space itself, there are some who respond to this enormous challenge by answering with a crash program for intercontinental ballistics missiles armed with hydrogen bombs.

What is at stake is, quite literally, the defense of man. For the world now stands at the most decisive crossroad in its history. We now have the technology to destroy mankind itself—or to transform mankind, to achieve the dream of the centuries, the good society. No one can be neutral in the face of such alternatives. And neither can we seek a way out through supporting one or another of the power camps which menace the very existence of the human race.

Briefly we feel only socialism is the politics of hope, of the defense of man. Socialism can no longer be called a utopia; it is now a necessity, and the means are at hand to achieve it. If socialists once spoke of the transition to a new social order in less complex terms, if we have made our mistakes and suffered our defeats, that does not alter the fundamental imperative. The most simple humanity obliges us to take the way of socialism.

This pamphlet is an attempt to explain, if ever so briefly and sketchily, our conception of how we must struggle for peace, for freedom, for socialism. We hope this study fulfills the basic need for a restatement of socialist ideas in America at this time.

I. Man Can Become Human

Our radicalism, our socialism, begins and ends in this: that we affirm man can become human.

When we look at man in the world about us, we see that his essential humanity is everywhere degraded. The hundreds of millions of peasants in Asia live their lives in an almost animal-like struggle for food and shelter and against pestilence and hunger. The workers of a prosperous America are mechanized on the production line and threatened by the gnawing insecurities of a society which is periodically wracked by crisis. All around us we see huge concentrations of economic, political and military power which tyrannize the people. In short, we live on a planet of a thousand tyrannies subordinating the human to a "higher" goal, to the demands of the Communist state or the rule of profit. And man is made alien to his own enormous potentialities.

But some say, things must always be thus, that there is an implacable law of nature which condemns the majority to the animal-like or the machine-like existence. There will always be, we are told, elites of the few and herds of the many. And yet, the moment we look at the reality around us, this view shatters. In one decade after World War II, hundreds of mil-

lions of colonial peoples organized themselves into vast movements and overthrew the power of a declining Western imperialism. To be sure, the aspirations of these masses were often betrayed by new oppressors (a point which we will touch upon when we discuss the role of Communism in today's world), but that does not alter the essential fact. The despised, the downtrodden and lowly who for centuries were thought to be "naturally" inferior and reconciled to the conditions of inhumanity, have moved in giant steps. And this is not a hope—it is a fact.

Inevitable Degradation?

But we need not look only outside of America. The great mass movement for Civil Rights is before our eyes. At the beginning of this century, this movement was tiny, an alliance of Negro intellectuals with white radicals and reformers. Today it embraces millions. For a century the racists believed that the Negroes "knew their place," that only a few agitators were the cause of trouble. Then, to take but a single example, thousands upon thousands of Negroes in Montgomery, Alabama, organized themselves into a voluntary and democratic movement which won a magnificent victory and electrified the world.

**These Four Pages
Are a Special Pamphlet
Issued by the
Young Socialist League**

We cannot accept the notion that man must bow to a fate of degradation, for the most important fact of our time is the entrance of the millions into the arena of history. It can be seen today in America in the movement for Civil Rights, it was present in the vast surge of the labor movement in the Thirties; it is the pervasive reality of Asia and Africa; it expresses itself in every advanced country outside of America in the adherence of the workingclass to the socialist ideal.

And yet, we simplify in all this. It is, to be sure, an observable fact that the people can move, that they have, not once but ceaselessly throughout history. Still, a major question confronts us. In the past, and even to this day, all these movements of the millions have failed to end oppression and exploitation. Our times, in particular, are rich with terrible examples of vast movements for freedom which issued into the power of a new tyranny. Is this inevitable, does the Revolution always devour its own?

In part, the answer is, yes. Until modern times, all of the great revolutionary movements which sought to end social injustice arose in societies of scarcity. Man's control over nature was so limited that the demands for justice and decency shattered against the reality of a general poverty. And though these revolutions

often made enormous strides forward — as when capitalism burst the parochial bounds of feudalism and transformed the world—they could not achieve the ages-old hope for a society of real peace and freedom.

But today, this has changed and such a development is no longer inevitable. Man's control over nature has become so great there is no foreseeable limit upon the possibilities of a just society. The very technology which is now devoted to producing the means of destruction can become the basis of a transformation which is utterly new and radical, of socialism. This new situation has been true for a brief time. During that period, movements have arisen seeking socialism and have been defeated. The transition is not easy—but it is, for the first time in man's experience, possible. The alternative, as we will try to show, is an intensification of oppression, World War III, perhaps the end of mankind itself.

It is not only that man can become fully human; it is that he must if he is to survive. For precisely that concentration of inhumanity, those huge power structures of our time, threaten us with annihilation.

Obviously, these generalizations are not enough. For we do not merely possess a socialist "vision" of things. As we see it, socialism is not a prophetic movement mysteriously erupting in the midst of history. It is the product of immediate, observable social facts, it arises in the course of a very real, often complicated, struggle.

II. Means of Inhumanity

Here, let us begin with an idea unpopular (and unrecognized) in America today: that of social class.

To the socialist, the most basic fact about the inhumanization of man throughout history is its accomplishment through the control of political, economic and social power by a minority, by a ruling class. The ability of this class to exploit the people is based upon its control over the means of production. This fundamental characteristic has, of course, taken many forms. In Medieval society, the feudal lord's position rested upon his place in the political and social hierarchy, and the merchants of the town, who only possessed money, were considered inferior. Under capitalism, the ownership of capital itself, of huge aggregates of wealth, became the defining fact of the class structure.

Closed to Millions

This rule of the minority over the majority through the power of a social class does not simply determine who gets the largest share of the world's earthly goods. All of society is related to this basic fact. Throughout history, the vast majority have been condemned to be half-men and quarter-men because of it. The great spheres of the full development of the human personality—the areas of creative thought, of art, of learning—have been closed to the millions. Today, for example, we hear much of mass culture. The "good people" are concerned that there is so much bad television, bad literature, so much debased use of leisure time. They never think that the worker who is daily brutalized by the routine of the production line is hardly prepared by that fact to

Evils of Capitalism . . . and Communist Totalitarianism

join the Bach Society; their criticism of television does not extend to the advertising industry, which always prefers to create a new, useless, but profitable desire instead of answering human needs, which argues for two cars at a time when people desperately need housing.

We do not believe that the class structure "determines" every nuance of our existence, that we are automatons of the economic system. It is obvious that men, even in contemporary society, choose, that they exercise their freedom. But we do believe that the class structure sets certain fundamental limits upon human freedom, that, for instance, the workers on the line are less likely to develop their aesthetic sense than those who, through their wealth and position, have the opportunity of education, of time and decent human surroundings. But more, we see these limits as the perennial enemy of humanity, we see Greek society as having been based upon denying the dignity of the slave, feudalism as having condemned the serf to a parochial and distorted life—we see capitalism as the opponent of man's most profound capacities.

Let us become even more specific. Many will agree with all of this as it relates to the past. They will admit that slavery and feudalism, and even early capitalism, had this terrible effect. But they will go on to argue that our New Capitalism with its welfare state has found a way to open up opportunity and culture to the great mass of people without resorting to the "dangerous" expedient of concentrating economic and social control in the hands of the people. In other words, they will argue that all of the objectives of socialism can be accomplished within a reformed capitalism, and that it is only a commitment to outmoded doctrines that keeps the socialist from seeing this plain fact.

Precarious "New" Capitalism

Certainly America has reached a level of prosperity unmatched in history. The reforms of capitalism, particularly those of the New Deal, have resulted in an amelioration of the early harshness of the system. But the price we have paid for this is enormously high—it involves the possibility of World War III.

Further, the dearly bought stability is, in itself, precarious. In 1929, world capitalism broke down. The crisis was particularly severe in the United States. By 1932, some fifteen million unemployed walked the streets. For a period of six years, there was a massive attempt to bring the system back on course, that of the New Deal. And in 1939, when the period of social legislation came to an end (there has not been a major, progressive reform since then), nearly ten million were still unemployed. The really decisive end to the depression came only with World War II and the war economy. In short, the Welfare State measures of the Thirties failed to solve the basic crisis of capitalism.

Thus we find John Maynard Keynes, the English economist who was the theoretician of government action in the economy in order to save capitalism, sadly speculating (in a *New Republic* article towards the end of this period) that it was politically impossible for a capitalist government to intervene massively enough to do the job in peacetime. To socialists the reason is clear enough. Peacetime government spending, particularly if it veers in the direction of institutions like the Tennessee Valley Authority, is seen by businessmen as competition. But on the other hand, war spending has its virtues. The products are not consumed on the market; they are either used to kill people or else they become obsolete. In either case it is preferred by the businessman.

So the first thing we must say about this "new" capitalism which has transcended the anti-human characteristics of earlier days, is that it is precarious, based in part on a War Economy. In other words, the inhumanity of a depression with fifteen millions unemployed was, to a considerable extent, "solved" by the inhumanity of World War II at the price of millions dead, and now, by preparation for nuclear holocaust.

Case of Too Many Goods

Even today, when a Republican President presides over a Permanent War Economy in which the government intervention is at six times the rate under Franklin Roosevelt, there is a regular and periodic economic insecurity. And here we come face to face with one of the central paradoxes of our New Capitalism. In 1949, 1954 and in 1957, there were recessions. True enough, they did not match the crash of 1929 (in part because of the billions of government subsidy to "Free Enterprise" for producing means of destruction). Yet, they shared a fundamental characteristic with the Great Depression. In the most advanced technological country in the world, there was want and unemployment because *there were too many goods!*

Prior to the development of capitalism, an economic crisis came when there was not enough, when there was a famine, or a shortage caused by some other natural calamity. But in 1929, to take but one example, there was leather, there were machines to make shoes, there were men who desperately wanted to work making

shoes, there were people who needed shoes, and still, there were "too many" shoes. The production of industry had out-run the buying power of the people. Thus, there was a crisis, but not a crisis of scarcity: a crisis of glut.

To a socialist, the fundamental reason for this situation is intrinsic to capitalism, even though the actual development of crisis may take different forms. As a producer, the businessman, under the pressure of competition, is always bent on reducing costs, above all, by replacing men with machines. But at the same time that he reduces costs and increases his productivity, he is also cutting down the buying power for his product by the number of workers he has displaced. In a boom period of increasing production, these workers can find other work, but once the surge of investment has leveled off, once the economy has retooled on a higher level, this basic contradiction begins to work its effect.

Thus another paradox: the depression and recession almost always occur at the very height of prosperity when wages are highest. So it was just recently, in 1957; so it was in 1929.

Further, even with all the talk about prosperity, there is only a thin veneer of well-being, a shell of welfare in the United States. A Federal Reserve Board survey in the Spring of 1956 (at the peak of the boom) showed that the average consumer had liquid assets of \$310—but then, *he owed more than that*. It was only when you get to incomes over \$5000 a year—that is, well into the middle class—that liquid assets were greater than debt. Instead of security the average consumer has fear and anxiety, menaced by a sudden sickness of a "rolling downward adjustment" (as some now refer to unemployment).

Now to return to our major point. It is obvious that contemporary American capitalism—concentrated in ever greater units, technologically advanced, "mature"—is not the same as the days of the entrepreneur or the sweatshop. And yet, the core of inhumanity remains. The prosperity is purchased, in part, by a Permanent War Economy, which means that we live on the edge of an abyss; and even then, there is the gnawing and persistent presence of economic insecurity, the fear that this peak of the boom may be the prelude to that recession. But that isn't all, for we have only taken capitalism viewed from within a single country, the United States.

On the international scene, capitalism has changed, yet there too it remains a bulwark of inhumanity, an enemy of man in his struggle to become human. And because of this, tremendous victories are won by the other major enemy of man in this modern world, by Communism.

III. Imperialism

Imperialism, many think, is an outmoded word. The old days of sending a gun boat up the Yangtze are over. Some even condemn the "old" imperialism. Again, these people argue that things have changed. They point to an obvious fact, that the United States has no colonies (forgetting Puerto Rico, Okinawa, and such irrelevant islands). Where, they will say, are there American troops oppressing a foreign people? But that misses the newness of the present situation. American capitalism continues its role of oppression—of imperialism—even if in a new and sophisticated form.

The interests of American capitalism have to struggle not primarily against rival capitalist powers, but against a rival anti-capitalist power bloc. Imperialist policies are not only expressed in the quest for profitable foreign investments, for no one can explain the Marshall Plan of Point Four programs in those terms alone. It has to be seen in the broader perspective of world-wide interests—the hegemony of American capitalism's economic, political, strategic and military power over its allies, the neutral nations, and if possible even the Russian bloc. The sum of all the means of aggrandizement of a powerful nation over its rival and weaker nations is the essence of imperialism whether it is manifested through colonies or other forms of economic and military domination.

Take Point Four. In many ways, this was a program containing many elements of idealism in its conception (or rather, in the minds of some of those who initiated it). But, as the State Department carefully explained, "particular emphasis . . . is given . . . to the stimulation of a greatly expanded flow of private investment." Indeed, Point Four never was the "war against poverty" of the liberal rhetoric. It proposed to set up *pilot projects* (a model farm), and then have the actual expansion financed through international bank loans or private investment. When John Foster Dulles proposed turning the whole thing over to the insurance companies and other centers of American capitalism, he was only carrying the conception to its logical conclusion. Moreover, as even liberals like William O. Douglas have pointed out, aid without land reform and other social changes in underdeveloped countries can end up by aiding reaction. In short, Point Four, one of the best of the programs initiated by the United States, was woefully inadequate and had its welfare proposals subordinated

to a higher purpose, that of maintaining a world free for the penetration of capital.

But no matter. Even this limited and narrow Point Four was stillborn. Within a few years, the whole program had become directly and administratively a function of the military. Funds were allocated, not on the basis of international need, but according to the "safety" of allies; i.e., usually to reactionaries and various dictators.

So it is that this aim of maintaining private investment in the midst of an increasingly anti-capitalist world has an enormous effect upon American policy. It means that the United States has been unable to appeal to the great democratic movements of our time. Instead, the military alliances of the "Free" world, have defended French colonialism in Indochina (a war financed by America which cost more than the total Marshall Plan funds received by France), the British in Cyprus, Chiang on Formosa, the dictators in Latin America, Franco in Spain, and on and on.

Prosperity and Profits

Take but a single striking example. The Middle East is up in arms. Everywhere, movements seek to oust the old colonialism. Even when these movements win political independence, they are faced with the enormous problem of providing a new life for starving millions. In this situation, the United States has proclaimed the "Eisenhower Doctrine," a program which is supposed to demonstrate American concern for the area. These high phrases are, of course, somewhat contradicted by the fact that the United States was willing to send a fleet with *atomic weapons* in order to maintain a Jordanian King on the throne (the "old" imperialism, mind you, is dead).

More than that. *In one year (1957)*, the profits to the various capitalist oil companies in the Middle East and to the reactionary feudal rulers who are in alliance with them, was . . . *two billion dollars*. Think of what that could mean to the people of this area. Is not the reason for the distrust of the masses of the colonial revolution for the United States, why they still regard this country as imperialist, obvious in the light of this fact?

Yes, America is prosperous, or relatively so. But on the other side is the dehumanizing of millions of colonial people who have been defrauded of their very birthright. That is still another aspect of the campaign of the New Capitalism, the Welfare Capitalism, against man becoming human.

But the most exorbitant price which the world pays for the continued existence of capitalism is . . . Communism.

Communism is an "anti-imperialist" imperialism. It has grown on the basis of the collapse of capitalism. Tsarism and Russian backwardness was the first source of this new totalitarianism. Since then, in every case, the power of the Communists is a function of the decline and decay of the Western imperialist rule. In Indochina, for instance, French colonialism (financed by America, armed by America, backed by America) was the recruiting sergeant of the Communist Viet Minh. In China itself, the corruption and rottenness of the Kowintang regime under Chiang (also supported by America) was the precondition of Mao's rise to power. In France and Italy, the workingclass, opposed to capitalism, has been tragically driven into the Communist Party in the absence of a truly democratic socialist alternative.

Thus, one of the central tragedies of our time: that a totalitarian power system like Communism has been able to appear as the inheritor of the revolutionary, democratic and socialist tradition. Though the Communists often take power on the basis of appealing to the legitimate aspirations of the people and their hatred against capitalist imperialism and feudal reaction, they inevitably turn against the people as soon as the victory is won. Anti-imperialism focused against the capitalist powers is made the road to power by a new kind of imperialism.

IV. Capitalism's Price: Communism

Make no mistake about it. Communism is anti-capitalist. In Russia, in Eastern Europe, in China, the Communists have literally exterminated the capitalists. But the nationalized property which they introduce is not the vehicle of popular control of the nation's destiny. If the capitalist's power is expropriated, so is that of the workers and peasants, of the overwhelming majority. In the one Party state, the Party owns the state, and nationalized property becomes, not a means for the liberation of the human personality, but a new, centralized force of exploitation, enslavement, anti-humanism.

There are some, calling themselves socialists, who admit all of the terror and tyranny of Communism, but go on to say that it is "progressive." Communism, they argue, industrializes, urbanizes, it educates and rationalizes the life of society. Eventually, these people hold, there will be a reform of Communism, a slow democratization and all will have turned out well in the end. We

The Democratic Foreign Policy and the Role of Labor...

feel this point of view misses the very heart of the question.

No socialist can be indifferent to how a society industrializes. Mussolini, after all, made the trains run on time; Hitler ended unemployment. Yet no one would argue that fascism and Nazism were thereby "progressive." Similarly with Communism. There is, to be sure, "progress" if one measures that in simple statistics, quantitatively. But it is achieved through the exploitation of the people, through the whip, through tyranny and anti-democracy. One cannot even make a comparison to the early days of capitalism which was also cruel in its drive to industrialize. For at that time, socialism was still a utopia, society had not developed to the point where a democratic, humanist alternative way of progress was actually possible. But in the Communist period, the world has been ripe for socialism. And an essential aspect of the reactionary character of Communism is that it has achieved its statistical progress through an anti-human exploitation when another and real alternative was present. In short, Communism is "reactionary" in the classic sense of the word: it is a throwback to the most brutal methods of modernization in a period when socialist methods are possible.

But more. Communism industrializes through creating an enormous, centralized bureaucratic ruling class. There is no warrant in history or logic to argue that this class will reform itself, that it will voluntarily hand down power. Under Communism, a single inch of real freedom sets the stage for a revolution. If, for example, the right to strike is recognized, or the right of an opposition press, that calls the whole regime into question. The workers at U. S. Steel can lay down the tools without raising revolutionary demands since there is a certain formal separation of the political and economic power in the United States. But when the workers of East Germany in 1953 demanded a reduction of the work-norms, or the workers of Poznan asserted their right to bread in Poland in 1956, they immediately counterposed themselves to the state itself—their strike, begun for immediate demands, inevitably became a revolutionary action.

The world pays a price for the continuation of capitalism: the growth of Communism. In this sense, reaction in both Washington and Moscow live off each other. In a vicious circle, America's policy of supporting capitalism and reaction throughout the world recruits discontented masses to Communism, and the growing power of Communism intensifies the strength of the militarists and defenders of the status quo in the United States.

V. To Break the Circle

In our time, the historic function of socialism is to break this vicious circle of reaction. We counterpose democratic socialism, the defense of man, to both of these anti-human social systems.

This basic conception is the key to the idea of a democratic foreign policy. For us, the most obvious thing about the Twentieth Century world is its revolutionary character. Everywhere, masses of people are on the move. The foreign policy of capitalism has responded to this situation by an arms race and a series of military alliances with every reactionary and discredited defender of the status quo left on the planet. Thus it is that the "Free World" has numbered Chiang, Franco, Syngman Rhee, Bao Dai and others in the camp of "democracy." Thus it is that America has voted in the United Nations against the Moroccans, the Tunisians, the Algerians, the Cypriots, and on and on.

On the other hand, Russia has demagogically exploited the vast sentiment for peace, and prepared for war. While smashing a democratic socialist revolution in Budapest, the Communists have maintained that they are the champions of the right of self-determination in the colonial world. And in the process of this struggle between the two power camps, the world has been pushed to the very edge of the abyss of a nuclear war.

The United States, as it is today with its present policy, has demonstrated that it is incapable of mounting a democratic political offensive against Communism, because it has everywhere subordinated democracy to the defense of capitalism, the rights of the Indochinese to the "rights" of French profit-making and the NATO alliance. We argue for a democratic foreign policy. We seek to win this country to a genuine and democratic struggle for peace.

Democratic Foreign Policy

What does a democratic foreign policy entail? It means, for one thing, directing the enormous resources of this country in support of the colonial revolution. It means that we can no longer defend the last footholds of capitalist imperialism in the colonial world in the name of the "unity" of the NATO powers. It means a policy which would, for example, oppose the alliances of the oil companies and feudal princes of the Middle East in the name of a program aimed at raising the living standards of the millions of people in these countries. It means that the United States would cease nuclear testing immediately and unilaterally—and by that act, that it would strike a tremendous political blow against Communism.

And though we recognize the differences between totalitarian Communism and America's limited, capitalist democracy, that does not mean that we have an image of Communism as monolithic. East Germany, Poland and Hungary proved beyond doubt that the Communist regimes exploit their people uneasily and that there is a seething anti-Communist resistance. Because we recognize this, we see another function to a democratic foreign policy: that it aid those people now living under Communist tyranny. In 1956, the United States stood helplessly, aimlessly by, while the Russians murdered the Hungarian Revolution. What if we had announced, at the time of the Revolution, that the United States was unilaterally withdrawing all troops from Europe? By exploding the Kremlin's "justification" for Russian troops in Eastern Europe we believe it would have made it infinitely more difficult for the Russians to carry out their imperialist attack on Hungary.

A democratic foreign policy, in short, is a policy which seeks to win the dynamic and progressive masses of the world, the workers and their allies in the advanced countries, the colonial peoples in the under-developed areas. It does not accept a division of the world between the two camps as "peace," but rather struggles to put forward a democratic alternative to both power systems. For America, a democratic foreign policy means the primacy of the fight for peace, democracy and human dignity over the "rights" of capital.

All well and good, someone might answer. We need a struggle for democracy and peace. But how can we accomplish it?

VI. The Necessity of Utopia

Clearly, we do not think that Big Business, or a government defending its interests, in the United States will undertake a policy which would subordinate their interests to those of peace. The oil companies, for example, are not going to suggest a rupture with their feudal allies, they are not about to favor devoting the super-profits of the Middle East to the welfare of the people of the Middle East. How, then, do these proposals make any practical sense—what keeps them from being a Utopia?

To begin with, we have no guarantee that the fight for peace and democracy—the fight for socialism—will triumph. It is possible that we are on the verge of a long night of barbarism, or even that we face the nuclear annihilation of mankind. But if there is a way out, it lies along certain lines. And these are not the product of an Utopian imagination making blue-prints of universal harmony. They emerge in the very flux of events in which we are involved.

Historic changes, social revolutions, decisive transformations of policy, have not come about because of propaganda, or the work of small groups. They have taken place only when vast masses recognize a common interest and a common action as an immediate necessity; they have taken place through the struggle between social classes. When feudalism was destroyed in France, for example, it was not simply the case of a nation agreeing with the rationalism of the Enlightenment Philosophers, though these ideas certainly played their role. The central factor was that the peasant knew he hated and despised the privileges of the feudal lords who exploited him; that the masses of the cities sought a change from the misery and arbitrariness of the *Ancient Regime*; and, above all, that the rising capitalist class, formed in the very midst of the old society, found itself required to struggle against the outworn laws and customs which impeded the spread of their economic power.

Emergence of Socialism

This complex of forces was at the bottom of the great French Revolution. And indeed, in every social transformation, such class interests have been the dynamic, the inner mechanism, of change. Today, in the modern

world, we see dynamic classes before our eyes, we see movement. To the socialist, the interest of the progressive classes in this struggle has nothing in common with the rule of capitalism or Communism—but there is still no clear, articulated mass consciousness of this fact. And the road of struggle for peace, for democracy, for socialism, is precisely the development of this anti-capitalist, anti-Communist and socialist consciousness—the emergence of socialism as an organized and aware movement.

In the colonial world, there is hardly reason to argue. The forces of the old order are disintegrating. In country after country the imperialists are being driven out and their feudal allies routed. The force behind this transformation is visible to the most casual glance: it is the organized and conscious power of the plebian masses, of the workingclass, the peasants and the city poor, usually in concert with a section of "national" capitalists who see independence as a means of extending their exploitation as counterposed to that of the foreign capitalists.

It is clear that this independence does not solve the real problem. In China, this revolution was taken over and betrayed by Communists who subordinate its democratic aspirations to the dictatorial rule of the Party. In India, the attempt to modernize, to satisfy the awakened demands of the millions, is confronted by the terrible and general poverty of the nation itself. In short, the transformation in the colonial countries cannot be taken in isolation. For real success, the creation of a decent living standard for these hundreds of millions who have been exiled from history for centuries, demands that the advanced countries come to the aid of the under-developed nations.

For America, this "aid" has meant, as we have seen, the penetration of capital, the subordination of all policy to a line of military alliances. For Russia, this "aid" has meant a means of subjugating independence movements to the rule of Communism. In other words, a realistic policy of help to the colonial revolution demands a basic change in the advanced countries, in the two power camps themselves.

Working Class as Key

That is why we regard the struggle of the workingclass as the key factor in modern politics. For this is the one social class in our time which is impelled in the long run toward a struggle for democracy and peace, and which is capable of organizing itself to transform the social system of the two giants.

In the case of the Russian bloc, we need not be hypothetical. The events in East Germany in 1953, in Poland in 1956, the Hungarian Revolution, all point to one fact: that the dynamic force of opposition to Communism is the workingclass. In October of 1956, the intellectuals and students had formulated revolutionary demands, the crowd was milling in front of the radio station at Budapest. But the Revolution did not really begin until the workers from Csepel arrived in their trucks. For only the workingclass has the cohesion, the numerical concentration, the solidarity and organization to act decisively.

In America, the situation is more complex, or at least it seems to be. There are, we are told, no social classes in this country. And indeed, this claim has a certain immediate justification. During the last decade and a half of the war economy, of periodic crisis but not of shattering depression, there have not been great surges forward on the part of the workers as in the dramatic social movement of the Thirties. But it would be superficial to make some sweeping generalization about American society and its classes on the basis of a decade or two. For even in these years, we can recognize the unique character of the workingclass and its enormous social potential for the future.

The largest single organized force in the United States which today fights for public housing, for medical care, for schools, for a whole series of progressive demands, is the labor movement. This is not to say that the American workers and their organizations are for socialism. They are not. It is to say that the labor movement is on the "left" of American society, and that it has been for decades.

Labor and Politics

Why is this? We cannot argue that individual workers are better human beings, that some biological process of selection produces virtue in the workingclass and vice among businessmen. That would be absurd. The point is that, whatever the individual personalities of the workers may be, the workers as a class (and even when they are not fully conscious of acting as a class) are impelled by the very conditions of their existence toward fighting for social change. The workers are concentrated in huge factories. In every single advanced country in the world, they have learned that in order to protect their rights in the shop they must organize into unions. But then, the local union, or even the international, can have all of its economic gains taken away by a hostile legislature or thwarted by an anti-labor police power. And thus, the labor movement is impelled toward political action, if only at first to defend economic gains.

ARE YOU FROM

New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles, Seattle, Berkeley, Westchester County (New York), Buffalo, Albany, Pittsburgh, Denver, Cleveland, St. Louis, Albuquerque, San Francisco, Portland?

DO YOU WANT

to fight for socialism on the campus and in the youth movement?

THEN CONTACT

the Unit or Organizing Committee of the Young Socialist League in your area or write directly to

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE
114 West 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

*If you're not from any place where we are, start us where you are. Write to us at above address.

Labor Party ... Socialism ... The Defense of Man

This political action has a certain content. For the workers do not base their power on private ownership of the means of production. As a class they are distinguished from the businessmen and the shopkeepers precisely in that they depend primarily upon wages. The strength of the labor movement, then, is not in terms of its great concentration of economic power, of its ownership: it resides in their numbers, in their ability to make the needs of the majority attainable. But this fact puts the labor movement in conflict with Big Business. Sometimes, as in the Thirties, this struggle takes on a dramatic and sharp intensity, involves pitched battles; sometimes, as in the period of the war economy prosperity, it is more muted, less pervasive. Yet this is the fundamental dynamic of our social life.

The unions can be taken over by crooks or racketeers—or rather some of them can. But even there, the labor movement is forced, if after long hesitation and with considerable unwillingness on the part of some leaders, to carry on a struggle against corruption in its own ranks. The leadership of organized labor today is not, of course, socialist. Indeed, it is only now turning upon the most corrupt elements in the union bureaucracy. In that struggle, we identify with the more progressive sections of the official labor movement, with men like Reuther and Meany, as against the Becks and Hoffas. But we do not believe that the process can stop there. Eventually, through the very experience of capitalist existence, we believe the great mass of workers will become conscious of the social meaning of the labor movement, that this consciousness will take hold and transform the present unions into even more potent instruments of social change. And there, of course, the socialist is at one with the democratic left of the labor movement in its fight, not only against reaction on the part of the boss, but against bureaucracy and conservatism in the unions themselves, even the best of them.

Thus, the key social class in the United States which would make these policies possible is the workingclass. In three decades, American labor has moved from a position of disorganization and political neutrality to a position of the mighty organization of the millions and pervasive political involvement. Socialists have, of course, many criticisms of the bureaucratism in the labor movement—we seek a complete consciousness on labor's part of the particular role it plays in our society—but this does not alter the main fact: that the workingclasses of the advanced countries of the world are the mainspring of progress in our time, that they offer the possibility of a way out.

VII. The Labor Party

In immediate and specific terms, the next step forward in American politics is the creation of a labor party.

Such a party would be based upon the mighty organized strength of the American labor movement (which already has developed political organizations in America's cities), and it would appeal to the Negroes in the great struggle for Civil Rights, to the farmers and to the white collar workers.

We need not be futuristic about all this. In 1948, Harry Truman was elected President of the United States on a "radical" Fair Deal Platform. The Southern reactionaries of the Democratic Party either opposed him (three states went Dixiecrat) or sat on their hands. But Truman, with the mighty backing of organized labor, with an appeal to the Negroes based on the Civil Rights resolution at the 1948 Democratic Convention, and with strong support from the farmers, achieved a decisive electoral majority. And this was accomplished even though the Communist-controlled Progressive Party polled a million votes and tipped the balance to the Republicans in such an important state as New York.

Controlling Their Destiny

Truman won—and the Democratic party thereupon sabotaged the electoral program. No major plank of the Fair Deal program—which had won a clear electoral majority—was ever turned into law! For the Democratic Party contains both the labor movement and the core of Southern reaction. And the reactionaries, through their control of the powerful congressional committees, are in a position to defy the popular will, as they did in 1948. For us, the essential problem is to work with the progressive majority in American society, to help liberate it from the confines of the Democratic Party—to create a labor Party.

Such a party would not have to temporize on the major domestic social issue in America today, that of Civil Rights. Its candidates would not have to call for "moderation"—as Stevenson did—when a surging, democratic Negro movement is on the march against reaction. Such a party could support this struggle, clearly and unambiguously.

We do not pretend that this labor party will end all of America's troubles. For that matter, we do not even think that it will necessarily be socialist at the beginning. But such a party would be able to put forth a series of answers to the enormous problems before us:

it could move toward a democratic foreign policy because it will not be tied to Big Business; it could take firm measures against economic crisis for the same reason; it could stand for Civil Rights unencumbered by political bondage to Southern reaction.

But above all, the appearance of such a party would mean a vast increase in the actual participation of America's millions in controlling their own destiny. A labor party cannot be based upon the financial support of wealthy angels and hundred dollar dinners as is the case with the Democratic and Republican parties. It can survive only through the freely given support of the people themselves. By its very nature, it would be forced to seek mass support and mass participation, for that is the primary source of its power.

Such a party, we have said, may not in all likelihood be socialist at the start. Yet, as a democratic and progressive party, it would contain a socialist wing from the very beginning. And eventually, through struggle, it would be impelled to adopt socialism as its goal and to struggle for it. Why?

To defend man in our time is to seek the democratic control of the huge powers of technology in the world. Left to the few, this unparalleled concentration of strength—which even now reaches toward the very sky—threatens man with economic crisis, with World War III. For the capitalist will deform man on the production line and subordinate his needs for peace and decency to the striving for profit. We have seen this. And the Communist will do the same in his way.

If, in seeking a way out, we see that it lies along the road of democracy, then we have already taken a giant step toward socialism. For as long as the few—capitalist or Communist—can take the fate of the world into their hands, so long are peace and democracy precarious. And a labor party which begins with the aim of democratizing this power through its reforms will continually be driven by the realities of the situation to seek its transformation. In short, the first, tentative steps toward real democracy lead toward the fullest expression of democracy, toward socialism.

VIII. Socialism as a Goal

And yet, is this final solution an impossibility, is man incapable of ruling himself? At every step of the way we are faced with this question. We cannot, of course, "prove" our answer, for the world has yet to actually see a socialist society. But we can, once again, indicate the facts before us which are the basis of our hope, of our commitment to socialism.

Socialism, we are told, will lead to a concentration of economic power, and that will inevitably lead to bureaucracy, and the whole miserable process of tyranny will have begun again. That is how the question is often posed—But it is naive to think of it this way. The modern world, be it capitalist or Communist, concentrates power. This concentration of man's power through technology is simultaneously the basis for the hope that man can create a reign of abundance and the fear that he may destroy himself. The question is not, will there be a concentration of economic power? That is already the fact. The real question is, who will control it?

There is no doubt that the answer is not as simple as some socialists once thought. Modern technology in all of its complexity, centralization and vastness makes bureaucratic tyranny a possibility in any society. We have seen how it works under capitalism and under Communism. We can give no guarantee that it will not be a threat under socialism. But the only possibility of controlling these forces is through democracy. That we also know. We are quite ready and even anxious to affirm that socialism requires the democratic participation of the people like man needs air to breathe. But we also know that socialism is the only way to give that democratic participation a chance to work.

Indeed, our consciousness of the problem of bureaucracy leads us to emphasize workers control as an integral element in socialism. We now know conclusively that nationalization can be the means of centralizing tyranny, as in Russia. We have learned from the experience of the British Labor Party that putting a plaque outside the mines, "This Pit is now owned by the British People" still leaves the depersonalization and inhumanity in force at the point of production even though it signifies a gain in terms of society as a whole. Thus, we concentrate upon the fundamental problem: that of changing the quality of life in our society, of transforming the human relations in the productive process. And we feel that this can only be done through the creation of democratic units of economic and social control on the shop level, among the consumers and in the countryside. In short, we are not simply for nationalization, but for socialization. And this, we believe, will provide a tremendous counterweight to any potential bureaucracy and tyranny.

But still another point must be considered. Our society's conception of man's potentialities—its cynicism with regard to democracy—is partially the result of the anti-democratic realities we see about us. Consider, for example, and old, somewhat simple but illuminating metaphor. In various desert areas of the United States, one still pays for a glass of water. Take a man who had lived there all his life. Someone from a city could tell him of public water fountains. And his initial reaction, formed out of the conditions of scarcity in which he had lived, might well be, "The people must fight with each other over those fountains," or, "The bureaucrats must hoard the water." But if water can be made free as a public service, why not electricity, why not housing, why not all the necessities of life?

For when we speak of socialism and the potentialities of man, we must make an enormous imaginative leap. We speak of a society of abundance, and once that fantastic fact is posited many of the sources of conflict which we know today disappear. The desert man may think it is "human nature" to fight over water; and capitalist man may think it "human nature" for individuals to fight over housing and nations over oil deposits; but the socialist man, in a society of abundance and decency, may well think of cooperative effort as human nature. And as all of these visions contain their truth, perhaps finally community rather than competition will become human nature—perhaps finally man will achieve his true humanity.

Thus, we end where we begin: with man. Our world is confronted with the most radical possibilities human history has ever known: the annihilation of mankind; the humanization of mankind. To us, socialism is the only way to the latter alternative. It is, in our time, the defense of man, not utopia, but our most immediate necessity.

"We look toward a new beginning. We have no illusions that a great, mass socialist movement will suddenly spring into existence. Yet, we see possibilities, an opening in American society brought about by a range of specific events; we call for a turn of the American socialist movement, away from its isolation, toward the American working class, and the job of building a labor party."

from the Young Socialist League's 1957 Convention resolution on the perspectives of socialism.

The Young Socialist League foresees and looks forward to the rebuilding of the socialist movement but it does not merely sit back awaiting the rebirth.

TODAY the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

- participates in the struggle to end Jim Crow
- participates in the movement for peace in the world
- fights for academic freedom and civil liberties
- brings the ideas of democratic socialism to the students and youth of America

THE YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE
114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N.Y.

GET ACQUAINTED!

- I want more information about the Young Socialist League
- I want to join the Young Socialist League.

Name

Address

School (if any)

City

LABOR SCOPE

BOOKS ABOUT LABOR

Class Consciousness? Kids Have It

The Institute of Industrial Relations of the University of California has published a study of "School Children's Perceptions of Labor and Management." To the layman, it makes an impressive appearance, complete with tables, charts, analyses and procedures. The authors reach the not-astounding conclusion that children from "low socio-economic" homes are far more sympathetic to workers and to unions than are their classmates from "high socio-economic" homes. And they are somewhat disturbed at findings which "suggest a kind of class consciousness and an attitude of split associated with socio-economic position which runs counter to the democratic assumptions of an electorate making decisions on the basis of a conception of the common good. . . . They also suggest that the split between classes is being widened by education, rather than narrowed by an increased understanding."

Democracy would be a frail thing indeed if it depended, as the authors seem naively to assume, upon a selfless electorate in pure pursuit of the common good without regard to class interest.

The Pope & H. W. Benson

In the *Social Call* this month, Frank Marquart calls attention to the fact that Pope Pius XI in an encyclical in 1931 expressed sympathy for the principle of profit-sharing; and Brother Marquart somewhat ironically adds that H. W. Benson in his discussion of the UAW program seems to share this opinion. That is a limited view of the issues.

Most of those who see eye-to-eye with the encyclical would emphasize the need to convince employers of their duty to share some of their profits with their employees. And, presumably the Church has for many centuries sought to convince exploiting classes of varying types

that charity and ethics oblige them to give to the undertrodden and exploited. The practical effects of such appeals to Christian charity have been meager indeed.

We on the other hand underscore the need of the exploited working classes to organize and wrest some measure of justice from the employer. The article in *LABOR ACTION* proposes that it is proper for the UAW to demand a share of the profits from employers and, if it comes to that, to compel them to grant it. Some Catholics could agree. In the February issue of *The Wage Earner*, published by the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, Editor William A. Ryan writes, "It has been stated, usually without supporting proof, that it would be permissible for workers to accept a profit-sharing plan if spontaneously conceived by management and voluntarily given by them, but it would not be permissible for workers to strike to obtain a profit-sharing plan. Those who take this position have some hurdles to jump and some fine lines of distinction to draw. And we doubt that they can successfully do it."

For Farmer-Labor Party

UAW Local 600 at the Ford Rouge plant is still on record for a liberal Farm-Labor party. Its weekly newspaper *Ford Facts* writes on Feb. 22,

"While individual members of both major parties are working for social legislation that will afford relief to the unemployed, the sick, the needy and the aged, neither of the parties as a whole are too much concerned. We in Local 600 favor and look forward to the day when we will have a bona fide liberal Farm-Labor Party, composed of farmers, workers and the liberal elements of both major parties."

SCREEN the NEWS with Labor Action
A sub is \$2 a year—

A Great Book On the Ludlow Massacre

OUT OF THE DEPTHS by Barron E. Beshoar. Golden Bell Press. 372 pp. \$3.50.

When 12,200 coal miners began their strike in Southern Colorado on September 23, 1913, they left more than the mines behind. They quit their homes; packed belongings and families into wagons and trucks; and moved into tent colonies prepared by their union, the United Mine Workers to shelter them. At first, there was not immediate transportation for all and some waited behind. They were instantly evicted into the bitter cold of a snow storm by the mine companies that owned their homes, their jobs, their churches—all but their minds and bodies. Chief among them was the Rockefeller Colorado Fuel and Iron Company. It was the beginning of a struggle that lasted for a whole year and has come down into labor history as the bloody Ludlow massacre.

The story has been told before but never like this. Mr. Beshoar has written an objective book-length account; yet the passion and bitterness of the time comes through. He is the son of a local doctor who sympathized with the union and turned over his own new rifle to the miners upon appeal from the UMW. It is history but not a dry registry of dead events; this was a strike fought out with rifles, machine guns and dynamite. Women and children were blasted to pieces by state militiamen, arousing the indignation of a generation of liberals.

Regrettably, this publishing firm is a small one and the book will probably not get the distribution it deserves. If you cannot afford to buy it, you will do well to ask for it at your library.

In Southern Colorado, Rockefeller interests dominated everything and during the strike, the police, the courts were staffed by its pliant agents, the state militia was infiltrated with company paid mine-guards and became its direct tool. For self-defense, the miners could do nothing but arm themselves as best they could.

On April 19, 1914 state troops attacked the main tent colony at Ludlow, driving out its defenders with machine gun fire; the tents were dynamited and put to the torch. The bodies of thirteen women and children were burned beyond recognition. But the Ludlow massacre did not defeat the strikers. The miners fled into the hills and regrouped into organized armed bands. The United Mine Workers union of April 22 issued a "Call to Arms" and called for the formation of armed volunteer forces of union men to defend the miners. "Gather together for defensive purposes all arms and ammunition legally available. . . . The state is furnishing us no protection and we must protect ourselves, our wives and children from these murderous assassins. We seek no quarrel with the state and we expect to break no law; we intend to exercise our lawful rights as citizens, to defend our homes and our constitutional rights."

Ludlow and environs were held by the militia but the workers attacked and drove them out of the southerly strike sectors and miners continued to police towns under their control. So it remained until Federal troops took over upon order of President Wilson who ignored union demands that the Federal government seize the mines. The mine companies gradually restored production with scabs; the strike was called off through sheer exhaustion on September 15, 1914 on the basis of a formula suggested by Wilson but ignored by the mine owners.

To all previous accounts, the author adds this significant sequel:

Two strike leaders were John Lawson, representative of the District to the UMW's International Executive Board and

Ed Doyle, District 15 secretary. In the judgment, the union should have rejected the Wilson formula. Right or wrong, they were later driven out of the leadership of the union for having stood up for the opinions; Doyle was not allowed to reply to attacks upon him at a UMW convention and his speech, reports Beshoar, were stricken from the record by the UMW secretary, William Green. In the end they were forced out of the union. But the author leaves this part of the story skimpy and a bit cloudy.

After we have read this story we know this: if we enjoy democracy today and if the labor movement is so strongly entrenched that no one can destroy it such are the gifts of men like those who fought at Ludlow. This book is the record.

David Dubinsky's World

THE WORLD OF DAVID DUBINSKY by M. Danish, 1957. World Publishing, 347 pp. \$4.75.

Author Danish, former editor of *Justice*, in his laudatory biography, notes a speech by Dubinsky at the 1940 convention of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, "He called attention to an interesting angle of intra-union life, the disappearance of club and groups within ILG affiliates. The ban on such internal clubs had been endorsed by a previous ILG convention as baneful to normal union life but remained a dead letter for some years. Now, this ban became finally a reality, clubs and groups within ILG units were now allowed to function only three months prior to elections and were outlawed for remaining periods, without affecting trade union democracy in the slightest."

Not in the slightest? A hundred pages later, he informs us, "At the ILG convention in 1947, Dubinsky deplored the 'gradual drying up of the old-type sources of leadership in the ILG.'"

Is there any connection between these two facts? Danish never turns to such questions.

Unions and Democracy

UNIONS AND DEMOCRACY by Benjamin D. Segal. The Trades Unionist, 1311 L St., Washington 5, D.C. 17 pp. free.

A worthwhile little pamphlet on "Unions and Democracy" is presented by Benjamin Segal, director of education of the IUE. He touches mildly and briefly upon a slightly sensitive area that most union writers shy away from: "Union officials want to stay in office," he writes, "and therefore act accordingly. Having moved up the status hierarchy by becoming a union official, a union leader has more status, income, prestige and community influence than does the average rank and file member. By and large, the leader of a national union is in a position to build a political machine, dispense favors, give out and control staff jobs and keep his name before the membership through the union and daily press." (The same theme is examined with skill in the recent book, *Union Democracy* by Seymour Lipset et. al.)

ALL BOOKS REVIEWED

in **LABOR ACTION**

are obtainable from
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14th St., New York

YOU, DEAR READER

are in this too. The ISL Fund Drive needs your dollars. Send a contribution in now, even a small one, if that's all your poverty can afford. Make checks payable to Albert Gates.

ISL FUND DRIVE

Let's Speed Up the Fund Drive!

By SAM BOTTONE

At the end of the first month of the 1958 fund drive, it is clear that we have gotten off to a slow start. With one third of the time gone by, we have only received about a fifth of our goal of \$10,000. This means that most areas which have been lagging behind in their collections, or in sending in the money, have to put on a big push in the next month and a half.

When the fund drive began, we knew that a great effort would be necessary for all areas to make their quotas. A minor part of the problem is that it got started a little late this year in terms of organization from the National Office.

We know that the snow-balling recession has affected most branches, making it difficult to raise their pledges without special effort. And this is an important factor in the situation. Therefore we ask our friends who have been fortunate enough not to

have been flattened by this latest "rolling readjustment" to dig a little deeper this year to offset the hard-hit areas.

Only the San Francisco Bay Area and New York have managed thus far to keep up the pace. The problem is that a number of big quota areas like Los Angeles, Detroit and Newark have not started payments. While the National Office and Chicago have only made token contributions.

If we are going to successfully complete the fund drive, as we have always done, then a fast pace will have to be set for the next six weeks. We want to urge all of our friends, both new and old, who understand the importance of maintaining the organized expression of socialist ideas and actions to contribute now, and to contribute generously.

CONTRIBUTE TO THE ISL FUND DRIVE

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

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

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE
(Make checks out to Albert Gates)

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

	Quota	Paid	%
Bay Area	\$ 500	\$ 160	32
New York	3800	1245	33
Pittsburgh	175	40	23
Buffalo	150	30	20
Chicago	2000	351	18
Cleveland	150	25	17
Seattle	150	20	13
National Office	1150	95	9
Philadelphia	200	10	5
Los Angeles	650	0	0
Detroit	450	0	0
Newark	450	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
Reading	50	0	0
Streator	25	0	0
Mass.	25	0	0
TOTAL	\$10,000	\$1916	20

The Supreme Court Upheld Them
The Coast Guard and NMU Blacklists Them
The AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee Seeks to Ignore Them

'Screened' Seamen Seek Justice

By H. W. BENSON

Once again the postman rings at the door of the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee. This time the case involves the National Maritime Union and no one will be surprised that there are seamen, hundreds of them, who need help from the labor movement to win some small measure of democracy. They seek a hearing at the Committee but so far in vain. And they are not alone. We have reported in detail the efforts of rank and file members of the International Union of Operating Engineers to get the ear of the Ethical Practices Committee; but that is not easy. The united labor movement now boasts of no less than six complete codes of ethical practices, making up a full evening's reading. And yet no one can answer one simple question: Where in the labor movement can a rank and file unionist find recourse against the violation of his elementary rights by an arbitrary union officialdom?

This is the seamen's story:

Between 1950 and 1956—days when a shadow hung over American democracy—hundreds of seamen lost their shipping papers and jobs under the U.S. Coast Guard's "screening" program. They had been accused, "tried," and convicted of suspicion of "disloyalty" under the murky procedures customary in those days when charges were never defined; witnesses, if any, never revealed; facts or fancy never disclosed; and verdicts protected by the mantle of "security." In those long years, victims sought redress where they could and at long last reached the courts. And they won! Six years of the fight for simple justice and in November, 1956, the 9th Circuit Court in California, throwing out a government appeal, directed the Coast Guard to issue validated Seamen's Documents to the men and the whole Coast Guard screening program went to pieces. It went to pieces legally, that is. But this is what actually happened.

SWEEPING VICTORY

The legal victory was so sweeping that even officials of the National Maritime Union were thrown off balance; but only for a moment. Under the first impact of the court decision, the NMU actually re-issued union books to some of the seamen; others were able, for a moment, to

ship out of union hiring halls. But it was only a temporary deviation from a long unbroken record; the officials soon reverted to type. And there went the great victory out the window. Here's how:

The Coast Guard had obeyed the court order but it issued special papers to its victims bearing a long telltale inscription: "VALIDATED: to be given same effect as all similar documents issued without. . . [Court] order." These documents became known as the "California" papers, an ironic reference to the federal court in California which had issued the order. So, there are now two kinds of papers: California papers which permit no discrimination; and regular papers which lead to no discrimination whatsoever. No one is discriminated against but some less than others.

NMU BLACKLIST

The officers of the NMU could take a hint. They decided that no man with California papers would be permitted to ship from the union's hiring hall. The text of the court order became a swift ticket to a blacklist. The NMU, then, is acting in clear defiance of the spirit

of the court's decision which gave recognition to elementary democracy.

But let us not imagine that pure arbitrariness rules. There is a place where seamen can appeal, a Permanent Appeals Board composed of three representatives of the union and three from the shipping companies.

The men duly made their appeal and each received the same stereotyped form reply, "the union has refused to register and ship this man because his loyalty to the U.S. has been questioned." No definite charges; no witnesses; no point by point indictment. We are back in 1950; the ghost of McCarthy looks on and smiles. The victimized seamen, after winning, so they thought, their six years' struggle, are now asked to prove that they are not disloyal. What is "disloyalty"; what are the charges? These were the questions they began with in 1950 and they end as they were.

BACK INTO COURT

Yesterday they went to court against the Coast Guard. Now, they must trudge back into court with the same case against new defendants: the union and

the shipping companies. Let us hope that it will not take another six years.

Meanwhile, the Seamen's Defense Committee Against Coast Guard Screening through its secretary, Lou Becker, announced its appeal to the Ethical Practices Committee. The seamen addressed a first letter to Al Hayes, chairman. He explained that his committee "does not handle grievances." Can that be? The EPC acted with alacrity when Congressional Committees made action against racketeers imperative. In a sense, the EPC does "handle grievances" when they come from Senators. Why not investigate complaints from union men?

Hayes promised to refer the seamen's letter to the NMU! It may be ludicrous but at least it is economical. Joe Curran, president of the NMU, chief inventor of its policy of circumventing the court decision, sits with Hayes on the EPC. Not even a three cent stamp will be needed. The next time the committee meets, Hayes in person can hand over the note. It can be done, say, when the committee convenes to discuss Ethical Practice Code No. 6 on Union Democratic Processes which contains this brief passage:

"Each member of a union should have the right to fair treatment in the application of union rules and laws. The general principles applicable to union disciplinary procedure is that such procedures should contain all the elements of fair play."

All the elements? Let us not be too demanding from cautious men. But how about one or two?

French SP Expels Andre Philip

By LUCIEN WEITZ

The veteran French Socialist André Philip, who publicly denounced the Mollet Government for its Algerian policy and the Suez adventure, has now been expelled from the French Socialist Party.

The expulsion came nine months after the publication of his book, *Le Socialisme Trahi* (Socialism Betrayed) which was reviewed in *Tribune* on July 28 last.

Our correspondent, Lucien Weitz, interviewed Philip at the Law faculty where he lectures. Philip said (Weitz's questions in bold face):

"It is the first time in history that a Socialist party has condemned someone on the basis of a book. I have been sentenced for the crime of thinking.

"Can anyone justify this on grounds of discipline when the offence is the expression of ideas? Until now, political actions against Party decisions have been treated as an offense."

Were you told the specific points on which your book offended?

"Oh, yes. There was a complaint about some expressions used to describe certain Party leaders: 'the internal collapse of Guy Mollet,' for example. But, above all, it was the conclusion I arrived at; and they took as pretext the fact that they had been published before the book, in *Express*.

"For the rest, the thesis of the book was not discussed. Party members were not invited to debate it. It all happened as if everything was being done to avoid shaking the conviction of party members that the party and its leaders could not be wrong."

What do you intend to do now?

"I shall ask for readmission, naturally . . . but without hope so long as the present situation persists in the party.

"The trouble that the Socialist Party is suffering from goes to the roots of the democratic ideal. The political instability that France is suffering from comes especially from the conception that has grown of what a party is.

"Everyone knows, that no party can obtain a majority and by itself, direct the Government. In these conditions, no one can keep his electoral promises and every Government can be only a Government of Compromise.

"So the voter knows in advance that his vote is wasted. In a coalition, each party takes power to prevent the others from acting. And the voters become more

The following article is re-printed from the independent British Labor weekly *Tribune* for February 21, 1958.

and more disinterested in politics and this is a grave threat to democracy."

What is your conception of a party?

It ought to be a widely-ranging group of individuals resolved to apply a programme. This presupposes discipline in action but the greatest possible freedom of thought. Such a party ought to permit the cohabitation, inside it, of a large number of groups devoted to thought and study."

Do you believe that this fight of yours has a chance of changing the attitude of the SFIO?

"It is impossible to prophecy. At all events, Socialism will not exist again in the party until such men as Lacoste and Mollet, who have dishonoured it, and are themselves dishonoured, are chased out. But it will not be enough to change individuals. It is the structure of the party that must be changed.

"The secretariat must become a simple administrative organ. The secretary should not be either a Deputy or a Minister. His role must be strictly not to impose his opinion, but to carry out the decisions of the leading bodies. The Executive must be a collective leadership.

READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM!

In six special pamphlet-issues of *LABOR ACTION*, the basic ideas of Independent Socialism are vividly and simply explained.

- No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism
- No. 4—Socialism and Democracy
- No. 5—What is Stalinism?
- No. 6—Socialism and the Working Class
- No. 7—Labor Politics in America
- No. 8—Revolt Behind the Iron Curtain

New York Independent Socialist Forum

Friday, March 28
SOCIALIST INTELLECTUALS OF THE DEBS ERA

Speaker: Bob Bone

Friday, April 11
RE-EXAMINATION of the SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

A Symposium:

Herman Benson, Assoc. Editor, LA
 Julius Falk, Managing Editor, NI
 J. Jacobi

Friday, April 18
THE ITU: A CASE STUDY IN TRADE UNION DEMOCRACY

Speaker: Emanuel Gellman
 Editorial Board, DISSENT

8:30 p.m. at L. A. Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

BOOKS AND IDEAS

Henry A. Kissinger's "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy"

The "Limited War" Theory

By SAM BOTTONE

NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND FOREIGN POLICY, by Henry A. Kissinger. Harper & Brothers, New York 1957. \$5.00.

In a time when the statesmen talk of total war, total diplomacy and consequently total destruction, a person who writes of limited war, limited diplomacy and consequently limited destruction seemingly offers a welcome respite. It was natural that a reaction would set in after the development of thermonuclear weapons, and after Washington announced the doctrine of "massive retaliation" as the deterrent to any possible Russian aggression. The idea of war employing the most destructive of weapons brought forth both moral and military arguments against the inherent cataclysmic consequences of such a war.

To the idea that the best and most effective means to deter wars through the threat to use weapons of maximum destructive force at times and places of Washington's own choosing, was counterposed the idea that the U.S. ought to have a more flexible policy. It was felt that since these weapons of maximum destructive power embody such cataclysmic consequences they could not justifiably be used except in the most clear and unambiguous circumstances. In practice, this meant that short of a justification for all-out war, the U.S. would be unwilling to commit its massive military power, since any use of these weapons meant all-out war.

U.S. Forced to Retreat

The net effect of such a policy has been that after threats to use massive retaliation, the U.S. has been forced to retreat since it could never justify the consequences of nuclear warfare over, say, Indochina. After all the bluff and bluster, the U.S. was regarded as a paper tiger after the Indochina fiasco. Therefore, the limited war advocates say, the U.S. must develop a military strategy suited to meet those situations of limited stakes and limited risks to make "unmistakable [our] ability and willingness to oppose force with force at whatever level of intensity may be required."

The leading study and exposition of the doctrine of limited war is in *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* by Henry A. Kissinger. Dr. Kissinger, the director of the Special Studies Project of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, authored the so-called Rockefeller Report, "International Security, The Military Aspect." In fact the Rockefeller Report is little else than a summarization of the book. Consequently even if the doctrine of limited war is not official Washington policy, it is the one held, to one extent or another by many high in administration circles.

The purpose of this study is a reassessment of U.S. foreign policy in light of the latest nuclear weapons. Although the emphasis is upon a military strategy, it does not deal merely with that. Broadly speaking, through the emphasis of military strategy, what Kissinger does it to define the crisis in U.S. policy in the cold war as a crisis in military strategy.

What is wrong with U.S. policy is that it has hinged upon an incorrect doctrine of "massive retaliation" which promised all-out war if it failed to deter war. Not only was this doctrine self-defeating but it enabled the Russians to seize the initiative in the cold war because the threat they posed was always less than necessary justify the unleashing of all-out nuclear war.

Kissinger charges that massive retaliation, far from being the most effective utilization of U.S. military might, in practice meant the renunciation of the use of force. His point is that the important problem is not primarily to build military power, but "to develop a climate of opinion and strategic doctrine which would make force meaningful. At the same time, we never tired of declaring that we would not use force except in resistance to aggression, and thereby removed any Soviet incentive for making concession on issues actually in dispute: the satellite orbit, German unification and, above all, international control of the atom. In short, our posture was

bellicose enough to lend color to Soviet peace offensives, but not sufficiently so to induce Soviet hesitations."

Without in any way changing the negotiation through military strength dogma that has paralyzed U.S. foreign policy, Kissinger proposed a new strategic doctrine: one designed to meet the challenge of less than maximum threats; and more importantly designed to utilize U.S. military power as an active part of a tougher diplomacy.

Posed in this way, the limited war doctrine represents the institutionalization of the military orientation of American foreign policy. It does not reject the fundamentally wrong idea that the Stalinist threat is a military threat. Instead it wishes to emphasize that "an all-out attack is the least likely form of Soviet strategy, either politically or militarily. Yet this is the kind of conflict for which our military and strategic doctrine best prepares us." In turn Kissinger develops a new military doctrine for meeting the more likely, but limited attack.

Military Orientation

The limited War doctrine possesses deceptive reasonableness. It recognizes that the horror of all-out nuclear war is a sword of Damocles over civilization; that it undermines the will on the part of America's junior partners to arm since their contributions will count little in an all-out war; that the announcement of "massive retaliation" has cost the U.S. heavily in political terms; that, in general, it doesn't meet the challenge of the real threat. But behind the seeming reasonableness lies a more pernicious doctrine.

First it must be recognized that limited war often embodies two different ideas. It has sometimes been interpreted to mean emphasis upon conventional weapons to the exclusion of anything over atomic artillery in size. But more specifically, as used in the military sense and by Kissinger, it means limited atomic war. Inherent in the concept is the idea that atomic weapons of less than megaton size should be part of the limited war arsenal, and that the U.S. must be prepared to use them as part of this alternative strategy of deterrence.

However the distinctiveness of the new doctrine does not only reside in the size of weapons used. Kissinger defines it as a war whose "outcome does not involve or seem to involve national survival." And since it does not involve national survival, there can be no justification for a strategy based on weapons whose use could only be justified in those terms, if they can be justified at all.

But the question arises: whose national survival? It may very well be that the national survival of neither Russia or the U.S. would be endangered by a limited atomic war fought out over Indochina or even Western Europe. Approached from the point of view of the nations who will become an atomic wasteland, it has all the essentials of a war for national survival. Consequently it boils down to a doctrine which states that an agreement should be reached between the two great nuclear powers to protect their mainlands so that, if there is to be a war, it would be a nuclear war fought on European or Asiatic soil. Such a doctrine, once clearly understood, can have only a limited political appeal in Europe or Asia.

Will Kremlin Play?

But there is no guaranteeing that the Kremlin will agree to this tacit arrangement. Quite the contrary, for the past two years Russian policy has been to deny the very possibility of limited war. Instead they have gone to great lengths in a kind of diplomatic nuclear blackmail to point out the inherent necessity of any localized action developing into an all-out war.

The interest in Kissinger's presentation of the case for a limited war strategy is that he attempts to place the rationale in a historical and political framework. From it we get a little better understanding of the reasoning bolstering the military fixation of U.S. foreign policy.

For Kissinger, the starting point of assessment of foreign policy is that it has to proceed from the new facts of the revolutionary nature of this age rather than the old lessons of the past. There is now a revolution in technology and a revolution in society going on. In fact there "never have been so many revolutions occurring simultaneously" — political, ideological, economic and social. On top of this there is the Russian-Chinese bloc

which seeks to dominate these revolutionary forces, and prevent the establishment of a new equilibrium.

The problem facing the U.S. in this revolutionary age after pointing out that "to be sure, the contemporary revolution cannot be managed by force alone, it requires a consistent and bold program to identify ourselves with the aspiration of humanity" is:

"As a *status quo* power, the basic strategic problem for the U.S. is to be clear about what strategic transformations we are prepared to resist."

Resist Revolutionary Changes

It turns out that the U.S. should prepare to resist revolutionary changes because they are under the control by Russia, or the unrest created can be utilized to undermine Western power. Time and time again Kissinger identifies the U.S. with the powers of the *status quo* and Russia and China with the revolutionary upsurge of this age. And basically he is arguing that the U.S. should abandon the legalistic approach and the aversion to the use of force which may have been all right for a non-revolutionary period, and adopt the techniques of revolutionary dynamic in order to defend the *status quo*.

This in turn leads to a criticism of foreign policy as well as military strategy. He raises the \$64,000 mystery which haunts U.S. policy makers and liberals. How come "the power which has added 120 million people to its orbit by force has become the champion of anti-colonialism. The state which has utilized tens of millions of slave laborers as an integral part of its economic system appears as the champion of human dignity in many parts of the world?"

Kissinger's answer is that the U.S. has failed to reduce the complex legalisms prepared for conferences to their symbolic terms since legalisms move no one in a revolutionary age. All of this is true of course. But the problem is why this failure? How, for example, would the "legalism" of the U.S. straddling position on Algeria be reduced to simple terms in order to appear as the champion of anti-colonialism in North Africa?

Whatever objection there may be conceptually to the assumption that limited nuclear wars will not turn into all-out wars, one thing must be clear: far from being a saner, more political-oriented and less dangerous policy, it can only become operative under a more bellicose and military-oriented foreign policy. It exacerbates many of the worst tendencies rather than leading away from them.

The objection the limited war strategists raise to the massive retaliation approach is not fundamentally that it threatens the world with catastrophe, but that it precludes the most effective use of U.S. military power and thereby encourages the ambiguous and less than all-out aggressions on the part of the Russian-Chinese bloc. Instead they emphasize that the U.S. should (1) announce that it intends to localize any possible conflict, and (2) that it would not hesitate to become involved in such local conflicts using weapons of less than maximum destructiveness, presumably because they could be more easily justified before world public opinion. We can see the reason why the Russians have announced their intention not to limit any such conflict and why they threatened England with missile attacks at the time of the Suez aggression.

Open Pandora's Box

The application of this "revolutionary" doctrine for a revolutionary age is not to be confined to open attack, but precisely to those situations of ambiguity where what is involved is a political struggle to upset the balance of power, to the "concealed wars," "subversion of governments," "non-overt aggressions" and "transformations, which are made to appear, insofar as is possible, as not aggression at all."

After duly noting that "to engage in nuclear war without a prayerful awareness of its consequences is to open a Pandora's box," Kissinger proceeds with the logic of the doctrine.

"We are certain to be confronted with situations of extraordinary ambiguity, such as civil wars or domestic coups. Each successive Soviet move is designed to make our moral position that much more difficult: Indochina was more ambiguous than Korea; the Soviet arms deal with Egypt more ambiguous than Indochina; the Middle East crisis more ambiguous than the arms deal with Egypt. There can be no doubt that we should seek to forestall such occurrences. But once they have occurred, we must find the will to act and to run risks in a situation which permits only a choice among evils. While we should never give up our principles [presumably never to commit aggression], we must also realize that we cannot maintain our principles unless we survive." (Italics added)

The choice between this and the Dulles-Acheson approach is meager. Both seek to meet the problems of a revolutionary age through a military strategy for the defense of the *status quo*. Both approach Stalinism as if it were a military threat, and not a political and economic phenomenon to be met by more democratic policies.

The strategy of limited war is not an answer to this challenge but only a new application of the same approach that has brought the Western alliance into its perpetual state of crisis.

Recession and Auto

(Continued from page 1)

Party in Michigan is reflected in the simple fact that as of the moment they have not been able to find a single candidate for opposition to Governor G. Mennen Williams who, of course, is campaigning vigorously against the "Hoover depression."

The fact that the whole excise tax question has to come up for review when the law expires June 30 has given Walter Reuther a new angle for putting pressure on the companies, for without his continued support for the removal of that tax the auto industry sees no way of cutting prices without drastic loss in profit, which they don't want. This is not the least of the reasons why there is suddenly a volume of journalistic prediction that there will not be an auto strike this year.

Under the pressure of the reduced car sales, Chrysler Corporation, which is losing more than its traditional share of the market again, continues to drive

hard for improved work standards in spite of the face-saving agreement which L. L. Colbert reached with Walter Reuther and which served only as a guidepost to settling speed-up problems rather than settling the problems themselves. The pressure in General Motors and Ford shops along the same lines has placed into the forefront the importance of working conditions as the number one interest and demand of the UAW in the forthcoming negotiations.

Along with this, the second big factor that can no longer be kept in the background as it was at the recent UAW special convention, is the problem of jobs, that is, the overpowering impact of unemployment.

During this past week General Motors called together the press and outlined its viewpoint on the question of productivity among auto workers and it is clear that General Motors intends to make, from its point of view, the works standard fight the number one issue in negotiations.

Jack Crellin, labor reporter for the Detroit Times, last week scored an important scoop when he told the story of a two-day meeting between Harlowe Curtice, Henry Ford and Tex Colbert in which the problem of a united front and united negotiations were discussed. At the insistence of General Motors a united front was rejected. While this does not seem to make sense at first glance, there actually is much wisdom in General Motor's insistence on going it alone against the UAW.

What General Motors actually did was to inform Chrysler and Ford what they were going to give in terms of a contract to the UAW in forthcoming negotiations. The job of Ford and Chrysler will be simply to postpone making any agreement with the UAW until the General Motors pact is signed. Ford and Chrysler may rest assured that this year General Motors is going to bitterly resist giving any package to the UAW which would be startling or costly or upset the balance in the auto industry.

It is an open secret in auto industry and union circles now that the UAW has no intention of calling a strike or having a major struggle if it can possibly avoid it. It is not excluded that simply a renewal of the current contracts, with their annual improvement factor of a 6 cents increase for another year will be the strategy of the UAW.

Recently the UAW had an unpublicized experience in Missouri that may not have had the national impact of the Kohler strike but certainly is a sign of the times. The UAW had demanded a 13 cent raise at a plant in Missouri and the corporation offered 8 cents. The union went on strike rather than accept the company's proposal. Eight weeks later the company announced it was going to reopen its plant and the UAW quickly called a meeting, called off the strike and its employees went back to work without any raise whatsoever. The estimate of the local situation was that if they had not done this the UAW might have faced another Kohler situation.

JOY RIDE OVER

In reviewing the past six months it is difficult to believe that both the auto industry and the UAW could have been as far wrong in their understanding of the American economy as events proved them to be. In both cases it was a belief in the wonders of American capitalism and its functioning that threw them off guard. It was only four months ago that Walter Reuther proposed that auto manufacturers cut their car prices \$100, as if that drop in the rainstorm might have made any consequential difference in the downturn of the economy, including the auto sector.

Politics and Recession

(Continued from page 1)

depth of developments may prove to be, there can be little question but that the political tides which have been rolling in against them for so long are beginning to turn the other way. But the opportunities which this will create for them will not be realized automatically. Socialists must actively participate in the struggles for the immediate demands of the unemployed; in devising practical proposals for the involvement of the trade unions on the local, city and State levels in getting maximum relief for needy families, and so forth.

In this situation, there are two dangers which the socialists will have to overcome. One is the inertia of the long-established habits of the "holding operation" of the past decade. And the other is the tendency to think that "socialism" or "radicalism" consists in finding out what the labor movement and the liberals are proposing in the way of anti-recession or unemployment-relief measures, and doubling or quadrupling it.

It is quite true that from a humanitarian point of view, or from the standpoint of pure reason it is infuriating and even almost unbearable to contemplate the absolutely senseless and immoral misery which unemployment, poverty and insecurity inflict and will increasingly

What is finally becoming accepted by both the auto industry and the UAW is that the great post-war joy ride is over. The auto industry has indicated by the kind of tool and die orders they are giving for the 1950 models that it has come to the realization that they will do well next year, even if there is a recovery of the economy, to sell a maximum of 5 million cars. For the UAW this means that between 250,000 to 300,000 auto workers will be permanently unemployed. In Michigan alone 200,000 workers, mainly from auto and auto parts plants are expected to be unemployed even if the business recession ends. Thus the pressure is mounting on the UAW leadership to have a program which takes into account directly the needs of the unemployed as well as the employed auto workers. In the context of these circumstances the issue of the shorter work week without a decrease in pay keeps returning, while a profit-sharing plan which Reuther recently announced seems to be fading increasingly into the background.

These economic and political events have forced the UAW leaders and ranks to re-examine themselves and take a more critical look than they have in many years. The Kohler hearings in Washington have served to remind many UAW unionists that peace and living together with management is not so easy or beneficial as seemed for such a long time. The UAW is being forced to fight back vigorously against the continued onslaught directed at its members, its reputation and its organization.

EASY PROBLEMS

The problems with which the UAW has had to wrestle during the years of prosperity and boom were relatively easy compared to the ones it faces now. The leadership's programs went over, even without much participation of the ranks in their planning or execution. "Leave it to Walter" tended increasingly to become the attitude of a large section of the ranks and the leadership at all levels.

Now the UAW, like the rest of the labor movement, is faced with a new crisis. In spite of its traditions, history and effort to remain in the forefront of the American labor movement, the answers which appeared adequate just a few months ago cannot meet the problems which now confront the workers it represents and the American working class as a whole.

This may be the beginning of a whole new period of re-thinking and re-evaluation of program, policies and leadership in the union movement. And past history certainly gives every reason for confidence that, though the UAW may be a little slow in getting started in this crisis, its response will eventually be adequate to the challenge. Certainly unionism-as-usual is as dead as the dodo in the auto industry.



Berkeley Campus Politics

(Continued from page 4)

in the spring elections. How significant this will be as an attempt to arouse liberal student opinion and gain a voice for it in the student government cannot now be estimated very closely for reasons both external and internal to SLATE.

The party has the problem of organizing the support of isolated and apathetic students. Most of the students to whom SLATE must turn for support either do not live in organized living groups or live in houses which have largely been indifferent to campus elections for some years. While this indifference reflects in part an attitude rather common throughout the country, it also reflects the fact that sororities and fraternities have no similar problem of organization and have had for some time virtually unchallenged access to student government and administration.

Should SLATE be successful in electing a majority of its candidates, the situation presents still another problem. All the powers of the student government are derived from the university administration and if the elected SLATE candidates would push vigorously for the type of policy they represent, they would stand a good chance of being stymied by the administration on a number of issues.

The future of SLATE is also somewhat ambiguous because of rather serious differences within the group as to its nature and role.

An important cleavage centers around the question of primary goals. A majority at the convention decided that the party should be primarily 'action-oriented,' i.e. that SLATE should aim at electing as many of its candidates as quickly as possible so it can then effect liberal student policies. A minority argued that their chief concern should be the development and extension of freedom on the campus and that politically this meant a long-term educational process developing genuine consent of the governed.

This difference resulted in a consider-

able debate over the kind of internal structure SLATE should adopt which was ultimately a kind of debate over efficiency vs. internal democracy; although, of course, each side claimed both. The majority voted for authority to be vested in the convention with the coordinating committee, elected by that body, to be the active but administrative agent between assembly meetings. The minority argued for a structure which would rest on the institutionalized representation of different views in caucuses and on the continuing participation of all members in policy-making through these caucuses. Although this controversy was temporarily resolved at the convention with the adoption of the majority convention-coordinating committee plan and the election of two representatives of the minority faction to the nine-man coordinating committee, some sort of conflict of this kind seems likely to continue.

It would appear that a balance between these two positions can and should be struck. While many of the ideas of the minority about the need for internal democracy and for building an independent and on-going liberal student opinion are valid, it is important to remember that this opinion must find expression in student government if the policies advocated are in fact to be effected. It is equally important for SLATE to bear in mind that over-emphasis on electoral success is apt to result either in the subordination of principles to a superficial expediency or, since it seems rather unrealistic to expect any widespread and well-rooted liberal tradition to be developed and capped with success at the polls in the course of one semester, in early and perhaps crippling disappointment.

Whatever the specific future of SLATE, the prospects for liberal activities at CAL seem a good deal more promising than they have for a long time. Members of SLATE are to be congratulated for demonstrating a political vitality and seriousness somewhat rare in this era of the so-called 'silent generation.'

Norman Thomas Speaks

(Continued from page 4)

replied that it was possible to turn national spending into an expanded Public Works program rather than the continued production of weapons. This response brought a sustained round of applause from this audience despite the fact that many of their jobs depend on military spending.

The second point dealt with immediate adoption of the policy of disengagement; a phased withdrawal from Central Europe, a modus vivendi in the Middle

East in which both the United States and Russia agreed to keep out of all but economic aid programs, and an immediate refusal to make commitments to dubious rulers and imperialist nations. This would mean stoppage of arms to France, withdrawal of support to Spain, as well as seeing that Okinawa did not become a United States Cyprus.

Thomas concluded his talk with an appeal to the students in the audience to find a new way through the atomic age so that there might be a future to which to look forward.

We Need Your \$\$\$

The facts of life for LABOR ACTION readers are: The maintenance of LA depends entirely on your contributions to the Fund Drive. We have no angel. Make out checks to Albert Gates and send them in.