

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 19, 1951

FIVE CENTS

Myth of Party-Machine Invincibility Smashed—

Halley N.Y. Victory Shows A Labor Party Can Win!

By MARY BELL

NEW YORK, Nov. 12—The election of Rudolph Halley as president of the City Council last week was a victory of startling proportions for the Liberal Party and a stunning blow to the Democratic machine.

In spite of a low registration of voters (1,909,016 or 453,732 less than four years ago) which was supposed to favor the machine candidates, in spite of the fact that it was an off-year election, in spite of the absence of a genuine fusion campaign, sought but not won by the Liberal Party heads when Halley's candidacy was first announced, in spite of the combined opposition of Republicans and Democrats and in spite of the injection of religious bias into the campaign, the Liberal Party candidate won by a margin anticipated nowhere, least of all by the boys in the backrooms.

The voters gave 657,158 to Halley, 493,366 to Tammany's Joseph T. Sharkey, and 435,744 to Republican Henry Latham. The American Labor Party (Stalinist) candidate, Clifford T. McAvoy, got 104,166, while the Socialist Workers Party candidate, Michael Bartell, received 3,700.

NO REAL FUSION

The most outstanding fact in the election is Halley's 163,492 plurality over Sharkey. The Liberal Party candidate polled nearly 100,000 more votes on the Liberal line alone than Sharkey received on the Democratic line.

Halley received only 54,737 votes on the Independent Party line and 21,392 on the City Fusion Party line. Thus the fusion was not real and certainly neither decisive nor necessary to the victory. The successive elections of the Fusion candidate La Guardia, to which the present instance is being compared, always assured the late mayor of the Republican support. It was not required in this campaign. The voters were not afraid of the Liberal Party label.

With the Republican candidate, Latham, carrying Queens and Staten Island, the Liberal Party candidate beat out the Democratic machine in the Bronx, Brooklyn and Man-

hattan. Tammany did not carry a single borough.

As a result of this first timid and reluctant sortie of the Liberal Party into independent politics—this is the first time they have run an important candidate independently—the Liberal Party has emerged in this election as the first party in the city. Halley is now being groomed for the 1952 mayoralty campaign. It could not be otherwise, given the results of the elections.

The importance of the Liberal Party vote in shattering the myth of the invincibility of the machines is the most significant thing that happened in this election. Typical of the reaction is

the following comment by Warren Moscow, N. Y. Times political writer:

"The victory of Rudolph Halley in last Tuesday's election buried, probably for all time, the myth of party-organization strength in New York City. When both major parties go gunning for a minor-party nominee under conditions technically tailored to their advantage and wind up floundering in his wake, no further proof is needed."

WHAT IT MEANS

There is no doubt that the Halley campaign reflected the disgust of the electorate with both the Democratic and Republican parties and the desire for a change. While the lamentable Mayor Impellitteri, who was elected last year, had bolted Tammany, he ran as an independent Democrat. The candidacy of Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. had been given Liberal Party backing as the result of a schism within the Democratic Party; Roosevelt remained an independent Democratic candidate. Halley's candidacy differs from these; he ran initially and primarily as a Liberal Party candidate, independent Democrat though he proclaimed himself.

There are undoubtedly other important factors that caused Halley to be elected: the glamor of television and the sensation of the Kefauver hearings which shocked the public conscience and incriminated both the old machines. But it cannot be controverted that it was a third, minor-

(Continued on page 7)

The Apostasy of the Liberals: The Test of the Egyptian Crisis

... page 6

Cooking Up the Middle East Pact

... page 3

Election Scandal at Brooklyn College

... page 8

CIO War on Pay Freeze Strains Truman Alliance

By WALTER JASON

NEW YORK, Nov. 10—The main value of the 13th annual convention of the CIO was to serve as a preview of the coming turbulent days ahead for the industrial union movement, in which it bids fair to be engaged in an intense fight with its closest political ally, the Truman administration, over the wage freeze.

The heart of the CIO position was expressed candidly by President Philip Murray in his remarks on the wage policy resolution. He said:

"You can't stabilize prices and you cannot stabilize wages unless the government of the United States attempts an all-out control. And that evidently is not in the offing."

"Mr. Johnston, in the course of his address to the convention yesterday, stated quite frankly that what he intended to do was freeze wages. Wages cannot be frozen without controlling profits and absolutely freezing prices."

Although the printed daily

proceedings do not show it, Murray also declared, "There is no free collective bargaining in America today." He also accused the government of "holding a bludgeon over the heads of labor."

ANOTHER PRICE BOOST

He warned: "The working population of the United States is in no mood to accept a one-sided discriminatory system of regulation that operates only against those who work and work hard for a living."

A dispatch in the New York Herald Tribune on Friday, November 9, served to emphasize this point, by listing all the wildcat strikes that have already taken place in recent months in the steel industry.

The announcement by Michael DiSalle on November 9 that price increases for nearly one fourth of all manufactured products were allowed that day also points up the crisis for the union movement in terms of its declining standard of living under the present wage freeze.

The brief report of Emil Rieve, CIO member of the Wage Stabilization Board, on the attitude of the so-called public members as well as the industry members of the board against the CIO demands, likewise illustrated the increasing difficulties which the CIO is having with its present po-

(Continued on page 2)

CIO Blasts Smith Act and CP Arrests

On the rights of political minorities, the CIO convention finally took up the matter of the conviction and imprisonment of the Stalinists under the Smith law. To be sure, the action comes a little late, but nevertheless it is a very significant step forward for the CIO, and it does place a major segment of the American union movement against the "legal" witchhunt of recent times.

The key section of the resolution reads:

"The Supreme Court's decision upholding the conviction of the Communist leaders was a grave blow to America's precious heritage of freedom of speech. We detest the men who were convicted under the Smith Act and we despise the ideas they spew forth, but the conviction and imprisonment not for conspiring or attempting to overthrow the government by violence, but solely for conspiring to 'teach and advocate' the 'propriety' of such overthrow, is a threat to the free speech of all men. We urge the vigorous prosecution of acts of espionage and sabotage, but insist that the prosecution of men for advocacy of ideas, however repulsive, does not benefit the cause of freedom. Communist ideas never win out in the market place of thought in a vigorous democracy."

The resolution also blasted McCarthyism and the MacCarran committee, and it urged the review and revision of both the Smith Act and the Subversive Activities Control Act. It called for the expulsion of Senator McCarthy from the Senate.

This resolution is the first official occasion on which the CIO has protested the imprisonment of the Stalinists. It ends a period, of silence on civil liberties which was not the least factor in the unbridled witchhunting in Washington and the nation.

It ends the alibi of those CIO unionists who said privately, if not publicly: "Why should we bother with the Stalinists? The court's found them guilty. That settles it." At least in the UAW-CIO, this line may not be used as frequently.

In other important issues, vital to the union movement, the CIO adopted resolutions which clearly stand far superior to those emanating from the recent AFL convention.

On the Negro question, the CIO called for an immediate proclamation by President Harry S. Truman, issuing an executive order for the establishment of an FEPC Commission with enforcement powers.

The third important resolution was a blast at racketeering and a constitutional provision for eliminating racketeers who take over in local unions or elsewhere in the CIO. This stands in the sharpest contrast to the AFL convention, whose leadership for years has tolerated and ignored the racketeer problem in some AFL unions.

HOLD THAT DATE!

It's November 24 and the ISL is holding its Thanksgiving Social—see ad on page 2

CIO CONVENTION SIDELIGHTS

There was only one speaker at the CIO convention who obtained the attention of the nearly 600 delegates. That man was Philip Murray, CIO president.

During the speech-making on the civil-rights question, Walter P. Reuther, UAW president, gave a brilliant analysis of the Negro problem to which the reporters listened closely. As for the delegates, they forced Reuther to speak at the top of his voice to keep ahead of the murmurs and whispering.

DIVISION OF LABOR

Best convention story, in our opinion, concerns the solemn statement of a Steel Workers' representative who was explaining how the Steel Workers' union operates.

"We have two types of meetings, conferences and conventions. At our conferences, we have discussion and no action. At our conventions we have action—and no discussion."

And the tragedy of the CIO movement is that this kind of stamp is rapidly marking its organizations.

SENSITIVE AREA

An interesting question at this convention was: Did Victor Riesel make up his story that the CIO was prepared to pass a resolution endorsing the Truman appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican, or did he fall for a tip given him by persons in the CIO leadership who feared such a prospect might occur in view of the pleasant relationship between Cardinal Spellman and Philip Murray?

In any event, there seems to be sensitivity on the delicate matter of the "Catholic bloc" in the CIO leadership.

NO NAMES, PLEASE

There was debate on one subject at this convention. The CIO Utility Workers, thanking President Murray for giving them the right to speak for their principles, made speeches against the traditional views of the CIO on public power.

Without mentioning names, the Utility Workers' spokesmen said, "Certain people in the union movement, as well as in the government, want government control of industry, and we are

against it." One delegate did suggest in brief reply that this sounded too much like the big utility corporation advertisements, but the real people against whom these criticisms were made—the ex-socialist bloc—kept a discreet silence. The Utility Worker spokesman insisted he was NOT referring to men "like President Murray, Alan Haywood, or Jim Carey."

HALLEY

There was considerable jubilation among many delegates at the victory of Halley in New York City. "Shows hope for the future," was a typical comment. Of course, the CIO delegates forgot to mention that the CIO, including the UAW-CIO, opposed the candidacy of Halley.

The one New York political figure who spoke at the CIO convention, presented as an illustrious son of a great father, Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., also supported the Tammany-backed candidate, Joseph Sharkey, in the New York municipal election for council president.

END-OF A HOPE

One of the pet dreams of some CIO leaders was the hope that General Dwight Eisenhower would take the Democratic Party nomination, and thus "provide labor with a victorious candidate in the 1952 elections." Arthur Krock's column on Thursday, explaining that Eisenhower refused such an offer from President Truman, spoils that hope. It also speaks for the CIO leaders like Walter Reuther who were enthusiastic for Eisenhower in 1948. Eisenhower turned down the Truman offer because he was for the Taft-Hartley Law, and against the Fair Deal aspects of Truman's verbal professions and the planks of the Democratic Party.

ON EISENHOWER

Emil Mazey left no doubt where he stood on the possible candidacy of Eisenhower for president: "I find nothing in his record that would indicate that he is an acceptable candidate as far as organized labor is concerned. . . . You will recall that some time ago he pooh-poohed the idea of the importance of social security and the necessity of pensions

and he thought we were pampering people by trying to provide for them when they reached the age where they were too old to work and too young to die. That is the only basic social question that the general has ever committed himself on. I say to people looking for a sure winner, let's make certain we don't buy a pig in a poke and that we don't try to elect a person who has not demonstrated in a single manner his fitness for the top position in this country of ours." After hearing his speech, both Emil Rieve and Joseph Curran said they agreed.

Times have changed since 1948 when the labor leaders were stumbling all over themselves looking for a man to supplant Truman as Democratic nominee—and turned up none other than Eisenhower. And today their Fair Deal paladin Truman offers to turn the presidency over to the man Mazey was talking about, according to Arthur Krock. . . .

CIO AND CICERO

Among the brief speeches during the resolution on civil liberties and discrimination, Delegate Townsend, one of the few top CIO leaders who is a Negro, bluntly pointed out that "part of our own membership was involved in the Cicero riots, because part of our secondary leaders haven't the courage to take this issue up." President Murray also made a brief comment on this. Neither mentioned the fact that this area of Chicago had many of the Steel Workers' union members.

RAPE

The burning preoccupation of the CIO delegates with the wage question was shown every day, when no matter what subject was discussed this issue arose. President Murray, in accepting his re-election, again spoke indignantly on the "rape of the American people," by congressional action.

IN THAT ORDER

Perhaps the clearest expression of the philosophy of CIO President Murray was made in his opening remarks: "A man must stand for God, Country, Home and Trade Union, in that order." We wonder how this jibes with the philosophy of other top CIO leaders?

Incident in France: Reuther Tells a Story

The resolution and "discussion" at the CIO convention on foreign policy was in the main a routine endorsement of the Truman administration's cold-war policies. The only slightly different note struck was in the short speech by Victor Reuther, the CIO's European representative.

The official resolution was critical of U. S. policy at only two points—on Franco and on the degree of involvement of labor men in the foreign-affairs programs. As noted elsewhere in this issue, the section on Franco avoided any direct criticism of Truman. In truth, the CIO—and the American labor movement in general—has shamefully failed to work out any distinctive foreign policy of its own, preferring to vote its enthusiastic hallelujahs for the White House line.

AMERICAN ORDERS

If Victor Reuther's speech departed from the rut, it was by putting before the delegates a small slice of the reality of U. S. foreign policy as seen from Europe. Reuther reported at one point:

"Let me cite a few examples of the kind of problems we are running up against. South of Paris a little ways is a little industrial town called Chateroux. There is an aircraft factory there and the authorities naturally were concerned with building up the rearmament program and needed that plant for the production of war materials, and they took over the plant and designated the French Air Force officials as the agency responsible for handling labor relations.

"Now in a country where the largest single bloc in the trade-union movement is under Communist control and where the Communist Party gets five million votes, your colonels and generals understand military matters but not labor relations. They don't understand how to really fight Communists. They post a notice in the factory saying from this day on the Comité d'Entreprise, the work council, the shop committee elected by all the workers in the plant, is dismissed, wiped out, every member of the shop committee is discharged.

"And in this cute little announcement is a phrase which has certainly done nothing to contribute to the friendly relations between the people of France and America. There was a statement that this order was being carried out on the instructions of the American authorities for security reasons.

"Well, of course, you wouldn't let the management deal with the Communist problem by arbitrarily firing shop-committee members. We will take care of the Communist problem as trade-unionists by strengthening our own free trade-union forces and by launching the only kind of constructive and positive trade-union program that reveals itself in bread-and-butter terms, that kind of program of demagogic Communism or demagogic Fascism is not a subject for and makes no comparable appeal. If there was no strong Communist influence in that plant it certainly got a big helping hand by that kind of policy approach to the Communist problem."

Everyone knows that the power of Britain and France is waning fast in this area. At one time, they were in a position to buy and sell the governments and armies there, or if the price was set too high by some ruler, to undertake a little "police action" which would soon quell the "disturbance."

But those happy days are gone. Even the corrupt rulers have come to understand that more can be gained from independence than from bribes, and in any event the rising national feeling of their subjects makes it impossible for them to sell their national resources and independence to the highest bidder.

TRICKLE-DOWN

At another point, after noting that "we have given our blessing to the Marshall Plan," he added: "But you know what, the only place where the benefits of the Marshall Plan have really trickled down to the boys at the grass-roots level, where the benefits of the Marshall Plan reveal themselves significantly in terms of higher living standards, the only place that has occurred is in those countries where the free trade-union organizations are not only strong in the factories, mines and mills, but influential politically in the councils of the government."

In this he contrasted Britain and the Scandinavian countries favorably as against France and Italy. He did not, of course, refer to the well-known effects of the Atlantic Pact's rearmament program on the "fair shares" policy of the British labor government and on the British workers' standard of living; but the degree of difference that does exist might have been food for thought for those delegates who opposed independent political action by labor in this country.

This points to one of the features which makes the proposed Middle East Command not only the most peculiar military organization in existence but perhaps of all time.

For in this area there is one delicate problem which the wise framers of the proposal for the Middle East Command have not been able to wish away. Although "outside aggressors" (read: Russia) are not at the moment pounding at the gates of the Middle East, there is in fact a "war" going on among countries "territorially in the area," namely the Arab states against Israel. Although this war is not, at the moment, being fought with guns, it is one which has never been declared at an end and which has not been terminated by any peace agreement.

Further, each side in this war is convinced that the other is interested in reopening it as soon as it is in the military position to hope for a victory. That is, each

Mid-East Pact Cooked Up For Western Domination

By GORDON HASKELL

Our world is witness to the development of some very peculiar political-military structures. But of all of these, there is little doubt that the proposed Middle East Command is one of the strangest yet to be seen.

Everyone knows that the power of Britain and France is waning fast in this area. At one time, they were in a position to buy and sell the governments and armies there, or if the price was set too high by some ruler, to undertake a little "police action" which would soon quell the "disturbance."

But those happy days are gone. Even the corrupt rulers have come to understand that more can be gained from independence than from bribes, and in any event the rising national feeling of their subjects makes it impossible for them to sell their national resources and independence to the highest bidder.

But neither Britain nor France have the strength or the will to "police" the area in the old way. The American government is loath to take on itself the onus for stepping into the military boots of the old imperialist powers.

And thus a wonderful new idea has been born: to set up a non-national, more or less international Middle East Command to which all the governments in the area may contribute forces. In addition states "not territorially in the area" (presumably only economically, politically and militarily there) will also be able to participate.

WHICH WAR?

The purpose of the command is to be, the official announcement of its creation states, to defend the area from "outside aggression." But while doing this, it is not to interfere in any way with any aggression by one or more states inside the area against each other.

This points to one of the features which makes the proposed Middle East Command not only the most peculiar military organization in existence but perhaps of all time.

For in this area there is one delicate problem which the wise framers of the proposal for the Middle East Command have not been able to wish away. Although "outside aggressors" (read: Russia) are not at the moment pounding at the gates of the Middle East, there is in fact a "war" going on among countries "territorially in the area," namely the Arab states against Israel. Although this war is not, at the moment, being fought with guns, it is one which has never been declared at an end and which has not been terminated by any peace agreement.

Further, each side in this war is convinced that the other is interested in reopening it as soon as it is in the military position to hope for a victory. That is, each

side is convinced that if the other gets enough arms they will be used inside the area, and not at all against any "outside aggressor." And thus each side is very much opposed to the other side being armed, for whatever supposed purpose.

THE REAL PLAN

That is quite a problem. And although there is no reason to have too much respect for the intelligence of statesmen or generals who have cooked up this proposal, there is also insufficient evidence to believe them to be clinically unbalanced.

Thus one must conclude that although the proposal is worded for diplomatic purposes in such a way as to invite the participation of the states "territorially in the area," actually what is PLANNED is to organize an army, navy and air force dominated chiefly by people who come from other parts of the world.

The Middle East Command is actually going to be set up by the governments of the United States, Britain, France and Turkey. Three other prominent "Middle Eastern" countries—Australia, New Zealand and South Africa—have already signified their inten-

tion of joining in. This is no doubt a clear example of the principle of "regional defense" as set forth in the official statement setting up the Command, which reads: "it is incumbent upon states of any area to be willing and able to undertake the initial defense of their area."

Once the Middle East Command is set up by these powers, a military force will exist in the area which is completely independent of the will of either the governments or peoples who happen to live there. Perhaps the idea is that if and when the menace of a Russian military attack becomes sufficiently clear, the governments of the Middle East will be forced to give up their present internal struggle and unite against the common danger. Then they will have a military organization and a nucleus of military force in being around which to rally.

But in the meantime, they are being given a good practical example of what the West means by "defense of their area" by the British, who are so successfully defending the Suez Canal Zone from the Egyptians. The only question one might ask is: Who is the outside aggressor?

Westinghouse Tries Out 'Bell Pattern' in Buffalo

BUFFALO, Nov. 10.—In its seventh week, the strike of the 5,000-member Local 1581 of the CIO Electrical Workers Union (IUE) against the Buffalo Motor and Control Division of the Westinghouse Electric Corporation has defeated all company efforts to manufacture a back-to-work movement. Both Local 1581 and the Niagara Frontier CIO are digging in for any siege which management may try to further impose upon the strikers from here on in.

The strike issues, as defined by the International Executive Board of the IUE, include: defeat of the company attempt to end plant-wide seniority through the substitution of a "job family unit" system for the system in force for the past four years; defeat of a company attempt to misuse a three-day off penalty supposedly devised to discipline "wildcat strikers"; return to work of an unjustly discharged second-shift departmental steward; and a demand that the company sit down and negotiate a fair and workable daily grievance handling procedure.

Fund-raising efforts on the part of the top officialdom of the CIO, area internationals, IUE New York State District 3 and nation-

ally by the IUE-CIO Board have enabled the strikers to compete with the corporation's expensive propaganda drive. The company has taken large display ads in all local newspapers twice a week, mailed copies of the advertisements to workers' homes, as well as personal letters from the plant manager, on an average of once a week.

TRIES BELL PATTERN

Local 1581 has replied to these constant attacks by securing 33 highway and city billboards throughout the area to tell its side of the story, as well as taking half-page ads in the newspapers, mailing to workers' homes, circulating leaflets in workers' shopping districts on shopping nights, in addition to leaflets circulated by area CIO unions to their own membership.

From the opening day of the strike, local management proclaimed that the gates were open for its employees to come to work; and by its unremitting and vicious attacks upon the union has shown that it has no genuine desire to settle the issues but instead is aiming to break Local 1581.

It ordered its foremen from all three shifts to cross the picket lines in organized flying squads led by supervisors while plant guards were posted on rooftops with motion-picture cameras, in an obvious attempt to follow the injunction pattern previously used by the Bell Corporation when Bell launched its union-busting attempt upon the Niagara Frontier.

CP FROZEN OUT

Foremen, salary workers and a separate unit of welders have access to the plant, but no production workers followed as management had hoped. With only one week to go before production workers become eligible to file for unemployment insurance under New York State law, management's back-to-work plans are going further awry.

The outcome of the strike issues, especially the one involving plant-wide seniority, will affect the entire Westinghouse chain of IUE locals across the country. IUE President James B. Carey has personally intervened both in local and national negotiations with the Westinghouse Corporation in defense of Local 1581.

The CP-dominated UE, rejected by Buffalo Westinghouse Workers two to one in a previous NLRB election, has pledged yards of paper support to the strikers, while hiding the fact that its acceptance of the company's "job family unit" seniority plan in the large Westinghouse Essington plant contributed directly to the company's attempt now to shove it down the throats of Buffalo Westinghouse workers.

WEEK by WEEK...

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism. A sub is only \$2 a year!

LOS ANGELES

MAX SHACHTMAN

on THE STRUGGLE FOR WORLD POWER

Sunday, NOVEMBER 25, at 8 p.m.

Case Hotel, 11th & Broadway (Conference Room, 6th floor)

Shachtman Speaks in Cleveland

CLEVELAND, Nov. 10.—As part of his national tour, Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, spoke here on Wednesday, November 7, at the Slovenian National Home. Comrade Shachtman spoke on "The Struggle for World Power," elaborating on the reactionary natures of the two great power blocs, and explaining the position of the ISL in advocating support of the Third Camp as against the American and Russian war camps.

Those present showed their interest and support of the speaker's point of view in their response to a collection made to defray expenses of the meeting. Following the talk there were quite

a few questions asked, and the meeting ended with a discussion period. Two of the audience took the floor for discussion, to disagree on some point with Shachtman. One maintained that the Korean war was "phony," and was being drawn out for the convenience of both Washington and Moscow in handling their domestic problems. The other participant attempted to defend the economic system in Russia as "socialist." Both were answered in final rebuttal.

The following evening Comrade Shachtman led a discussion at the Cleveland Branch meeting on the war question, based on his articles in recent issues of the *New Internationalist*.

You're Invited

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

CIO War on Wage Freeze — —

(Continued from page 1)

sition in relation to the administration.

Furthermore, the CIO leaders admitted that they expected no relief from this intolerable situation during 1952!

WARNS OF BLUDGEON

What are they going to do? Murray said: "I don't proclaim to the universe I am going to do business as usual.

The heavy hand of government lurks forever around the corner. It may have a bludgeon in its hand I don't know.

"But whatever hazards are incident to the prosecution of ordinary collective bargaining, we who are responsible men, understanding that trust has been reposed in us, will endure all of those hazards, and provide with whatever wisdom God may have

given us, a proper sense of direction for the people who employ us."

Murray added, "I am making no appeal to class hatred about these things—it is the furthest thing in my mind—or class strife." However, he emphasized again, "It may be that workers will be forced into a strike situation through no fault of their own."

CONTRAST WITH UAW

A very frank picture of the real situation in union negotiations was described by Murray: "What do you do when you meet an employer and he says to you at the beginning of the conference, 'Here it is, take it or leave it. If you don't like it, go over to the Wage Stabilization Board. If they give you a couple of pennies, we will seek a price increase. Go on: Get out of here. That is the extent to which we are going to collectively bargain with you.'"

"To all practical purposes that is the kind of collective bargaining going on today."

Contrast that speech with the Caspar Milquet toast letter of the UAW-CIO—a fine example of collective bargaining replacing collective bargaining—in calling off the

Borg Warner strike, and one gets a perfect illustration of where an ordinary unionist, concerned with the ABCs of collective bargaining, takes a more militant position than a "socially-conscious" leadership personified by Walter P. Reuther. [The UAW's letter was published in LABOR ACTION last week.—Ed.]

The real situation in America was furthermore brought out by the admission of Maurice Tobin, secretary of labor, that 20,000,000 families whose wage earners were not organized have received no wage increase since inflation soared upwards in the last two years.

FOREIGN POLICY

Of course, no speaker at the convention asked the question: Why did we get in this terrible predicament? The discussion on political action was purely routine. But the conflict between the

policy of support of the Truman administration and the elementary needs of the American people represented by the labor movement is going to assume more intense forms.

The failure of the CIO convention to grapple with this basic problem marks the political blind alley into which its present political policies have driven it.

In the field of foreign policy, the determination of the CIO leaders to look with blinded glasses at the Truman administration was shown by their blasts at the "military viewpoint" which sought bases in Spain, worked with the totalitarian governments in various pacts and recognized Franco. The idea is that Truman was NOT responsible for this foreign policy.

This happens to be something that no one outside of the labor movement professes to believe.

Get it EVERY week!

A sub to LABOR ACTION

is only \$2 for 1 year

IT'S SATURDAY EVENING
NOVEMBER 24
FOR THE NEW YORK ISL'S
THANKSGIVING SOCIAL
AT LABOR ACTION HALL
114 WEST 14 STREET
DANCING AND REFRESHMENTS—
LIQUID, SOLID, AND SPIRITUAL
WE'RE EXPECTING YOU—
AND YOU—AND YOU—AND YOU

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a world-wide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th 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
Address
City Zone
State Tel.

Editorials

Another 'Disarmament' Maneuver

Above all else, the peoples of the world desire peace. To them, and this applies particularly to the war-weary peoples of Europe, the prospect of another futile, infinitely destructive war seems the ultimate folly, the ultimate catastrophe.

The Stalinist leaders were the first to recognize that political capital on a large scale could be made out of heart-felt popular aversion to war. With the utter cynicism which is their hallmark, they have proceeded to organize a "peace movement" on a world scale. With petitions and monster rallies and a constant propaganda campaign in all countries where the Stalinist movements function, they have sought to channel the desire for peace into support for their own diplomatic and military objectives.

The United States government has now decided to start a "peace campaign" of its own. Unlike the Stalinists, however, American capitalism has not been able to build a vast popular movement which could adopt the "peace" slogan as its own. The State Department therefore is compelled to launch its "peace campaign" not as a mass movement but as an open diplomatic maneuver.

This is the obvious significance, and the main meaning, of the "disarmament" proposal launched by Truman and offered by Dean Acheson at the opening of the General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris. In fact, the purely propagandistic intention of this proposal is so clear that it is bound to fail to accomplish even its propagandistic purpose.

In this respect, the Russian Stalinists have a considerable advantage. Their armament program is well advanced, and takes place under a veil of totalitarian secrecy. Dissatisfaction with the terrible economic hardships imposed on the peoples of Russia and her satellites by the armament program is smothered under the guns of the secret police. Popular opposition to their side of the arms race is, for the time being, effectively silenced by all the organized means of communication and coercion of the state.

But in the rest of the world, the American effort to whip up the armament race to all-out proportions has to be conducted out in the open. In a Paris dispatch dated November 11, *New York Times* correspondent Anne O'Hare McCormick states that "outside the Palais de Chaillot, however, the main subject of discussion is not disarmament, but armament. Military experts, ECA advisers and ambassadors are gathered here from many countries to confer about the West's sharpest dilemma—how to adjust military programs to economic conditions."

'DON'T WORRY—NO DANGER OF AGREEMENT . . .'

Propaganda can scarcely be effective when there is such an open public contradiction between what is proposed in the interests of "peace" and what is being done to prepare for war. And just to make sure that no one should take the American plan seriously, on the day the Acheson proposal was made to the UN American correspondents quoted unnamed government officials to the effect that no one need worry that the United States would actually have to reveal the size of its atom-bomb stocks, as the Russian government was bound to turn down the whole "disarmament" scheme.

A further ironic touch was put to the whole tragic farce by the Paris stock market. The slim possibility that the Russians might accept the disarmament proposal had depressed industrial shares and raw materials for two weeks. As soon as Vishinsky made his speech sarcastically rejecting the proposal, these shares resumed the upward course which the armament boom has given them.

The genuine desire of the peoples for peace, for an end to the grinding arms race, for a chance to gain economic security and an end to oppression and exploitation cannot be fulfilled by the statesmen who have gathered in Paris. The grand objective of both the Stalinist and capitalist governments is to create a world cast in the image of their own economic systems and thus subordinated to their own political power. If either of them could achieve this goal without war, there would be some possibility of disarmament. But both are firmly convinced that only overwhelming military might can guarantee their victory, and to them that is what really counts.

The road to disarmament and peace lies elsewhere. It lies in the creation of a popular world force which separates itself completely from the objectives and the power-spheres of the two war camps. It must consist of the working people, the colonial nations struggling for their independence, all who want nothing but freedom, democracy and equality.

What Is INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM?

For information and literature about

the Independent Socialist League, write:

114 W. 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 47

November 19, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Asst. Business Mgr.: SAM FELKUS

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

BIG BUSINESS AND THE SCHOOLS, by J. Austin Burkhardt.—*The Nation*, Nov. 10.

This is a recital of some of the little known facts in the campaign of big business to turn the schools into propaganda media for themselves—a campaign that has met with the willing cooperation of many school heads. It works through the showing of subsidized films glorifying businessmen's aims and the profit system, through subsidized speakers on free enterprise, and so on. "Should the effort be intensified, we shall need a Supreme Court to separate business and the state in public education. A principle is at stake," writes Burkhardt.

"A few years ago it was estimated that the money spent on business-sponsored teaching aids exceeded the educational budgets of Delaware, Idaho, Nevada, New Hampshire, Vermont and Wyoming."

The National Association of Real Estate Boards' textbooks are being used in 127 colleges and universities. The Committee on Constitutional Government, a businessmen's outfit far to the right even of Taft, has distributed 5 or 6

million leaflets to school children—through the schools. The proto-fascist Mervin K. Hart's National Economic Council sends out gift editions of its publications to innumerable schools and colleges.

The big-business films are costly—anywhere from \$20,000 to \$125,000. An NAM movie shown through the schools compares the state's intervention on behalf of people's security to the rise of Hitlerism in Germany. A Burroughs Adding Machine Company film "pictures what happened to a Gloucester fisherman who divided his profits with his crew and then applies this lesson to modern business. The impression left with the student is that profit-sharing does not work." An Alcoa film presents Alan Ladd as the scientist who discovered the process of making aluminum and preaches the beneficence of the big monopolies.

"Several companies can claim yearly school audiences of over ten million; one corporation reports that a hundred and fifty million individuals have witnessed its offerings since the inauguration of the audio-visual program."

Thomas Keeps the Factional Pot Boiling in SP with New Demands

By PHILIP COBEN

The issue of electoral action is boiling up again in the Socialist Party, again as the result of a new move by Norman Thomas and his supporters to commit the party against the decision of their last convention.

Leading up to the new dispute were the following stages:

(1) At the 1950 convention, the majority of the delegates defeated a resolution sponsored by Thomas and his group which, in effect, would turn away from running candidates in the name of the SP and permit support of Fair-Dealish capitalist candidates running on the Democratic ticket.

(2) Although defeated by the convention, Thomas and other SP leaders created such turmoil in the post-convention period by openly refusing to obey the discipline of the party majority that the said majority, timid and weak-kneed as usual whenever their leader Thomas insisted on his own course, capitulated to their pressure. In a membership referendum, the convention decision was virtually scrapped.

Or, as the majority SPers have just phrased it once again in a letter to be referred to below: "After the elections of 1950, the members of the NEC representing the point of view of the majority of the convention were faced with the choice of taking disciplinary action against some prominent party members for violation of the convention decision, or suggesting to the party membership that the convention decision be modified by referendum vote to allow individual party members to support certain non-socialist candidates under some conditions."

PEACE, PEACE—The Open Letter continues: "Our earnest conviction is that the party needs peace and an opportunity for constructive action now even more than next spring. Since the last convention, we have had hardly an uninterrupted month for party building of constructive political thinking because of issue after issue raised in a factional manner."

"For the sake of peace and unity in the party, most of us [the majority members of the NEC] supported the referendum last spring, going against deep convictions to do so. But there is now less unity than before, and at the first opportunity another referendum was introduced into one local—New York (on the Liberal Party, now postponed until November)."

The writers of this touching account are not the first who gave up "deep convictions" for an illusory inner-party "peace" before pressure from the right—only to find that the more they abandoned their "deep convictions," the more the right wing was encouraged to demand the rest of its program.

Immediate occasion for the Open Letter was a further move by Thomas. Since the referendum was voted down by the NEC, Thomas & Co. proceeded to take a referendum on their own. Using the party's membership list, Thomas sent out over his own signature a letter inquiring individuals' views on the matter. The Open Letter says:

"We are frankly appalled that, after the NEC voted against the proposal to call a referendum, a private group within the party should use its own machinery to do so. Since the precedent of allowing use of the membership lists to responsible party members had been established before the last convention, the national secretary agreed to allow the use of the list to Norman Thomas without consulting the NEC."

The Open Letter, then, is the NEC majority's means of reply-

endum. The NEC majority voted this down by two-thirds.

The latter's Open Letter explains: "This new referendum was suggested by Irving Barshop and Norman Thomas as a means of avoiding conflict at the national convention next year."

This is among the cutest reasons for holding a referendum that one will be privileged to hear about. It is the convention which is supposed to be the most authoritative means of expressing the members' views, taking place as it does after discussion and votes on delegates who can thereupon debate the issues on the convention floor. "Peaceful" conventions, however, seem to be dearer to the SP leaders than democracy.

Behind Squabble What is more important, however, is that behind the squabbling is the fact that neither the NEC majority nor the Thomas group have any distinctive political policy upon which the party's continued existence can justify itself, especially since the party gave up any pretense of being anti-war—that is, since it fully plumped for the Korean war in particular.

The Thomas group, pushed by the logic of the position, are moving toward virtual liquidation of the SP as an independent force of any kind—electoral action being the first arm to be chopped off.

In the absence of any electoral function, of course, a socialist organization may well decide that it prefers to be a propaganda group, but it is not this type of orientation which is behind the Thomas proposals. After all, a propaganda group needs above all a clear policy of its own for which to propagandize!

As we have said before, we do not gloat over the sad state of disrepair of the SP. That might be in order if its once extensive mass support had left it in order to build a genuinely independent and revolutionary socialist movement. This, to be sure, is not the case.

The whole American socialist movement is weak, as is well known, and the weakness of the SP is in good part a reflection of this general situation. The point is that, in the face of these objective conditions, the SP in addition has no political ideas which can keep it together either as an electoral-action machine or a propaganda group. This is its tragedy. Its pro-war development has spelled suicide for it.

Get your L.A. every week! Subscribe at \$2 a year!

HOW "THE ARMY BUILDS MEN"

From CONSCRIPTION NEWS

Published by the National Council Against Conscription

Military training has two main purposes. The first of these is preparation for war, and the second is the annihilation of the individual's will by instilling in each soldier the habit of automatic obedience to authority. These two purposes are of course meshed together. As Willard Waller put it in his "Veteran Comes Back":

"The aim of an army is to impose its will upon the enemy. Before an army can succeed in this purpose its leaders must first impose their will upon the men in their organization. They must mold the common soldiers and the officers into perfect instruments for expressing the will of the leader."

The marines are quite proud of their training system and have cooperated with various writers who in a number of periodicals have described it for the public. A former marine, writing for the January 16, 1949 *New York Times* magazine, says: "The theory is that you can't change a civilian into a marine without first driving a hard wedge between his past and his future."

This "wedge" is started the moment the marine enters "boot" camp. The drill instructors "are deliberately rough and abusive. They heap maddening indignation on the boots, demand almost impossible physical exertions and keep up a ruthless pressure 17 hours a day, seven days a week." (*Life*, October 8, 1951.)

The indignities, many of which have been photographed by a *Life* photographer, begin with the shearing of every marine's hair until he is completely bald. The theory is that this is "essential for humility." (Ibid.) A marine who had neglected to shave all the fuzz off his chin had to scrape it off with a dry razor while a bucket covered his head and rested on his shoulders. Another who "forgot his belt had to carry it around in his mouth." (Ibid.) A careless recruit who throws a candy wrapper on the floor is punished by being forced to "hold it in his little hand" for three hours until the hand goes slightly numb." (*New York Times*, January 16, 1949.)

There are innumerable indignities of a sadistic nature such as every recruit being forced to stand in a tear-gas chamber and sing the Marine Hymn without gas masks. A recruit who "committed the crime of calling his rifle a gun had to hold the 10-pound rifle at arm's length for five minutes." Another who scratched a bug bite during formation had to wear his cap pulled down over his eyes. *Life* shows him stumbling along to the chow line in this blind fashion.

The Perfect Nervous System

Every move of the marine recruits, unless otherwise specified by drill instructors, is made on the run. (*Life*.) They must address everyone as "sir" from PFC on up and must lurk to attention when spoken to, "must request permission" to speak, get a drink of water or go to the toilet. (*Life*.)

"The objective," writes an ex-marine, "is a nervous system conditioned to respond without the slightest hesitation." The marine recruit is given no opportunity to make choices. "Every act is a command," and "the smallest detail of training becomes a matter of supreme urgency."

Life magazine tells of "a march in full combat gear to an area where for eight hours the boots raced through a field course." The drill instructor "double-timed the boots along the blistering, dusty road. When he detected a boot sneaking a drink of water without permission, he made the entire platoon empty their canteens." Recruits who passed out were left lying by the side of the road without any aid. One picture in *Life* shows a collapsed recruit by the side of the road. He was made a lesson by the drill instructor who marched the platoon "past the inert form twice" in order "to emphasize the point that weaklings are not wanted." (*Life*.)

"Profanity is still liberally used and nobody urges anybody to write home to mother." The recruit is taught how to stick a bayonet in and how to pull it "out of an enemy's belly." In fact, he is expected to do literally anything the drill instructor tells him. The drill instructor "roars his orders . . . and waves his swagger stick, demanding instantaneous, almost cringing obedience." (*New York Times*, January 16, 1949.)

This is marine training—as brutal and sadistic as any storm-trooper training in Hitler's Germany. The result is acceptance of authoritarianism and dependence upon it. There is a vast difference between this ordered existence and the opportunity parents, teachers and other civilians give boys to learn to make decisions for themselves so they are not forever dependent on a "leader."

Air force training at Randolph Field was described in the July 24, 1949 *New York Times* magazine. From the moment the boy gets his uniform "he is not permitted to walk across the campus. If he is alone he must run. If he is with another cadet he must march in step. He goes from class to class in stiff formation. Outside his room he may not speak unless he is spoken to except under certain rigidly defined situations. He must keep his eyes cast down to the ground except when saluting."

Meal-time for the cadet is an astonishing ordeal. He files into the huge hall without a word because he is not allowed to talk. His eyes are on the floor. He walks stiffly, his shoulders thrown back in the almost painful posture of "bracing. . . . He then sits in his chair, but his is a special one. Its front legs have been sawed off several inches, so the cadet is hunched forward. He sits only on the forward inch of the chair, eyes still cast down and not speaking."

Theory of Superiority

The article continues with an account of childish actions which some college fraternities use for a few days or perhaps a week in hazing freshmen, but which most colleges have outlawed. The purpose of all this is "to make a man respect authority—in the military way." Not only is there this subjection of the will to that of superior authority, but cadets are expected to be informers. They "are taught that it is the duty of a cadet to report any infraction of rules by any other cadet."

Army training is similarly authoritarian. "I don't need to explain anything to my men," a post commander said recently. "The good soldier is the one who obeys without question everything that he is told." (*New York Times*, May 19, 1951.) This idea is not simply the expression of one officer's convictions. It is the rule of the army. One of the "Armed Forces Talks" issued for the use of commanders in informing their personnel of army procedures and ideas points out that "training in the service is designed to instill in us the direct and almost automatic obedience to orders that is necessary in peacetime and indispensable in war. The habit of discipline must become almost second nature to us and it can be acquired only by actual performance." (*Armed Forces Talk No. 281*.)

The army teaches every man that this automatic obedience to authority is a virtue surpassing the undisciplined civilian life. The same *Armed Forces Talk* says to the soldier: "In the armed forces . . . you are faced

with standards that are higher than and different from those you knew in civilian life." This emphasis on a soldier's being superior to a civilian is part of the program which the marines call driving a wedge between a man's past and his future.

As Willard Waller points out, there is a direct relationship between a man and his environment. Most men have whatever habits their society permits and encourages them to have. Few court social disapproval in a conforming society. "Change the society," says Waller, "and you change the man. The civilian turned soldier derives his distinguishing characteristic from the social environment of the army."

The Role of the Number

Two social scientists, Howard Brotz and Everett Wilson who served in the armed forces, discussed the characteristics of military society in the March, 1946 *American Journal of Sociology*. After discussing the authoritarian caste system, they described the disintegrating results of military life:

"Not only does entrance into the armed forces mean the lapse of civilian occupations and avocations, it also involves the increasing decline of the social controls of the family and of the neighborhood. . . . The impersonality of the military method of handling great numbers also makes for anonymity. This impersonality, as evidenced bet, numbers designating main civilian occupation and main occupational specialty, tent numbers, and laundry numbers, is soon accepted by the GI. He learns, somehow, that his new role will be easier if the anonymity of numbers is preserved—if, to be specific, his officers and the orderly room never identify his name or number with face and personality."

"While lack of objectives and other incentives discouraged initiative and creative effort among men in the army, another condition contributing to the same effect was the security, however minimal, offered by the services to their men and dependents. Since, on the one hand, effort went largely unrewarded and, conversely, a slothful disposition of duty did not jeopardize the soldier's rating and his monthly stipend, the tendency was to 'soldier' on the job, to get away with as little work as possible. Over any period of time the dull, do-nothing routine stimulated escape reactions, which, in decreasing order of frequency, were movies, gambling, liquor and brothels."

"The complete exhaustion of the monthly paycheck within a few days was comparatively common. The soldier could squander his cash with equanimity, knowing that next month would see him 'flush' again; while, in the meantime, there was always the assurance of food and shelter. In the army, money came to have a new and more direct meaning for most soldiers. Time had only a present phase. Money had only its immediate goods and services value. It was used or loaned or gambled with considerable abandon. The future could and would take care of itself."

Readers Take the Floor . . .

Readers Take the Floor . . .

A Dissent

To the Editor:

It seems to me that Shachtman (in his article in LA, October 9, on the joint declaration of the Indian and Japanese Socialist Parties) is wrong in holding that the "Third World of Socialism" is the same as the Third Camp. "The Third World of Socialism" is the general Socialist goal in opposition to both capitalism and Stalinism; while the Third Camp is usually understood as the program for the war crisis.

As I remember the discussion sometime ago in LA, the participants (Coleman, Green, McKinney) did not give up the Third World of Socialism. But they maintained that in view of the actual conditions existing today, proper socialist tactics consist in giving critical support to the U. S., since a victory of Stalinism would destroy the chances of a Third World of Socialism for a considerable period. Shachtman's sneering reference to these people does not seem to me right.

The program of the Indian and Japanese socialists seems to be inadequate. For instance, they say: "World peace can be indefinitely secured only when the retarded two-thirds of the world . . . is raised to a decent level of well-being and strength." But what happens in the meantime, since such a development must be a matter of time, and much time, whereas the danger of war is immediate? What would the Indian and Japanese socialists do if they were faced with the engulfing military might of Stalinism? For once under the military despotism of the Russian army, what opportunity would they have to carry out their program? If not butchered by the conquerors, they might dream about their program in the wastes of Liberia. And one can also legitimately ask if it is not the presence of American military might in Asia holding off the Stalin army which permits the evasion of these questions.

A Reader—

The Indian and Japanese socialists used the term "Third World of Socialism" in the context of their Joint Declaration in the same way as we use the term "Third Camp." Readers of LABOR ACTION should know this, especially as far as the Indian socialists are concerned, from our reports on *Janata* (the Indian SP organ), on the speech in New York by Comrade Lohia (who signed the Joint Declaration) and more recently from Norman Thomas' attack on the Indian socialists precisely because they do support this concept.

Comrade Shachtman's article referred to "the skeptics, the tired and retired people, the timid and the highly respectable people in the labor movement" who "shrug their hopeless and helpless shoulders" at the aim of building a Third Camp against the war blocs, etc. "A Reader" insists on dragging in the names of "Coleman, Green, McKinney," quite pointlessly.

"A Reader" has, before this, expressed his pro-war views in our letter column. The issues we have debated in this regard are not visibly clarified by his singling a sentence out of the Joint Declaration — one, moreover, which is increasingly accepted as axiomatic even by pro-war liberals.

"A Reader," however, should be sufficiently acquainted with socialist anti-war views to know that the Indian and Japanese comrades do not pose "a decent level of well-being and strength" as the sum-total of their fight against both Western and Russian imperialism. They work for a socialist India and a socialist Japan. What "A Reader," like most Americans, finds it easy to forget is that the people of Asia are also "faced with" the "engulfing" domination of the capitalist West—and they are not as willing as "A Reader" to support the old exploiters out of fear of a new exploiter. They seek a road to fight both.

THE APOSTASY OF THE LIBERALS

Nobody but Nobody Is Against 'Freedom' — Except in Concrete Cases — Like Egypt

By SAM FELIX

Since the end of the Second World War there has been a great search for the reasons why the Communist Parties have been so successful in their world propaganda, especially by liberals. A number of pat reasons and phrases were developed which certainly pointed to part of the truth but never advanced beyond mere shibboleths.

When the Marshall Plan was first proposed in 1947, the stock liberal approach (if there is such a thing as a stock liberal) was essentially this: The CPs are able to win over large sections of the West European working class because they feed on poverty; the Marshall Plan will help to feed Europe, and perhaps even solve some of the basic weaknesses of West Europe's economy. But the fact remains, with or without the Korean war, the Stalinists still constitute a major force in France and Italy, and the basic problem of Western Europe, the disorganized, national capitalist economies, still remains.

Next was the Point Four program for the undeveloped areas of the world. Once again we were solemnly told that "communism feeds on poverty." Point Four will give technical aid and help raise the level of productivity, and perhaps even loan large sums of money to carry out the program. There is a need for land reform—which to some meant the development of "American-style" farming. This will prove to the world that the U. S. is primarily interested in the welfare of these peoples. The standards of living will rise and the influence of communism will decline.

However, Point Four never really became much more meaningful in practice than the piece of paper on which President Truman's 1949 inaugural address was written. The two reports on Point Four, the Gray report and the Rockefeller report, both showed that the U. S. is more interested in developing raw material resources of these countries, while the propaganda purposes of the program were relegated to the future.

The victory of Stalinism in China and the State Department's White Paper on China brought to emphasis the realization that the U. S. has been losing political prestige in Asia. Our liberals were quick to point out that the U. S. has to support or at least not oppose the nationalist and revolutionary forces. Heretofore, the U. S. has "permitted itself" to be pictured as supporting the old colonialism, and this has been a strong point of communism. Now we must become the champions of the Asiatic revolution, and this will expose Russia's imperialist schemes.

And so went the general liberal proposals to meet the new developments.

On "Despicable Roles"

While each one of these points takes a step toward an understanding of Stalinism, they do not add up. The struggle is not merely against poverty and hunger. The revolutionary upsurges and discontentment, while striking out in one way or another for a better world, are also a reaction against the given social system which has caused their present plight. They want a change in the old policies of war, exploitation and poverty AND in old rulers who are responsible for these conditions.

The results of the U. S. economic aid that has been given in Europe and Asia indicate what is at fault with the liberal approach. It is precisely because the U. S. has worked with the social forces that represent the status quo—the landlords in Asia and the capitalists in Europe—that this aid has failed materially to benefit the people. The partial exception has been in Britain where a Labor government at least assured some mass benefit from this aid. The barrier which stands in the way of increasing living standards is set up by the forces that the Western imperialism supports or supported until recently.

Therefore, the crisis of Western policy in the Near East reproduces many of the problems that were met, to one extent or another, in Europe and Asia. But the events of the last six years might as well not have occurred for all the influence they have had on U. S. policy,

'VPERED'

is the organ of the Ukrainian socialist resistance movement, published by its section in emigration in West Germany, recording the thinking and activities of the new anti-Stalinist underground fighting behind the Iron Curtain. It is written in Ukrainian, of course, but an English summary of the contents appears in each issue.

For Ukrainian friends, *Vpered* is a must. Others will find the English page of extreme interest—and can help the movement by subscribing.

One dollar for 5 issues.

Order through: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Read about INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

Send for the two special issues of LABOR ACTION devoted to explaining the ideas of the Independent Socialist League—

May Day 1950—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism

May Day 1951—Independent Socialism and the War

10 cents each

or for that matter on the thinking of prominent liberals.

The approach of the U. S. government in this area has been strictly dominated by military and strategic considerations, with the liberals trailing along. The prime concern in Iran has been the disposition of the Abadan refinery and in Egypt the availability of the Suez Canal for Western shipping. The political implications of these moves have been added as a second thought, and then only to ask whether Russia will benefit from them—and it has. It is the program of peace through armaments that has paralyzed liberal political thinking.

This could lead the editor of the *Nation*, Freda Kirchwey, to write about a year ago in a similar situation that the Egyptians seem to have a strong case on paper, but—

"Yet nowadays Egyptian efforts to cast off the British imperialist yoke does not inspire a sympathetic response from Western liberals. The despicable role of Egypt in the Arab aggression against Israel is too fresh in the memory. Moreover the miserable performance of the corruption-ridden army in that campaign showed plainly that it could not be trusted to protect the Canal Zone, which is vital to the defense of the whole Middle East."

Hollow Words

Freda Kirchwey permits the "despicable role of Egypt" against Israel to cancel out the "despicable role" of Britain supported by the U. S. against Egypt, all in the interest of the "defense of the whole Middle East." One can only wonder about the dilemma Miss Kirchwey would have been in if the Egyptian army were not corruption-ridden and could "be trusted to protect the Canal Zone." What if Egypt chose to protect it against the foreign occupier and its ally?

Faced with the concrete case of Egypt, the liberals' demand that the U. S. "support the Asian revolution," and cease to oppose the strivings of the peoples for freedom from old exploiters, has turned out to be as empty as the following invocation to Freedom by Dean Acheson at last April's Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics:

"What binds the nations of the free world together into partnership is that they have a powerful interest in common: the concern for freedom."

"Freedom is the key. This is what free nations have, and other nations do not. This is the heart of the matter, for without freedom neither real peace nor real security nor any real progress is possible."

"To the nation, freedom means national independence, freedom to work out its destinies in its own way. . . ."

"When people ask us, 'What is it you are for, you men of the free world?' then we say, 'We are for freedom, because freedom is the key to everything else we want.'"

The very literary style of this litany is revealing: the word freedom is chanted in a ringing voice as if it were echoing in a hollow space, and in truth there is nothing but hollowness behind it, for Acheson. When it comes to the question of the freedom of a nation "to work out its own destinies in its own ways" as against the military plans of the U. S., Acheson announces that there is no "justification" for this "interpretation" of national independence. The liberals translate this into their liberalese.

HOW TO SUPPORT IMPERIALISM — LIBERALLY

Difficult as that may be, the reader should bear in mind as he scans the following expressions of imperialist chauvinism that the passages are from some of our leading LIBERAL journals, writing on the Egyptian crisis:

From The Reporter, Nov. 13, editorial by editor Max Ascoli:

"In the Middle East, Iran and Egypt hug with fanatic fury what they think is theirs, even if the Abadan refineries rust into heaps of scrap, and no more ships sail through the Suez Canal.

"Face to face with these movements, our government has the duty of talking plainly and acting forcefully. . . . must be guided by clear and hard principles. . . . The first of these principles is that no nation has the right to behave as if it were a world unto itself—not even a nation whose pride has been long hurt. . . . National independence does not mean the right to set the world afire. . . . The idea of absolute *mineness* that Egypt and Iran advance is about as feudal as their internal political orders.

"Americans still obsessed with the anti-colonial complex like to say that every newly independent country is entitled to make its own mistakes and evolve in its own good time. . . . As for the Washingtons and Jeffersons of the Middle East, it is worth remarking that they like to drive Cadillacs. . . ."

"In every step we take in the Middle East we must act as if we were the agent of the UN—not because the UN now can solve the Middle Eastern problem 'ut because ultimately it will inherit any solution that we bring about. . . . one day we will render an account of our actions to the UN—and to the people of the Middle East." [Italics in original.]

This is the measure of the apostasy of the liberals: Throughout the events in Egypt, not one of the leading liberal journals has come out unequivocally for the right of the nation to its full national independence, its right "to work out its destinies in its own way." None has spoken out forthrightly for its right to shake off imperialist domination. The only concession offered was a better deal inside of the U. S.-dominated power bloc. Regardless of whether or not the Arab nations will eventually join a Middle East Defense Command, part of the right of national independence is the right to stay out of it.

Keeping in mind the hypnotic influence of this military emphasis, various devices have been used to get around the question of the rights of the Egyptians and Iranians. They are devices, for whatever kernel of truth they contain cannot cancel the importance of national independence.

Short Course in Apologetics

Following is a composite of the liberal formulas for its apostasy:

First, you point out the reactionary and feudal nature of the Iranian and Egyptian ruling classes. This, it is hoped, will cover up the reactionary nature of the U. S.'s support of British imperialism.

Then, a deal is offered whereby Egypt can be permitted to participate in the government of its own territory through a Middle East Defense Command, and whereby Iran can participate in an international corporation that administers its own oil, all the while keeping your fingers crossed lest Iraq and Saudi Arabia do not get similar ideas, not to speak of Venezuela.

If this is unsuccessful, then you can point out that Egypt's army is corruption-ridden and inefficient as a military force and that it would be of small use in the defense of the Middle East. This makes you feel better, since they refuse to join your military pact anyway.

Next, you start writing about the dangers of "sneer nationalist passion," "Arab fanaticism" and "chauvinism," linking it to Islamic extremism with its headquarters at Cairo, which seeks to dominate the Middle East.

Then you ease up and point out that joining the Middle East Defense Command is a chance for Egypt to gain prestige in the region through an "evolutionary process."

Another angle which used to work with great success is the threat to drive the weak country into economic and political bankruptcy, or to manipulate behind the scenes for the overthrow of the government in the hope that a more pro-Western regime will be set up.

Finally, it can be pointed out, with the sense of smugness peculiar to a rich and powerful country, that Egypt is too weak to force the British out of the Suez—and beside the American feet is in the Mediterranean.

Of course, none of this goes out over the Voice of America, which all the while is busy broadcasting: "Freedom is the key. . . . To the nation freedom means national independence, freedom to work out its own destinies."

And in the spare moments, and for the empty pages, *soul-searching articles can be written trying to explain how poverty and failure to back the national revolution drove people into the arms of Stalinism, or in pondering the growth of neutralist tendencies.*

From The New Republic, Oct. 29, editorial:

"For one thing, the Egyptians are militarily useless to the West, since their armies are impotent. . . . Ideologically, Islam extremism has for a long time had headquarters in Cairo, and shows no sign of losing its hold.

"Whatever hopes there may be for bringing more reasonable Egyptians to leadership will not be furthered by giving in to the present set of Egyptians blusters and threats.

"... [Egypt] needs domestic reform and a gradual deflating of her religious and other fanatic elements. The West should extend her help to advance toward these goals and a modest share of regional authority. . . . In view of this, it is best to proceed apidly and drastically to deflate Egyptian ambition.

Western power in the Middle East may be fading, but it is still strong enough to determine who shall share in the succession."

From The Nation, Oct. 20, editorial by Freda Kirchwey:

"This is a moment when sheer nationalist passion, outweighing security or even apparent national interest, is the ultimate controlling force in an area of critical international concern—a fact both Britain and America have consistently underestimated ever since the war ended.

"To say this is not to suggest that Egypt's present move is 'correct.' . . ."

"Let Washington make the best possible deal with Egypt; it will be no stronger than the treaties Egypt has broken as long as the misery of the people creates enough smoldering unrest to provide a blaze any time the politicians need one to reinforce new demands."

THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY on the HOME FRONT

Jim-Crow Murder by Florida Sheriff

By MEL HACKER

Two Florida Negroes, whose conviction on the charge of rape was upset two years ago by the Supreme Court, have been shot without provocation by Sheriff W. McCall of Tavares, Florida, in as brutal a racist crime as the country has seen in many a year. Mob violence—including the terrorization of local Negroes, the burning of homes and attempts to lynch these men—had previously occurred in 1949.

Sheriff McCall who, it is testified, said to a guard "You-all haven't electrocuted these n—rs yet. When you do, I want to see them finish," killed one prisoner and wounded the other. Handcuffed together, the pair were being taken to Tavares by the sheriff for a retrial of their case. This case had previously been quashed by the Supreme Court because inflammatory press and other attacks on the Negroes had made a fair trial impossible.

Sheriff McCall has been quickly exonerated by a "packed" coroners' jury. However, the FBI and the Lake County Grand Jury are continuing their investigations of the attack.

This brutal "execution" by law enforcement officers has, of course, already been utilized by Russia's Andrei Vishinsky, who demagogically attempts to use every violation of civil liberties in the United States as a counter weight against any criticism of forced labor, concentration camps, totalitarianism and absence of civil liberties in

Stalinist Russia. Also aware of the international scandal of U. S. race relations, Walter White of the NAACP stated that "This killing is worth five divisions of troops to Stalin."

The NAACP, long criticized in the South for "outside interference," has so far decided not to interfere unless it becomes clear that Florida will do nothing to prosecute the case. The governor and local officials are meanwhile keeping very much out of sight.

BEGGAR IN DIXIE

Clarence Mitchell, Washington NAACP director, has warned that the association may have to shut off the flow of all federal funds to the South if segregation practices are continued there in certain projects. Speaking in Birmingham, Mitchell declared that "The South, to maintain its costly segregation practices in schools, jails and parks, has had to adopt the role of a beggar and seek funds from the federal treasury."

OHIO GAG

Dr. Howard Bevis, president of Ohio State University, in response to protests from faculty, religious and professional sources, excluded three classes of speakers from the university "gag rule." Speakers invited by faculty members for classroom purposes, speakers for religious foundations, and participants in conferences of off-campus professional

organizations may appear on campus without first being screened and cleared by Dr. Bevis.

However, the gag rule still remains in effect for university students and local faculty groups. At Chicago, the American Association of University Professors attacked the gag rule: "The training of students in the methods of free and responsible discussion can be accomplished only by actual practice. Imposing censorship and curbing the right to hear dissenting views deny students this maturing experience."

Two off-campus professors within two days rejected invitations to speak at Ohio State in protest against screening. The professors, both of whom were approved in the screening process, were Robert Dixon of Denison University and Dr. Douglas G. Ellison, chairman of the Indiana University Psychology Department.

STORK CLUB

Walter White, secretary of the NAACP, has charged that Sherman Billingsley's Stork Club discriminates against Negroes in its employment practices: "Failure or refusal to employ Negro waiters, captains, clerical help, musicians and entertainers by the Stork Club is as notorious as its policy of violation of the State Civil Rights Law with respect to Negro patrons," White stated. He urged the State Commission Against Discrimination to investigate this matter as well as the Stork Club's Jim Crow treatment of Josephine Baker.

NO STIR

Negroes sat beside whites at a North Carolina football game for what was said to be the first time. A university official said: "It did not create the slightest stir."

Halley Victory —

(Continued from page 1)

party which elevated its candidate to office.

That third, minority party, the Liberal Party, which exists only in New York State, is not yet a labor party. But it is the closest thing to a labor party on the American political horizon. It is really a quasi-labor party, deriving its principal strength from the unions, mainly the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union and Hatters Union on which it is based. The selection of its candidate was made at the top and his campaign, based almost wholly on crime-busting, was determined by the leaders of the Liberal Party. But to the extent that its candidate was an independent candidate of the Liberal Party, its campaign resembled that of a labor party.

The arguments that have been used by the Liberal Party heads in the past are the classic arguments that are used universally by labor leaders everywhere in the case of the formation of a genuine labor party. They are always opposed to running an independent candidate of labor for fear of "splitting the liberal vote." The argument is a self-defeating one, even if initially the liberal vote is split and the labor candidate loses.

But the Liberal Party vote serves notice that the machine candidates CAN be beaten by a party based on labor. We hope the lesson is not lost on the CIO, which did not vote to support Halley here, and especially its UAW segment, whose spokesmen are eternally postponing the formation of a labor party or any kind of independent political party based primarily on the broad masses of workers.

The Halley campaign was almost completely made up of variations on the single theme of crime, corruption and influence. Aside from some feeble syllables on housing before a Puerto Rican audience, opposition to a sales tax, and a statement for the right of policemen to join a union—although without the right to strike—the Liberal Party's candidate did not make a single bold, forthright statement on any of the major issues which were boiling over in the city during his campaign. He said nothing of importance on the dockers' strike, the sanitation workers' strike against the city, the monstrous housing problem, etc.

Yet it was labor in the main, forming the core of the Liberal Party, which produced the Halley victory. It was because the Liberal Party is the only independent political party with a labor base that LABOR ACTION supported the Halley candidacy. This election, whatever the shortcomings of the campaign and candidate, afforded the Liberal Party an opportunity to function as an independent organization, even though it did this poorly and did not utilize the campaign to build and strengthen the party as such.

The results have demonstrated in a manner that should be understood by the temporizing labor leadership of this country, those "practical" politicians demanding "practical" results, that a new national party of labor could win victories too.

The election should do much to spur the Liberal Party further in the direction of independent politics. It should stem the tendency to fusionism and reliance on the old parties. That is the implied mandate of New York City's voters.

In English for the First Time!

Rosa Luxemburg's

THE ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL

Yale University Press • 475 pages • \$5
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

LONDON LETTER

Tory Line Will Push Laborites to Left

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Nov. 7.—So far the Tories have surprised their own supporters by completely ignoring their election pledges to build 300,000 houses a year, to abolish controls, to abolish food subsidies, etc. Instead they have extended state control by vast restrictions on imports from Europe and halving the foreign-currency travel allowance; and they are even going to introduce their pet excess-profits tax.

One of the first things Churchill did was to cut down the salaries of cabinet ministers by 40 per cent during the economic crisis. This was a clever move, designed to set an "example" of how to tighten one's belt. It did not, however, escape the pro-Labor press that there was some difference between cutting down a salary from \$15,000 to \$12,000 a year and cutting a wage from \$25 to \$18 a week.

The effect upon both Tories and Labor of these moves has been somewhat mixed. It may be that the Labor Party feels that to a degree the wind has been taken out of its sails; but at the same time there is the realization that the Tories must maintain a good portion of Labor's advances. Today the Conservatives gave an undertaking to keep up the social services; and they are not going to undo the constitutions of the African colonies.

But the Tories do intend to denationalize the steel and road-haulage industries. Still, the fact that they know of Labor's intention to nationalize once again, when they are returned to power, deters most capitalists from risking investments on these industries.

Further, a large measure of control will be needed to make up as much of the deficit as they can of the one and a half million tons of steel which industry requires this year. Even here, it appears, we shall see that the Tories will only be able to modify state control. They have not even formulated a plan for action—they cannot give back these investments to people who regard them as unprofitable.

TWO STATEMENTS

The new Tory measures, precisely because they look more "progressive" than those of previous Tory regimes, are beginning to dictate a new policy for Labor. They are initiating a movement WHICH MUST FORCE LABOR TO ADOPT MORE CONSISTENTLY SOCIALIST POLICIES. Otherwise, the latter will do nothing with which to appeal to the electorate next time.

Immediately after the Tories had settled themselves comfortably in office, two important statements came from top leaders of the Labor movement.

The first was a statement by the executive of the trade unions, saying that they would cooperate with the Churchill government in those measures which they consider in the national interest. Atlee and the Labor Party leadership took the view that "give them enough rope and they'll hang themselves."

The other statement was by the president of the large shipbuilding union, warning the Tories not to take advantage of their power to force measures against the majority of the people.

These two together mean, as Atlee put it, "We shall be vigilant in opposition, but not factious."

After 127 Years of 'Wardship': This Emancipation Is VERY Gradual . . .

By MEL HACKER

After 127 years of federal wardship, America's 435,000 Indians are still far from emancipation. A great number of these Indians are living in varying degrees of squalor and poverty on their reservations. Educational programs and facilities are inadequate to deal with the Indian needs for emancipation.

These facts have been publicized by a current dispute between Dillon S. Myer, commissioner of Indian affairs, and representatives of Indian tribes supported by lawyers' and ethnological groups.

Myer proposes to control lawyers representing Indian tribes by enabling himself, as Indian commissioner, to terminate lawyers' tribal contracts, limit their terms, control fees and require periodic reports of lawyers' activities. These powers have been attacked as dictatorial, since many legal actions are directed against the Indian commissioner himself. The government is undoubtedly worrying about mounting Indian land claims against it. The Utes recently won a \$32 million land claim.

The American Bar Association, in opposing the government's regulations, suggested that the only policy consonant with the emancipation of the Indian would be to let him negotiate freely with counsel provided the attorney is competent and the fee reasonable. Even granting that federal paternalism might reduce the exploitation of ignorance by some lawyers dealing with the Indians, this paternalism would prevent the Indians from learning how to govern, how not to make their own

them of the plans and programming; and only half-heartedly endorsing the extension of the Indian Claims Commission.

Not only are the Indians not being encouraged and taught to manage their own affairs but, they charge, Myer's paternalism is denying them a large measure of self-rule which had been permitted them by previous commissions.

INDIANS RESTLESS

Behind the present dispute lies the fact that there is no real federal program for the emancipation of the Indians. Proposals, including one by former Indian Commissioner Zimmerman, are growing dusty on many shelves, rejected because of the "complexity" of the problem. Myer believes programs must be developed locally, doubting that federal paternalism will end in his lifetime.

Meanwhile, only two even slightly comprehensive programs are at work, both in response to emergency situations. First is a congressional rehabilitation plan for the Hopi and Navajo tribes. Federal funds for these most severely depressed tribes have been cut by Congress. Second is a project to teach the Ute Indians how to manage their affairs and spend the \$32 million recently won from the government.

Ruth M. Bronson, executive director of the National Congress of American Indians, emphasizes the restlessness of the Indians to take the initiative and solve their own problems, to take over functions as soon as they can. Myer is opposing these attempts as efforts to "needle" him.

STUDENT SOCIALIST

November 19, 1951

STUDENT-YOUTH SECTION of LABOR ACTION

Five Cents

Brooklyn College Scandal: Protests Reveal Administration's Role in Rigging of Election

By PAUL AXTELL

"Some of the finest speeches about training for citizenship are made by people who behave like autocrats when confronted with specific circumstances."—President Harry D. Gideonse of Brooklyn College, in a speech some years ago.

President Gideonse has been confronted with still another "specific circumstance," in the words of the above-quoted speech—which was obviously autobiographical.

This one concerns the role of the Brooklyn College administration in what is probably the dirtiest of all school elections in the college's history. [See the last issue of the STUDENT SOCIALIST for Oct. 22 for the background—Ed.]

The scandal centers around last spring's elections for the Student Governing Council (SGC) and in particular about the campaign activities of the pro-administration party in that election, the Campus Affairs Party (CAP), whose presidential candidate was Dave Goldman.

The CAP's presidential candidate was opposed by Willie Sandler, running for the Liberal Independent Party (LIP). Sandler had been a member of the Campus Coalition for the Reinstatement of Vanguard, the former college newspaper which Gideonse had autocratically suspended and replaced with the present Kingsman. The coalition had been composed of liberal and socialist students opposing the administration's assault on academic freedom. Sandler was obviously *persona non grata* to Gideonse.

The results of the election were announced as being extremely close and a series of recounts and checks took place. These showed fluctuating results, but in the last three recounts taken before the end of the spring semester Sandler was ahead by a steady margin.

THE ODOR MOUNTS

The elections committee then held a "final recount" during the summer, when most students are out and student political life is in suspension, and announced that the winner was—Goldman. Sandler and the SGC protested and asked for a new election.

The odorous history of this affair includes, among other things, the stealing of LIP campaign literature, the slashing of an LIP silk-screen, and the "disappearance" of statements by LIP candidates from the files of Kingsman. This campus paper, as the administration-sponsored successor to Vanguard, is run by a staff which is not very discreet in its exhibition of bias in favor of the CAP, of the fraternities and of the administration.

Some of the most outrageous electioneering stunts of the campaign, which received virtually no notice in the newspaper, were recently revealed by a Special Elections Investigating Committee report of the SGC and by a letter to Gideonse by Willie Sand-

ler, the LIP candidate who was counted out.

Sandler reports:

"The first morning of voting, every student upon arriving at school found upon his seat a booklet of approximately seven mimeographed sheets urging the election of Mr. Goldman and other members of his party. This oc-

curred in spite of an election rule prohibiting the distribution of campaign material in school. The regulation was clearly circumvented by a telephone call to Dean Marroney at his home in which the caller asked for permission to distribute the leaflets in school and neglected to inform Dean Marroney of the rule prohibiting such action. . . . The importance of this move, and its skillful timing cannot be overestimated. It occurred the first day of voting when anything read by the students would still be fresh in their memories. It reached over 2500 students. It could have easily influenced over a hundred votes."

ROGUE'S GALLERY

Sandler also reveals that in order to mimeograph their material CAP members "illegally entered the school mimeograph room during the weekend before elections and

availed themselves of school property. To accomplish this they had to enter the school when restricted to do so and obtain the key to the mimeograph room. That they accomplished this without too much difficulty is characteristic of the entire election."

The Student Governing Council report reveals that Ed Karlin, CAP vice-presidential candidate and Kingsman business manager, was involved in this action. Karlin is further indicted by the report as follows:

"The advertisement appearing in Kingsman in the form of a letter to the student body [which lumped the LIP with a Stalinist "independent" candidate, who was also in the race, as birds of a feather—P. A.] and signed by Mr. Elliot Krasnick as the president of Common Cause [a right-wing student political club] is in the opinion of the committee a willful circumvention of [student] council's ruling on advertisements. Furthermore, we are convinced that Mr. Karlin, as business manager of Kingsman, was in collusion with Mr. Krasnick in accepting the ad. . . . The distribution of CAP pamphlets on the seats of Boylan Hall, with the permission of Dean Marroney, cannot be condoned by this committee. . . . This action was directed by the aforementioned Mr. Karlin."

This fellow Karlin got around, didn't he? . . . But the CAP rogues' gallery is not yet complete.

THE "GOOD CITIZEN"

We also have to introduce Daniel Schneider, president of CAP, who illegally entered and used the facilities of the registrar's office for the purpose of printing campaign literature. Comments Irwin Lainoff, a member of the Elections Committee, in yet another protest to Gideonse:

"For this action Mr. Schneider was dismissed from his position [by the administration] only to be rehired days later. Certainly this act by the president of CAP should have been brought to the

attention of the proper authorities, if not the entire student body." (My italics—P. A.)

Campus politics makes some not-so-strange bedfellows. We now have a flesh-and-blood example of what Gideonse means when he speaks, as he does so often, of the "good campus citizen."

On the ballot-counting itself, we again quote Willie Sandler:

"The last and final count of ballots spelled victory for Mr. Goldman by a margin of 23 votes. But this was only one of a long series of conflicting counts and checks, the results of which fluctuated anywhere from 5 to 40 votes. To simply say that we must stop counting some time and therefore the next recount shall determine the election . . . seems like a rather unjust way of solving the problem. Yet this is precisely what was done. If the Elections Committee had been able to explain satisfactorily the differences in election returns, how and why the vote fluctuated . . . only then could I accept one final count as binding. Unfortunately, this is not the case."

"CROOKED"

In this connection, it is interesting to note that last term Gideonse immediately suspended the election results when Sandler was the victor; but he is presently ignoring SGC's and Sandler's request for a runoff election.

Bill Arron, another of the three chairmen of the Elections Committee, may be on the right track in expressing "concern" over the fact that in the two-week interval between the next-to-last and last recount the ballots were kept in an open safe. This interesting revelation may also be one of the factors that led the aforementioned election committee member Irwin Lainoff, who was in charge of the final count, to declare publicly that the final election results were crooked.

All of which should make many LIP members and supporters grateful that they are not considered "good campus citizens" by the administration. It should give them such a clean feeling.

Ban on YPA Attacks Democracy, Not Stalin

In yet another blow at academic freedom, the Gideonse administration at Brooklyn College, not content with merely meddling with the student elections, has recently banned the campus chapter of the Stalinist front group, Young Progressives of America (YPA).

Gideonse's anti-democratic attacks do not become more fragrant because he justifies them as necessary against the totalitarians of the detestable Stalinist movement.

Brooklyn's Faculty-Student Committee on Student Activities, serving as executioner, was given authority by a ruling of the Faculty Council to suspend or revoke the charter of any campus group which it deems "communist, communist-related, or otherwise subversive of the college or the national welfare." This is as broad a formula as any under which the Stalinist totalitarians operate themselves.

THE REAL VICTIM

Unlike its own sycophants on the Kingsman's editorial board, the administration has presented no maze of rationalizations. The wording of its authoritarian edict makes perfectly clear that it is interested in eliminating opposition, democratic prerogatives notwithstanding. In this it is in complete accord with the policies and methods of Washington in the current imperialist cold war.

After all, could we expect anything different from Gideonse when, on a national and global scale, the Truman administration cynically and ruthlessly utilizes the ideas and methods of reaction in its self-styled war for freedom and against Stalinist Russia's police state—loyalty purges, subversive lists, economic and political sup-

port to such defenders of democracy as Franco, Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, ad nauseam?

It is not for the sake of this Stalinist youth group that we oppose Gideonse's extension of the "anti-red" witchhunt on the campus. Socialist youth are the stoutest in consistently fighting the supporters of Moscow's totalitarianism and breaking their influence over students. But as in the nation as a whole, such attacks on academic freedom and the right to political opinion are far more serious with regard to the democratic rights of all the students than they are with respect to the fate of the YPA. Stalinism can be beaten democratically, politically, among the students; it is democracy which is the victim of the witchhunt method.

STUDENT SOCIALIST
Student-Youth Section of
LABOR ACTION
No. 2 November 19, 1951
Section Editor:
Gertrude Blackwell
Appears as a 4-page section bi-monthly; one page on months in-between. Next 4-pager in December.

Subscribe to
LABOR ACTION

N. Y. Socialist Youth League Class—Sunday Evenings at 8 p.m.

The Politics of Independent Socialism

November 18
THE SCIENTIFIC INTERPRETATION
OF HISTORY
Jack Maxwell

November 25
THE WORLD WE DIDN'T MAKE
Anne Russell

December 2
LEVIATHAN IN CRISIS
Jack Maxwell

December 9
STALINISM: THE ROAD TO 1984
Gertrude Blackwell

December 16
THE WAY TO FREEDOM
Phyllis Hoffman

December 23
DEMOCRACY AND THE NEW SOCIETY
Hal Draper

December 30
THE WAR WE NEEDN'T HAVE
Julie Falk

January 6
WHERE TO BEGIN
Jack Maxwell

At Labor Action Hall, 114 West T4 Street, New York City