

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 18, 1952

FIVE CENTS

OILING UP POINT 4 FOR INDIA

... page 3

Reuther Fires the Fall Guy

... page 2

In this issue:

**STUDENT SOCIALIST**

Four-Page Student-Youth Section

## The Strange Case Of Francis Biddle

Two weeks ago (February 4) we front-paged "The Grimmiest Joke of the Year"—the statement by ex-Attorney General Francis Biddle that he prosecuted the Minneapolis defendants in the first case under the Smith Act simply to test the law.

"That was simply to test the constitutionality of the act; we wanted to get the Supreme Court's ruling on it as to its legality," he has claimed.

**And we left out what should have been the punch line. It took a reader to write in and remind us of it.**

To recapitulate first: Biddle is today chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, and author of a recent book *Fear of Freedom* in which he denounces the Smith Act with laudable vigor. On a TV program last month, "Author Meets the Critics," he was the author who was put on the spot by critic Leo Cherne. Biddle was asked why he saw fit to prosecute the Minneapolis defendants on the basis of the law which he denounces. His answer is the one quoted above.

It should be added that the government prosecution under Biddle definitely, on its own initiative, made the case hinge precisely on the "crudest evidence of 'dangerous thoughts,' including Marx's 1848 *Communist Manifesto*, not on any 'clear and present danger' of overthrow of the government 'by force and violence.'" In this respect, this first Smith Act case under Biddle (and Roosevelt), because of the grounds which Biddle himself chose, was even more clearly one of persecution for radical opinions than was the more recent case fathered by Truman and Tom Clark against CP leaders.

**So Biddle now claims that he organized the legal witchhunt of the Minneapolis 18 simply as a judicial experiment—"to test the constitutionality of the act"! Presumably he did this with the scientific objectivity of a white-coated laboratory assistant dissecting 18 guinea pigs.**

This is what we referred to, somewhat inadequately, as "the grimmiest joke of the year."

*Now, the punch line?*

**It was the same Department of Justice under Biddle—who now explains that he was dissecting the 18 guinea pigs just to find out if the knife was sharp—which exerted itself to block an anti-Smith Act ruling by the Supreme Court.**

### Did He Try to Get a Ruling?

That was in 1943, when the defense committee for the Minneapolis victims appealed to the highest bench to reverse the verdict which Biddle's witchhunt staff had obtained. In November 1943, in an unusual action, the Supreme Court curiously refused to review the case, thereby refusing to pass on its constitutionality. It gave no reasons for this rejection of its first opportunity to pass on the constitutionality of a new law.

**It was Biddle's department which argued for the constitutionality of the Smith Act before the court.**

(Our reader's letter goes further: "This was most accurately pointed out by a representative of the American Civil Liberties Union speaking at a recent meeting of the Socialist Youth League at the University of Chicago. The attorney pointed out that it was Biddle... who opposed reviewing the Minneapolis cases in a 40-page brief submitted to the Supreme Court.")

Whether Biddle actually urged *no* review or a *favorable* review, the fact is that Biddle never did get the review which, he now pretends, was the sole object of his endeavors.

**The fact is that Biddle never did oppose or criticize the refusal of the Supreme Court to do what (he now tells us) was the only reason for the Minneapolis case in the first place.**

The fact is that the court's refusal to rule on the Smith Act was regarded as a victory for the government prosecution and a defeat for the defendants—and it was.

The fact is that Biddle acted as the hatchetman for the Smith Act, and that there is not the least scintilla of objective evidence that he ever sought seriously to be anything else.

The fact is, furthermore, that the juridical basis for much of the present pall of fear which blankets political and intellectual life in the present Era of the Witchhunt, the Purge and the Loyalty Oath stems not from the activities of the fascist type McCarthy nor from the McCarran Law, and even goes back further than the subversive-by-decree of Truman—that juridical basis was established by the Smith Act adopted under Roosevelt and the precedent established by Biddle.

**And now Francis Biddle, chairman of the liberal ADA and author of *Fear of Freedom*, washes his hands.**

*What accounts for Biddle?*

It may seem futile to raise the question, or not worthwhile. A man can change his mind, can't he? . . . But certainly, and even if he is

(Continued on page 2)

## What's Behind Murray's Tactics in Steel Talks?

By GERALD McDermott

PITTSBURGH, Feb. 11—What is going on in steel? Has Steelworker President Phil Murray surrendered the right to strike in order not to embarrass Truman? Or is Murray out for a major victory? Are the current steel negotiations the beginning of a new no-strike-pledge period, or are they merely postponing an explosive strike?

**Enough has happened in the last three months to make it possible to draw some interesting analyses and conclusions. But first, it is necessary to say something about present conditions in the industry.**

The steel workers are now working under a contract that is five years old. While wages have been raised and pension provisions added since the present contract was drawn up five years ago, the contract itself is now obsolete compared with those in the other mass-production industries. For example, the steel workers, almost alone in modern industry, do not get any paid holidays. Not only that, but they still work on Saturday and Sunday for straight pay.

A further example of the shortcomings of the present contract is the question of shift differentials. In steel, this is only four cents for afternoon and six cents for evening work. Vacation provisions are bad; Southern workers still get less pay than Northern workers for the same work; reporting pay is inadequate, and so on. The rank-and-file steelworker has become more and more aware how far his union has fallen behind that of his neighbor who happens to work in auto, electrical goods, or coal.

Add to this the effects of inflation on steel wages. The United Steelworkers of America (USA-

CIO) does not have an escalator clause and it does not have a clause granting pay raises for increased productivity. The union did get an overdue increase in 1950 to bring wages up to the increased cost of living, but the cost of living has sailed right on ahead again since then.

**Neither wages nor fringe benefits are the most serious grievance, however. The real problem in the mills today is speedup, rate-cutting and company arrogance.**

### STATE OF THE UNION

Since the end of the war, the steel industry has embarked on a fantastic rationalization program. Far from permitting the workers to benefit from their greatly increased productivity, the corporations have cut rates, decreased crews and reclassified jobs (downward, of course), right and left. Labor relations were bad enough to start with under the old contract, because the number of grievance committeemen in any one plant is so greatly limited that it cripples union protection.

Taking advantage of this, the companies have sabotaged the grievance machinery until it is at a virtual standstill. The steel companies have taken advantage of the same situation which the auto companies have been exploiting—long contracts, the Taft-Hartley Act, McCarthyism, the cold war and Korea.

**That conditions in the steel industry have come to the pass described above does not speak well for the United Steelworkers of America.**

Murray, the president, is also the president of the national CIO. As such, he has been occupied in re-

cent years with a number of weighty problems—expelling the Stalinists, organizing new unions to replace the Stalinist ones, functioning under Taft-Hartley, working out some sort of livable relationship with the mobilization program, Operation Dixie, winning the telephone workers, and so on. As a result, the steel workers were left largely to the UMW-type bureaucracy which is still characteristic of the steel union. The union staff was as much occupied with maneuvering to be in a position to be Murray's successor as it was with building the union.

At the last convention of the CIO, with the CIO's house in some semblance of order, Murray turned over a good many of his duties as CIO head to the man in the newly created post of executive vice-president, Alan Haywood. He did this, said Murray, because he hoped to give up the post of CIO head entirely before long, and because he wanted to give more attention to his own union, the steel workers. Events are showing that he was serious about this latter task.

The first step in the rejuvenation of the USA-CIO was the present set of contract demands. The union is trying to make up for everything it has missed in recent years, plus some demands not yet won by other unions—notably the guaranteed annual wage. The union is asking for a union shop. It is asking for a new type of incentive plan whereby pay will be based upon the total tonnage of the entire plant, so that increased productivity will automatically mean higher wages.

**In short, the steel workers are**

(Continued on page 4)

## Liberal Party Runs Independent Labor Candidate Against Both Party Machines

By GORDON HASKELL

The Liberal Party is running its own candidate for a major office in the borough of Queens in New York City. He is not an "independent Democrat" or a "liberal Republican." He is an official of the Liberal Party and of the United Automobile Workers (CIO). He is running against both a Democrat and a Republican who have the backing of their parties. This is news.

His name is George F. Cranmore, assistant regional director of Region 9 of the UAW. He is running in a by-election for Congress in the fifth district, for a vacancy which was left when the incumbent was elected district attorney of Queens County last November. The election takes place on February 19. If he wins, he

will hold office only till the congressional elections next November. Yet it is clear that whoever wins the seat in Congress now will have the inside track in the contest next fall.

This election is not an ideal one from several points of view. Governor Dewey announced the date only a couple of weeks ago. Thus the time during which to organize a campaign was very short, and this gives every possible advantage to the powerful Republican machine in Queens County. In view of its traditional position in elections which have a bearing on national political line-ups, it is easy to understand that it took the Liberal Party leadership a little time to make up its mind to run its own candidate against the field. The actual campaign is

only going into gear one week before the balloting takes place.

In view of the difficulties, it can already be said that the membership of the party is responding magnificently to this chance to run the kind of candidate which so many of them would like to see the Liberal Party running regularly. Special contributions have been solicited and received from the membership, and many are putting in evenings in the campaign headquarters and doing the leg work which is needed.

Of course, the strongest impetus to this campaign has been given by the victory of Rudolph Halley for the post of president of the City Council last fall. Although Queens has not been a traditional stronghold of the Lib-

(Continued on page 2)



# Tactics in Steel Talks — —

(Continued from page 1)  
aiming at not only catching up but at becoming the "spearhead" of the labor movement, a role hitherto divided between the UAW and the UMW. Perhaps a factor in this is that when Murray does step down from CIO leadership, he still wants a strong base in CIO circles and thus is building up his own union. At any rate, a dynamic program is necessary to rally the union, which has not been the healthiest at the grass roots of late.

The reaction of the companies is what might be expected. LABOR ACTION readers are already aware that most profits are "fantastic" and that most corporations are "arrogant" these days. Yet, these are the words that have to be used.

For example: gross profits in the steel industry last year were running at the rate of 32.5 per cent of capitalization! Think of it—a rate that would pay back the entire investment of the owners every three years. Of course, taxes cut into this, but the literally stupendous size of the profits shows who is to blame for inflation. It is small wonder that both the union and the government claim that the industry can meet the union's demands without raising prices.

## WHY POSTPONED?

The steel industry, however, is used to having pretty much its own way both with the government and the union. From the government, the industry has demanded higher and higher prices, and gotten them. From the union, the industry got tacit approval for these price hikes, at least until Murray realized that labor was being blamed for inflation. In 1945-1946, when the UAW was trying to make prices a subject for collective bargaining, it was Murray who cut the ground from under them.

Today the industry is adamant and arrogant. It has pretty well sold the idea that wage increases inevitably mean price increases. Steel is in scarce supply for the armament drive (which Murray supports). So the industry simply rejects all union demands and proposes instead to weaken the present contract further. Ben Fairless, head of U. S. Steel, announced at the outset of negotiations that a new contract couldn't be reached through collective bargaining, and he proved his point by absolutely refusing to bargain. The industry tossed the problem to Truman. Truman threatened to invoke the T-H Law, and the union postponed the strike.

Why the postponement? Was Murray simply trying to avoid embarrassing "labor's friend" in the White House? Was he afraid of Taft-Hartley? Of course, both these factors enter in, but it is not that simple.

Steel is a touchy industry. Traditionally, it has been the toughest to organize, the last to be organized, and the hardest. It is the basic industry—a measuring rod by which nations are judged economically. Further, a strike in steel is immediately felt throughout the economy, more so than in auto, coal, or any other industry except transportation. Then there is the "inflation" issue and the "defense" issue.

For all of these reasons—and also because it is his method—Murray is playing for public opin-

ion. The union has now postponed the strike twice—reasonable enough, eh? The union asked President Fairless of U. S. Steel to address their special convention. This delighted the Pittsburgh papers, which apparently really believed that Fairless would accept the invitation and would talk the workers right out of a wage increase! Instead, Fairless declined with the incredible (because it's true) admission that "there is nothing I could say to you delegates which would change your opinions." This confession by such an industrial notable should end once and for all the lies about "labor dictators" who "force strikes" upon unwilling workers.

## OUTLOOK FOR STRIKE

Another play for public opinion (which, of course, includes steel workers and their families) has been the fuss the union has raised because U. S. Steel will not admit Red Cross Bloodmobiles to their plants so that steel workers may give blood for the wounded.

Now, the reasonable union has submitted the dispute to a Wage Stabilization Board panel. Of course, the panel will award the union part of its considerable demands; the reasonable and moderate union will accept; the companies will not; and THEN a strike will take place (unless the government immediately gives the companies a price boost.) This is the outlook.

This, as well as the other factors, is what is behind the strike postponement. It is a pattern of bargaining with Murray—partly arising out of the nature of the industry, and partly arising from Murray's personal philosophy and psychology. This was exactly the same pattern the steel workers used to get pensions two years ago, and largely the pattern of 1945-1946.

It was in the light of this strategy that the first special convention that the steel workers ever called was held last month. Supposedly a meeting to call off a strike, it was really preparing one—only for a later date. (It might be added that only a convention and a promise of later action would have headed off many angry and provoked locals.)

## LEFT FOOT FORWARD

This first special convention was a remarkable convention, if for no other reason than it concerned itself solely with union business. The program was not loaded with assorted generals, elder statesmen, archbishops, cabinet members, Friends of Labor, Marshall Plan dignitaries, senators and the like. In such a good clean atmosphere, the convention took place. It was soon apparent that Murray hoped for several things:

- (1) to unite the union around the contract demands and prepare the locals for a struggle after the WSB hearing ends;
- (2) to serve notice on the WSB, on Truman, and the companies that the rank and file were aroused and were united and were in a fighting mood;
- (3) to release the wellsprings of militant democratic rank-and-file participation which are necessary to renovate the USA-CIO.

All three of these purposes were achieved.

Most union militants have had the experience of attending con-

ventions or conferences where the chairman ignores or calls very infrequently on the known militants. This convention was the reverse—Murray, Goldberg and the other chairmen made it a point to call on the radicals, the militants and the fighters. The result was a hard-hitting, unifying, electrifying convention which brought the backward locals (and the cynical staff members!) up to a higher pitch and gave the secondary and local leaders a sense of unity and purpose which has not obtained for a long time in the USA-CIO. As one hardbitten journalist observed with some wonder, "You'd think these men were starting a revolution instead of calling off a strike; you'd think they were going out of this hall and go home and take over the police stations."

Murray was as leftish as the next man. The steel industry, he said, wants labor "to sell its bodies to the steel industry and make them amenable to the lash of the whip." He raked Fairless; he assailed Congress; he cursed Wall Street; he damned the House of Morgan. Of course, all this has been done before, and then forgotten two weeks after the words were uttered, but it was strong talk for Murray, who customarily calls steel executives by their first names. At any rate, the convention ate it up.

## READY TO FIGHT

What Murray said beyond the subject of current negotiations strengthens the notion that he is aiming at a general overhauling of the union. He declared his "return to the ranks" from the duties of CIO head. He swore that there would be no racketeers in the union (there never have been) and that there would be no petty dictators (he could have spit on several from where he spoke.) This brought applause. He openly warned that the undercover personal factionalism and building of staff machines had better stop. More applause. He swore that the USA-CIO was going to be a model democratic union. He continually referred to the coming regular convention in May of this year as if a great deal was to be accomplished there.

The spirit engendered (and expressed) at the convention was neither temporary nor artificial. Since then, there have been wildcats and slowdowns in plant after plant throughout the country. The ranks are ready to fight. (During the pension strike two years ago, such a feeling was largely lacking.)

It is not the intention of this article to whitewash Phil Murray. Most of the problems which the steel workers now face are a result directly or indirectly of the CIO's kowtowing to the Democratic Party in the foreign and domestic field. Nor is Murray's "clever" strategy to be wildly acclaimed. If he now feels he must win public opinion by going along with a government board, it is because he lost a lot of public support when he undermined the GM strike of the UAW in 1945-1946. And the whole policy of getting the sanction of a government board for wage increases and other benefits is dangerous. It is better to teach the workers from the start to rely on their own strength; the next time, the government board may turn thumbs down and explode the "reasonable" approach.

The above are truisms. They should not conceal that—within the bounds of the unfortunate Democratic-labor alliance—Murray is leading a struggle with considerable skill.

And perhaps most important of all, Murray is apparently coming to realize more fully the danger that the labor movement faces in the United States today. He has begun to mobilize more fully the steel union for the rough days ahead. In so doing, he has—of necessity, there is no other way—called on the ranks. Once they are in motion and begin to realize their power, they may do an even more thorough job than Murray hopes for.

# YOU and SCIENCE

## FREE SCIENCE IN A FREE SOCIETY

By CARL DARTON

When American scientists speak critically of Russian science it is often difficult to decide whether they are merely being "patriotic" or are sincerely concerned with the curtailment of freedom and the traditional liberties of science.

The harnessing of science to destruction, whether in Germany, Russia or America, is wrong. This fact should be apparent to all scientists. Less apparent, however, is how society, which is becoming increasingly interdependent, can best utilize science without restricting the creative working of the scientist. Fundamentally, it is part of the broad problem of individual freedom in an industrialized and complex economy. The solution should not be too difficult for scientists and all workers alike once the burden of war, capitalism and Stalinism is removed from our backs.

Numerous papers on Russian science at the recent AAAS meeting in Philadelphia reflect the dual interest of scientists in freedom as well as in things Russian.

The most publicized controversy on Russian science is in the field of genetics. This matter was reviewed at Philadelphia by Th. Dobzhansky, Columbia University, a Russian scientist himself until exiled in 1929.

The details of the controversy are highly technical and will not be reviewed here. However, no government had attempted to take sides in this scientific discussion until the Russian regime officially adopted Lysenkoism as the Stalinist line in genetics.

It is the considered judgment of most scientists throughout the rest of the world that Russian scientists, by misrepresentations, the use of half-truths and obscurantism, have made genetics in Russia a pseudo-science. To those familiar with the manner in which Stalinism has vulgarized and degraded Marx and Lenin, such corruption and misuse of scientific theory and method does not come as a surprise.

To Dobzhansky's credit let it be said that he does not beat the Russian bear unduly, for he realizes that Lysenkoism is just one form of nationalistic reaction which is repressing science everywhere. He stated that the day of the individual or independent scientist is past; that science is part of the great social movement of mankind, but the best method and means of utilizing science for human good is not yet available.

Dobzhansky emphasized that the Russian attempt is a miserable failure and the only answer to Lysenkoism is free criticism. He added that the reaction in science exists also in the United States, and any American scientist who can see anything good originating on Russian soil is considered subversive.

Most of the other speakers were merely critical of the Russians, mostly with a "holier than thou" attitude. It remained for R. L. Ackoff of the Case Institute of Technology to point out that many of the criticisms of science in Russia apply also to the United States.

To prove his point Ackoff compared the low status of the social sciences in both countries. In the Russian Academy of Science there is no separate department of sociology and the nearest approach to the social sciences is in economics. The only social inquiry is in the form of propaganda for the collective effort. There is no discussion of the scientific method as such, since the philosophy of "dialectic materialism" (in its mangled Stalinist form) is alone considered necessary. Under these conditions social sciences can only play a propaganda role and no attempt is made to question the basic political life of Russia.

In the United States Ackoff finds the social sciences not much better. Here they are often considered as part of the "humanities," and there is no social science in the National Academy. There have been no Nobel Prizes in the social sciences. As in Russia the greatest progress has been in propaganda, study of public opinion, and market research. The foremost sociologists in the U. S. are Gallup, Hooper and Crosley. The greatest employment opportunity for sociologists and psychologists in this country is in the War Department. The method of the social sciences here is the wide collection of superficial data of little significance. Comparing the relative budgets in the U. S. for the social and physical sciences, Ackoff stated that the former increased less than threefold from 1938 to 1948, from \$34 to \$88 million annually, while that for the physical sciences increased fivefold, from 234 million to 1 1/4 billions. Furthermore in 1938, about 38 per cent of the government's research was in the social sciences while in 1948 only 6 per cent was so applied.

Ackoff concluded that the reason for the failure to support the social sciences in both the U. S. and the USSR was the lack of urgency for such work from the viewpoint of those in political power. The social sciences are suppressed because those in control see no need for fundamental changes in social relationships. A highly developed social science requires the conditions of a free society.

Such sentiments as Ackoff expresses are inspiring, particularly when presented to such an august body as the American Association for the Advancement of Science and point the need both for a free science and a free society.



## LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 7

February 18, 1952

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, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

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

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.

## "THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV"

A Novel of Modern Russia

by VICTOR SERGE

\$3.00

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

## Militarizing the Youth of the Nation—

# UMT: Toward a Garrison State

By EUGENE MARTEL

Hearings recently conducted by the House Armed Services Committee, and now proceeding in a Senate Committee, hold the key to the fate of every young American male. For if the bills which will soon be before Congress should ever pass, Universal Military Training will become an inevitable part of every young man's life.

Because in most versions the proposal for UMT is in many respects similar to present Selective Service practices, the vital distinctions between the two are frequently ignored. The present Selective Service Act, like UMT, forces the draftee to serve several additional years in the reserves after regular full-time service. The present law also provides for almost automatic induction of all physically fit youth, if not immediately then ultimately.

As a matter of fact, when the current Selective Service Act was written, it included Universal Military Training as one of its features. Congress was then unwilling to accept UMT; 1950 was an election year, and even in the face of the Korean crisis, Congress had not yet been convinced of the "necessity" of permanent conscription. It accepted a compromise which provided for a commission to study the whole problem and bring in its recommendation.

This National Security Training Commission, stacked from the beginning, issued its report in October 1951, calling for UMT as necessary to defend the U. S. throughout the entire next period of its history.

It is this perspective of PERMANENT conscription which gives the UMT law its significance. The present Selective Service Act expires in 1954, and until Korea, its operation had been suspended indefinitely. Any system which makes induction a part of every youth's eighteenth birthday celebration must have far greater influence and far more extensive repercussions than one which is considered temporary and more or less accidental.

Should UMT be put into operation, we may expect the high schools to become more concerned than ever before with preparing students for their "post-graduate" work. If



football fields are not turned into drill yards, it will only be because of the increased emphasis on physical education which will be considered more necessary than English or mathematics. Narrow technical subjects will be stressed rather than those catering to broader intellectual and cultural interests. And all this will be in addition to the whole emphasis and orientation around preparing boys "psychologically" for their military career. (See accompanying story on "Operation High School.")

A large part of the reason why military circles favor UMT over the present conscription law is precisely because it will give them far greater influence, even if indirectly, over the entire educational structure of the coun-

try. But it will do far more than that.

By keeping all inactive reservists on call for seven and a half years, the armed forces retain direct control over the education, occupation and activities of the entire youthful working force of the country. While nominal reservists would be subject to recall only in times of "national emergency," the pretexts for such are numerous and varied. A nation-wide coal or rail strike could easily become the occasion for invoking "national emergency" powers and for a presidential draft of striking workers or for their replacement. Other examples are equally easy to visualize.

Whether or not such powers were ever invoked, the consequences of such a system would be to increase military influence, together with military ideology and prestige, in all areas of social life. And when it is recalled that military circles are almost always to be found on the extreme right wing of reactionary social groups who look with favor on "strong" measures as the solution to social problems and social conflict, the real threat behind this measure becomes apparent. It can become one of the main channels for the introduction of the Garrison State.

### ARGUMENTS OF THE OPPOSITION

Much of the opposition to UMT stems from precisely such considerations, but because of the almost inviolable position of sanctity which the armed forces enjoy, few opponents of UMT condemn it on this basis. A multitude of labor and religious groups appeared at the House Committee hearings on the bill, but their objections frequently lacked consistency and persuasiveness.

(1) One of the arguments is that a UMT program now would merely duplicate existing training facilities set up under Selective Service. The Defense Department met this by arguing that it wished to begin UMT on a "small" scale, using only 60,000 "volunteers" the first year, and then gradually building up to 800,000 yearly, completely dispensing with the draft.

(2) A similar position argues that the draft is doing a "better" job than UMT. This was the line of the CIO spokesmen, who took pains to assure everyone that CIO opposition to UMT was not based on any basic disagreement with American foreign policy and its military orientation, but that CIO thought UMT a "waste" of the taxpayers' money.

(3) Another line of argument denies entirely the need for large standing armed forces, or at least those trained in short periods of time. This "military opposition" is most likely to come either from exponents of Old Guard Republican isolationism, who are opposed in general to "foreign adventures," and hence oppose a large standing army

(Continued on page 4-5)

### U. of CALIFORNIA —

## Administration Slips a Pre-Fab Straitjacket on the 'Daily Cal'

By JOHN PARKER

BERKELEY, Calif.—"The monarch of college dailies," *The Daily Californian*, is being dethroned. The University of California student government, in a mood of subservience to the administration, has passed a measure providing for "adult" censorship of its own campus newspaper. The resolution calls for an advisory board to direct long-range policy and content of the campus paper, plus a day-to-day representative to counsel the editorial staff. The board is to be appointed by the president of the university, R. G. Sproul, and the adviser by the executive committee itself.

The board will be made up of members of the alumni, administration and faculty, together with student representatives, and *Daily Californian* spokesmen. It will be empowered not only to "advise" on policy and content, but to watch over appointments to the *Daily Californian* staff, and "to make such recommendations as it may deem appropriate to the executive committee."

As if blandly reassuring the students, the resolution states: "The board's duties shall not include direct control of *Daily Californian* editorial policy." But since the executive committee "reaffirms its constitutional jurisdiction over the policies and appointments of the *Daily Californian*," the board's opinions will be much more binding than mere advice.

The advisor is supposedly limited in powers but, again, his reports will be made to the executive committee, which in effect will control the *Daily Californian* in all matters. Furthermore, the com-

mittee may enlarge the advisor's duties any time, according to the resolution itself.

This will not be a popular move, and would normally meet with fierce opposition on the part of the students. It may be that the Executive Committee was thinking of this when it brought the resolution up on January 14, only a few days before classes ended and the *Daily Californian* quit publishing for the semester. Only two issues of the paper remained, and one of these was to be published by the sophomore staff. Besides this, the senior staff of the paper was leaving shortly, to be replaced by a brand new one.

### BEHIND EDITOR'S BACK

The editor of the paper must have had suspicions when she said, "It would appear that the committee has had all semester long to work out this resolution and that its presentation here tonight was extremely well-timed."

The committee did seem in a terrible hurry to get the resolution passed right away. With regard to

(Continued on page 3-5)

## A Victory at the Univ. of Chicago

CHICAGO, Feb. 11—The position of the University of Chicago as a stronghold of academic freedom has been maintained at least for the time being. On February 1, the campus *Maroon* announced that Dean of Students Robert Manning Strozier had decided not to veto the decision of the Student Government to extend official recognition to the Labor Youth League. This was an important victory for defenders of civil liberties and conversely a genuine defeat for such hypocritical "liberals" as Malcolm Sharp, university law professor, who are willing to defend the democratic rights of minorities only so long as it is "safe" to do so.

On January 22 Student Government, after brief discussion, voted to recognize LYL, with only two opposing votes. The recognition of the Socialist Youth League was passed unanimously without discussion.

The question was then in the hands of Dean Strozier who has veto power over the actions of

Student Government in such matters. Under the leadership of Student Government, the *Maroon*, and the Politics Club, an attempt was made to get various student organizations to demonstrate to Dean Strozier their opposition to a veto. These efforts met with considerable success.

There is no question that the unanimity of Student Government on this question and the united support which the Government received from the student body determined in large measure the decision of the dean not to veto.

Professor Sharp, the erstwhile liberal who originally raised the question of recognition of LYL on flimsy legal grounds, jumped on the patriotic bandwagon too late. There is undoubtedly a growing reaction throughout the country against the subversive list, the Smith Act, McCarthyism, and the rest of the apparatus of the current witchhunt. The action of the University of Chicago is only one symptom of this reaction. The protest will grow, more victories will be won, and more phonies like Professor Sharp will be exposed.

(Continued on page 4-5)



# UMT: Toward Garrison State —

(Continued from page 1-S)  
as bad military strategy, or unnecessary at this stage of the cold war.

(4) A large amount of talk was spent on proving that army experience is not conducive to "good moral character." On this point, a great many amusing things were said. Dr. R. M. Hutchins, for example, was quoted as saying: "I was in the army from the age of 18 to the age of 20 and cannot recommend it as a school of responsible citizenship. I came out lazier and more negligent than when I went in. I became an expert at cutting corners and at the elaborate kind of cheating to which privates devote most of their time."

The NSTC report, on the other hand, went into great detail about the benefits to be expected. "The greater need," it wrote, "is to stimulate and lead, to establish within the UMT program standards of honor and conduct comparable to those of a first-rate military academy or civilian college." (This was probably written before the great West Point scandal.)

In order to assure American mothers that their sons will not fall into traditionally bad army habits, it is planned to have post establishments selling 3.2 beer situated at an "inconvenient distance" from living barracks, and in the place of "hygiene" lectures usually delivered, there are to be talks on "the virtues of clean living."

## ALTERNATIVES

All of these arguments, however cogent they may be in part, suffer from their proponents' failure to suggest any real alternative to UMT as long as America maintains its present type foreign policy, which is completely based on building up her military power even further. Norman Thomas could only plead the cause of "universal and enforceable disarmament," a proposal which suffers only because of its utopian character.

The fact is that for all who have come to accept America's aims in the cold war—political, diplomatic and military—there is ultimately little choice but to accept the hard necessity of a huge military apparatus with all of its reactionary

consequences. And, if UMT can build this better than the draft, then opposition to UMT becomes "unreasonable."

Contrariwise, socialists who oppose America's aims are also opposed to the methods by which they are carried out, including Universal Military Training.

Present opposition to UMT, though widespread, is by and large disorganized or of meager political content. Its base undoubtedly rests to a substantial extent on the opposition of mothers who just can't be sold on the desirability of having their sons conscripted for reasons which are, to them, not immediately compelling. Senator Russell of Georgia explained it this way: "you are always going to have trouble with legislation that will affect intimately the lives of so many persons." And in a spirit of candor he added, "Let's not fool ourselves. The election campaigns are not going to help a bit."

## CHANCE FOR REPEAL

It is the very widespread, even though largely inarticulate, sentiment in opposition to UMT which makes possible its defeat. Even if passed, it is likely to have a clause prohibiting it from running concurrently with the draft, and beginning after Selective Service expires. This will give anti-conscription forces, both socialist and non-socialist, opportunities for working for its repeal before the program is actually put into effect.

The real task, however, is to attempt to create a broader understanding of UMT in relation to the cold war: how it aids in the creation of a Garrison State at home, and is an instrument for fastening American imperialism's yoke on the rest of the world. Opposition to UMT must be based on rejection of Washington's aims, as well as those of Russian imperialism—the threat of which is so often invoked by UMT advocates. But as against methods, military preparations and both these forces, with their aims, diplomatic maneuvers, the alternative of a Third Camp must be posed as the solution to the present impasse in world politics. As part of that perspective, the attempt to militarize America must be defeated.

## 'Operation High School'

Opponents of compulsory military training always have pointed out that the appetite of militarism is insatiable. One more proof of that fact appeared in the October 1951, issue of *Coronet* magazine. Anticipating success in compelling every 18-year-old American boy to undergo a period of military training and indoctrination, the militarists already are reaching into the high schools for the younger boys and girls.

This first phase of "Operation High School" is a large-scale assault using a series of 14 "educational" films very shrewdly. The films, under the general title "Are You Ready for Service?" were prepared by Coronet Films, a private firm, with the cooperation of the Department of Defense.

The ostensible purpose of the films will appeal to many parents and educators. Citing the "bewilderment" and "discouragement" of older boys in high school because they face possible military service, the films propose to explain why this service is necessary, what it will be like, and how boys—and girls—can prepare for it.

## PEACE — 'OBSOLETE'

The encroachment of enforced military service is producing discouragement and cynicism in teenage boys, who see their life plans being interrupted and even destroyed. Inevitably, many concerned parents and educators will welcome help in dealing with these youth—unless they see clearly the real purpose under the persuasive sales talk.

That real purpose was revealed in *Coronet* magazine, published by the films' producers. It is to help young people adjust psychologically to the "new principles" that *Coronet* claims America must now accept. The "old principles," now outmoded, are ones that the boys and girls in high school, says *Coronet*, "have taken for granted." What are these now obsolete principles? "First, peace is basic. Youngsters have been taught to abhor violence and to value 'getting along with others.'"

If "peace is not basic," then war is. If we do not value "getting along with others," then we shall value compelling others to obey us—or liquidate them, as the Communists do!

The films do just this kind of job—but they do it skillfully. Here is how they do it:

(1) They emphasize the inevitability of war. Even though the accompanying text points out that the conscripted boys "may not necessarily" be involved in war, the effect of this is destroyed by the defining of communism as a purely military threat and the plain implication that only military means can deal with it.

(2) The films take permanent conscription for granted. There is no suggestion that universal conscription might be temporary. On the contrary, the films emphasize that the American pattern of life has been changed; henceforth every youth must count on a period of military service as he counts on home, school, and work. They imply, without stating, that this service provides the principal motivation for good citizenship, for staying in school, and for planning one's curriculum.

## DEBASING DEMOCRACY

(3) They oversimplify the problem of world peace. The films reduce world tension to the cops-and-robbers level. Nothing is involved in the threat of war but the lust for power of the Communists. Nothing is said of the problems of hunger, nationalism, and other factors that can only be combated on a non-military level. People whose understanding of world problems stops on this level will be unable to find, or even comprehend, any other type of solution than a military one.

(4) They debase democracy. Like much other advertising-level political thinking, the essential nature of the "American way of life" is defined principally in terms of "the right to stop in at the corner hamburger stand" and the "right to spend your money as you choose." As an afterthought, the narrator mentions—but only mentions—freedom of speech, press and worship, but gives them no content or meaning.

The films, on the whole, will do little good and a great deal of harm. They should be kept out of schools wherever possible.

—National Council Against Conscription.

## ISL Program — in Brief

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

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

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a 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!

## STUDENT SOCIALIST

Student-Youth Section of LABOR ACTION

No. 5 February 18, 1952

Section Editor: SAM FELIKS

## SYL Aims to Top The Fund Drive

By DON HARRIS

All indications at the start of this year's Fund Drive are that the SYL is going to make the largest quota in its history—and oversubscribe to a considerable extent.

While last year's quota was \$500, and over \$850 was actually collected, this year's quota totals \$1500 and final collections may be several hundred dollars over that amount. Every unit listed below has either already accepted its quota, or indicated that it will do so. New York already has over \$400 pledged.

Chicago, seeking to remain in the lead this year as last, writes that it hopes to top its quota by 150 per cent! St. Louis decided that it wished to have its tentative quota raised from \$35 to \$50 and that it would try to raise even more. In no case did any unit ask to have its quota reduced.

This augurs well for the

drive's success! Throughout the drive, as receipts are reported, the SYL will be listed separately with one total amount, but each separate contribution will be acknowledged in the Fund Drive articles week by week.

The only category which is now in doubt is that attributed to "general." It is hoped that SYL members-at-large, and sympathizers of the SYL throughout the country, will independently contribute to this fund. Separate quotas are as follows:

Chicago	\$475.
New York	375.
Berkeley	175.
Detroit	175.
St. Louis	50.
Buffalo	40.
Los Angeles	40.
Northwest	30.
Madison	20.
New Haven	20.
General	100.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1500.</b>

## University of Chicago Chapter Socialist Youth League

### Jews in the Soviet Union

Speaker:

**Jerzy Glicksman**

Survivor of Russian forced-labor camps;  
Author of "Tell the West"

**SUNDAY, MARCH 2 at 4 p.m.**  
**EAST LOUNGE, IDA NOYES**

Admission Free. Light refreshments.

## U. of Chi. —

(Continued from page 1-S)

The reactionary, red-baiting opponents of democracy, however, will not cease their efforts. Their propaganda is based upon and nourished by the drive toward war on the part of the American government. Dean Strozier's statement carefully leaves the door open to a future withdrawal of recognition, should the pressure become too great. It is up to the students of the University of Chicago, by maintaining their opposition to any and all infringements on academic freedom, to see that this does not happen. Students at other universities should take heart from the success at Chicago. If students are united in their defense of civil liberties victories for democracy can be won.

## New-Fashioned

"Similarly, old-fashioned economic exploitation [in Africa] has disappeared, but this has not prevented Western Europe from drawing liberally on the resources and riches of colonial Africa in order to recover from the ravages of the war."—N. Y. Post, Feb. 7, series by J. P. Lash.

## Horror Dept.

"The steel industry told a Wage Stabilization Board panel yesterday that the board would hamper the country's defense against atomic attack, undermine our foreign economic policy and introduce 'totalitarianism' in the United States if it recommended that Southern steel workers get the same pay as Northern steel workers."—N. Y. Times, Feb. 7.

Wonder what became of the poor widows and orphans. . .