

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 8, 1952

FIVE CENTS

WHAT'S HAPPENING TO THE STUDENT CO-OP MOVEMENT?

... page 8

THE 'COUNTERFEIT REVOLUTION'

... page 6

Lots of Left Talk in the BLP

... page 3

## No Reuther Slate Against Stellato in Ford Local 600

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Sept. 1—Rather than face certain and overwhelming defeat in the forthcoming elections at Ford Local 600, the top leadership of the United Auto Workers (CIO) pulled the rug from under its own right-wing caucus slate and left Carl Stellato, incumbent president, unopposed for re-election.

The right-wing slate, headed by Ed Lee, UAW educational representative, issued quite a blast at the Reuther leadership at the time it announced its withdrawal from the election, thus assuring victory to Stellato and his three top officers, Bill Grant, Pat Rice and Bill Hood, in the balloting this coming week.

"We feel that the house-cleaning job promised by the administrative committee turned out to be a white-wash," the right-wing statement said.

### "FAST MANEUVER"

They accused the administrators (meaning Walter Reuther) of imposing a "gag rule" on anti-Stellato literature. As for the sudden announcement of an election, it was branded "a fast maneuver," and the caucus statement charged that this "gave added weight to the rumored deals which the right wing had protested to the international over two months ago."

(At that time, a proposal by Walter Reuther that the right-wing slate support

(Continued on page 3)

## 'Containment' or 'Liberation'?

## Eisenhower and Stevenson On the Horns of a Dilemma

By BERNARD CRAMER

Governor Stevenson has now replied, in his speech at Hamtramck, to the new line on foreign policy which General Eisenhower took the preceding week in his American Legion address. The stand by each defines the cruel dilemma in foreign policy which Washington faces in the cold war.

Eisenhower quite clearly proposed to go beyond the administration's line of "containment" of the Stalinist power, to the "liberation" of the peoples under the Kremlin's heel. While it is possible to question whether he really understands and accepts the implication of this line which John Foster Dylles has sold him, we must still discuss it on the assumption that he is responsible for what he says.

The pretty nearly unanimous, or at least very widespread, reaction in Europe to the general's speech is an accurate indicator of its

implications. They too wonder whether good old Ike knows what he said when he was talking through that Legion hat,

but they have little doubt about what the words meant. It is no exaggeration to say that his speech was the most openly war-mongering address made by a responsible American politician, short of MacArthur's alarms for extending the war to China and the undercover "preventive war" talk.

### PEACE THROUGH DEALS

And yet—and at the same time—Eisenhower has a powerful and legitimate point! There are a couple of elements in all this which have to be disentangled, after which the nature of Stevenson's reply will also be clearer.

What, after all, is the end-aim of the official Washington policy of "containment," of overawing the Russian imperialist rival? It is peace, they say; and we have never expressed any doubt that they do not want a war. (We would add only that neither does the Kremlin necessarily want a war; like other rivals before them, they "merely" want that which, in the long run, cannot be achieved without war, namely, dominant power in the world.)

And what is the nature of this peace which is to be achieved by "containment" and military superiority? It is, of course, a peace which is to rest on a negotiated deal—one which the West can trust, presumably, unlike all other deals—a deal whose stability will be ensured by military superiority, but a deal nevertheless. Such a deal, it cannot be concealed, must in one form or another rest upon a division of the world.

### WHAT IT WILL MEAN

If the Atlantic camp can eventually force one to the advantage of the West, it may conceivably

(Continued on page 2)

## AS LABOR DAY LAUNCHES THE DEMOCRATIC CAMPAIGN—

## Stevenson Speeches Warm Up the Fair Deal

By MARY BELL

The Democratic Party campaign has started into high gear; its leading nominee has now made over half a dozen speeches since we last went to press, including a couple of major policy-making addresses. Eisenhower, whose campaign (says his headquarters) has not really begun as yet, confined himself to a speech to the Letter Carriers' Association, pledging himself to improve the mails and not to discriminate against civil employees if the Republicans take over in November. The incumbent president delivered himself of a vigorous defense of the Democratic record and peppery attacks on the Republicans on Labor Day.

Several important issues thus appear to have been set by the Democratic spokesmen, speaking first, in attempting to demonstrate their political superiority over the Republican Party.

With, of course, several gratuitous nods to the American Legion (such as for its "campaign to awak-

en America to the need for military preparedness"), Stevenson's address was markedly different from that of Eisenhower who, as has been reported, skipped his most pointed prepared remarks attacking McCarthyism.

### ON PATRIOTISM

Stevenson, on the other hand, sought to separate himself from the pressures of special-interest groupings, and read the Legion a sermon on patriotism, a sphere which the Legion regards as its special province. Stevenson spoke shortly after the adoption of a resolution by the convention attacking administration foreign policy and calling (for the third time) for the dismissal of Secretary of State Dean Acheson. Nevertheless, he was able to stir some apparently respectful applause with such comments as:

"There are some men among us who use 'patriotism' as a club for attacking other Americans. . . . Now what can we say, too, for the man who proclaims himself

a patriot—and then for political or for personal reasons attacks the patriotism of faithful public servants?"

### HOW "BOLD"?

Stevenson cited the attack on General Marshall, calling this type of patriotism "the last refuge of scoundrels," using Dr. Johnson's famous phrase. He also warned that threats to the Bill of Rights and to freedom of the mind are done in an excess of patriotic zeal and that "to strike freedom of the mind with the fist of patriotism is an old and ugly subtlety." The attacks on the schools and school teachers who have become targets for the witchhunters were also dealt with.

The line which Stevenson took in this instance on civil liberties is of a piece with his stand on the Broyles' anti-subversive bill in Illinois. It is a strictly measured type of civil-liberties approach, which has already been dealt with in LABOR ACTION in an appraisal by Dick Oliver, indicating that the governor preferred to let such matters be handled

by existing agencies, loyalty boards, Subversive Activities Control Board, the FBI, the unreviewable attorney general's list, etc. This again is of a piece with the Truman administration's point of view. It is an approach which appears "bold" only on a Legion platform or in contrast to the paleolithic Republican approach, and in the stench of McCarthyism which pervades the American political atmosphere.

In his pre-campaign remarks, when the strategy of political unity within the Democratic Party was being set, Stevenson was equivocal in his statements on repeal of Taft-Hartley and on federal FEPC legislation, although the Democratic platform was in favor of each. His stand on the latter question has been resolved in favor of the platform, and has given Adam Clayton Powell, who was threatening to boycott the elections, a chance to come back to the fold. While Republican Senator Ives of New York continues to campaign on the

(Continued on page 2)

### Take a Letter, Mr. President

After they had gotten through listening to General Eisenhower and a few other politicians, the National Association of Letter Carriers adopted a convention resolution advocating that all "loyalty" proceedings against civil-service employees be conducted in the open "as provided in the Constitution." In taking this democratic stand the letter carriers distinguished themselves both from Eisenhower, who has pussyfooted even on McCarthyism, and from the Truman administration's "antisubversive" program and policies.

# Speeches Warm Up Fair Deal — —

(Continued from page 1)  
basis of federal FEPC legislation, Eisenhower remains opposed.

### CAPTIVES

In Detroit, before a labor audience, Stevenson came out for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law, which he described as a "tangled snarl of legal barbed wire, filled with ugly sneers at labor unions and built around the discredited labor injunction." Adherence to this plank was the *sine qua non* for the support of the labor movement, and the Democratic Party recognizes its indebtedness to its most consistent and cohesive large body of supporters. Carrying out the strategy of speaking as one who is above special groups, Stevenson told the labor audience, "You are not my captives and I am not yours."

"Captive" has become a political dirty word in the current campaign. In President Truman's Labor Day address, he referred to the Republican effort to "hide behind a new face—their lonely, captive candidate." On the Republican right, Stevenson and Truman are "captives of the CIO." The New York Post, in a rather snide report on the Detroit audience composed of men from the labor movement, called it "in many ways a captive audience." (The Post reporter, applying a vulgar concept of a mob, wrote: "Any orator, no matter how mediocre, who is prepared to say the right phrases and repeat the classic punch lines, could whip these men to a frenzy, or at the very least be sure of warm applause. . . .") The proper comment on this bit of snobism is that it seems to be even easier for Democratic phrasemakers, including Sparkman, to get warm applause in the Post's editorial columns.)

Aside from getting rid of the "political symbolism" of the Taft-Hartley Law, Stevenson would introduce a new law, something the labor movement has not hitherto proposed. He would outlaw injunctions, one of the worst features of the law, modify "unfair labor practices," spelling out some he considers unfair on the part of labor, and propose measures for dealing with strikes opposed to the "national interest." His formulations left plenty of room for uncertainty as to the character of the new law he would favor, an uncertainty which can be further read in terms of his previous reluctance about repealing TH in the first place.

At its present stage of development, this matter is something about which the labor movement has nothing to say and with which it is unprepared to deal, as it was in the case of the problems posed for it by the no-strike

pledge of the last war and the War Labor Board burying ground for labor disputes. While Stevenson has no clear-cut proposal, he mentions possibilities such as legally defined seizure powers, arbitration, mediation, and fact-finding procedures.

### NUANCES

Stevenson also hewed to the New Deal-Fair Deal line of "decent living wage, insurance against risks of disability and unemployment, and the assurance of solid security when life's work is done," as well as "equality of work—regardless of race or creed or color." In addition, he stressed that the ends desired by the Democratic platform were "private collective bargaining" as if to answer the charges from the right of "creeping socialism" in describing the welfare aspects of the state under the Democrats.

In his Grand Rapids talk, harking to the bi-partisan

ghost of Senator Vandenberg, Stevenson drew the line between the Eisenhower Republicans and those who have attacked the administration policy in Korea and called for an enlargement of the Korean War, making as much as he could of the "two Republican parties." He thus strengthened the "me-too" label on Eisenhower which annoys the Taftites and has alienated the Chicago Tribune's McCormick. Stevenson also stressed the difference which could exist between the legislative and executive with a Republican victory, with the Republican legislators opposed to what the Republican president approved. (This has, of course, been the case with the Democrats, too.) Stevenson held up for admiration, in contrast, his united Democratic Party—"united" as a result of the concessions to the South made in Chicago.

Nuances of differences in style and approach were observable in Truman's Labor Day address in Milwaukee, but not in substance. Whereas Stevenson posed as being above groups, Truman placed the Democratic candidates as the "friends of labor," as well as of the farmer and of all groups in the population. The Republicans he castigated as the party of the "special interests, still the errand boys of the big lobbies, still the ones who want to exploit labor and the farmers and the consumers." There is a little more of the "radical" (in the New Deal sense) phraseology in Truman than in Stevenson.

Truman also read the record on Republican opposition to public power, rural electrification, soil conservation, price stabilization.

### ISSUES REFRACTED

While the preservation of the two-party system is invoked as something sacred at times by both parties, Truman does not care a fig for the disappearance of the Republican Party at present. The argument for the

election of the Republican Party at this time on the grounds that it might disappear, he dismissed as "an appeal to charity."

Arguments as to the distinctions between the Truman administration and a possible Stevenson administration are on the speculative side, and many factors have to be weighed. The Democratic campaign is being waged on the basis of a unified party. This strategy was apparently decided upon in the interests of winning in the face of the Republican nomination of a popular hero against an unknown. It takes place at the height of the United States role in world affairs, in a period of prolonged war prosperity and with the prospect of a third world war in sight. Most importantly, the two major capitalist parties have the political arena to themselves. All class and social issues are thus refracted and distorted within the two-party system.

# 'Containment' or 'Liberation'? — —

(Continued from page 1)

mean that the Stalinists get completely out of Korea, or out of Indo-China, or stop harassing West Berlin, or call off their dogs all along the marches where the powers are clashing in arms or propaganda. One can list the very extreme possibilities which the U. S. may hope for. But who in his senses dreams that any kind of negotiated deal with the Russians can mean freedom for the satellite peoples who are now under the heel of the Kremlin, and who were handed over to the Russians by the deals at Yalta and Potsdam?

In a real sense, the very optimum goal of the Western statesman, granting them every benefit of every doubt as we are doing at the moment, is a "peaceful coexistence" and negotiated deal at the expense of the peoples already swallowed by the Stalinist empire. That is, by a new—and, they hope, more stable—Yalta and Potsdam. There is nothing surprising about this, if we forget the high-principled morality which is spouted for the record while the jockeying is going on. And we are not now raising the question of how long even such an imperialist peace, laid out cold on the bargain table, can endure in today's world, even if it is ever made, greeted, hailed and signed with at least as many hosannas to the spirit of peace as filled the air in some quarters after the Munich pact.

THE OTHER SIDE  
It is not surprising that the masses of Eastern Europe, who hate Stalinism, are not enamored of such a peace which appears to much of the Western world as a beautiful dream.

Nor is it necessary to doubt that the hearts of the Western statesmen will feel a couple of twinges in that happy eventualities, perhaps even a couple more than filled Chamberlain's bosom as he disposed of the Czechoslovak nation. It is not hard to see how convincing their rationalization is and will be: *What can we do so inhuman, so cruel as to throw the world into an atomic war even though it may be to liberate these cruelly oppressed people? Our heart bleeds for them, and we wish heartily that they will be able to free themselves some day, but meanwhile it is peace whose claims*

overshadow every other consideration.

And if one sticks to the framework which is assumed, that is unanswerable too.

This is the dilemma of Western capitalist foreign policy: imperialist war or imperialist peace. And as we have said, that is quite apart from the fact that, in the longer run, the latter means imperialist war too as long as the social forces at loggerheads remain the same.

### PERMANENT WAR?

This is the dilemma which is lifting Eisenhower and Stevenson on its either horn.

Within this framework, the Eisenhower-Dulles line means a perspective of permanent war. If it means what it says, it excludes a negotiated deal with the Russians. It poses as its aim only a decisive military conclusion—if any military conclusion is possible at all in tomorrow's atomic war. It raises the Carthaginian slogan—Russia must be destroyed—but it will not fight with oared galleys. Above all, it flatly makes war inevitable.

There is, of course, only one way out of this dilemma, and it is the course which Independent Socialism advocates as the basis of the building of the Third Camp. It happens that in this issue it is more adequately discussed on page 6 that we can do it here; in short, it is the program for a political struggle for the destruction of Stalinism, and of Moscow's hold over the masses of people, a political struggle which is impossible for capitalism.

It is only such a course which can reconcile the struggle against Stalinism to the death with the struggle against war itself.

### THE TWO FORMS

Such a course cannot even be discussed in connection with Eisenhower. For him the "liberation" of the Eastern European peoples means the restoration of the old regimes, and the ruling classes behind them, which even the mass of people of Stalinism hate at least as much as their present oppressors. In fact, one of the forces which moderates opposition to, and invites passivity and toleration before, the Moscow power is precisely the fear of the peoples that the only alternative to the Stalinists is

the return of the old system of which they had their belly-ful, including the return of the Chiang Kai-sheks.

This is why the Eisenhower-Dulles line has up to now been pretty much the property of the Republican right wing, or indeed only of certain sections of that right wing, supported by the rightist émigré lobby.

In their form, the line of "liberation, not containment" is a rallying slogan of some of the most reactionary forces in the country, including the China Lobby and the congressmen "from Formosa."

In the socialist form, the slogan of liberation, not containment, is the only road toward blowing up the Stalinist power from within.

### STEVENSON'S LINE

In opposition to Eisenhower, however, Stevenson has clearly declared for sticking with the Truman-Acheson formula for containment, while expressing his sympathy (which we have no reason to consider insincere) for the hapless peoples under Russian totalitarianism. At Hamtramck he was speaking to a predominantly Polish-American community.

The line that he presented to them was forthrightly one of a negotiated deal for peace.

"His [Eisenhower's] speech aroused speculation here and abroad that if he were elected, some reckless action might ensue in an attempt to liberate the peoples of Eastern Europe from Soviet tyranny," he said.

Let us make clear right now that we do not think that this is the real danger. We do not think Dulles and his co-thinkers want to throw the U. S. into war for

the sake of liberating East Europe. That is as far from their approach to the question as is socialism; they have no such internationalist, idealistic or philanthropic aim, even if such a leap into war could be thinkable on the basis of such aims. They too tell themselves that American military superiority can be built up so monstrously that Moscow will have to knuckle under without war, and (like some elements in the State Department) kid themselves about the possibilities of fostering revolt behind the Iron Curtain on their own basis.

"I tell you now that I will never fear to negotiate in good faith with the Soviet Union, for to close the door to the conference room is to open the door to war. . . . The free nations . . . must always be ready to sit down at the conference table, insisting only that any agreement must conform to the spirit of our great wartime pledges and the Charter of the United Nations."

"I think the Soviet Union will be influenced only by a steady, serious, undeviating determination to build up the strength of the free world—not with a view toward war but with a view toward preventing war and negotiating the conditions of peace."

In this context, the fair words about the spirit of the UN charter mean no more than that did the "great wartime pledges" which were contained in the Atlantic Charter.

Stevenson is perfectly right in arguing that the Eisenhower-Dulles policy means "liberation," if at all, "in the ashes of another world war." What he has to offer must be understood equally,

Get ALL your books from  
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

We specialize in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement and Marxism.

Write for our free book list: all the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky; labor history; socialist fundamentals; economics of capitalism; Stalinism and Stalinist Russia, etc.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street New York 11, New York

### LONDON LETTER

## There's Lots of Left Talk Going 'Round; Bevanite 'Tribune' to Become a Weekly

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Aug. 27—The 51st annual conference of the Labor Party is to be held in Morecombe from September 29 to October 3. All the leading figures of the labor movement are making speeches with an eye to influencing the decisions of this great conference.

Over the weekend Emanuel Shinwell, former Labor minister of defense and hitherto a staunch right-wing loyalist, made it clear that he was in favor of a reduction of the period of military service from two years to—12 months! It was only a few weeks ago that he had come out in favor of reducing it from two years to 18 months. Not only that, but in the same speech at Liverpool, he insisted that the next Labor government must adopt a "consistently left-wing policy."

Meanwhile Hugh Dalton, at a Fabian summer school in Farnham, had this to say about the differences within the Labor Party:

"I intend to do my best to help to bridge the differences and bring rival factions together."

And on the subject of Labor's future policy he said: "There must be another big heave toward socialism under the next Labor government." And most interesting still, pointing a warning finger at the dangers of inertia in the leadership of our party, he made this comment: "Some socialists, as they grow older, settle down by the wayside—mentally and spiritually as well as physically. They gradually cease to believe in the possibility of more big changes in their lifetime, and they undervalue the greater energy and the new ideas of younger men. This form of creeping conservatism is very insidious and must be combated."

### CATHOLIC BLOC?

The only discordant note in this left-wing chorus so far has come from Richard Stokes, former Labor minister for materials. He is trying to organize an anti-Bevan caucus meeting at the Empress Theatre, despite the fact that he has been advised not to, by the National Executive itself. It was Stokes, it will be recalled, who raised the hue and cry about Bevan's "party within a party" not very long ago.

What is suspected in certain quarters is this: that the Catholic hierarchy in this country is organizing a clique of leading figures in the Labor Party to combat Bevan's influence. The fact that Bevan is a sort of "Marxist" and a friend of Tito, whom the Vatican regards as a bitter enemy, makes him enemy No. 1 of the Catholic hierarchy in Britain. Both Richard Stokes and Lord Pakenham are practising Catholics and it is believed that they have been encouraged to mobilize the not inconsiderable Irish Catholic support in the Labor Party against Aneurin Bevan. This also goes for Bessie Braddock, an erstwhile left-winger and a candidate for the National Executive Committee, who is leaning on the very strong Irish Catholic machine in the Merseyside area against the very militant Liverpool Trades Council.

It is, of course, from the socialist point of view exceedingly regrettable that religious lineups should in any way affect the situation in the Labor Party, and it is certainly to be hoped that these beliefs are at least exaggerated—or if not, that such attempts will be properly dealt with.

On policy: (1) *Our First Party Peace*; (2) *Labor's Foreign Policy*; (3) *Towards World Plenty*; (4) *Facing the Facts*.

On education: (1) *Trade-Unionism, Its Origins, Growth and Role in Modern Society*; (2) *The Cooperative Movement*; (3) *The Real Nature of Conservatism*.

On education: (1) *Trade-Unionism, Its Origins, Growth and Role in Modern Society*; (2) *The Cooperative Movement*; (3) *The Real Nature of Conservatism*.

On education: (1) *Trade-Unionism, Its Origins, Growth and Role in Modern Society*; (2) *The Cooperative Movement*; (3) *The Real Nature of Conservatism*.

On education: (1) *Trade-Unionism, Its Origins, Growth and Role in Modern Society*; (2) *The Cooperative Movement*; (3) *The Real Nature of Conservatism*.

and Michael Foote and the main organ of the Bevan tendency, which has been a fortnightly, is to blossom out as a weekly paper on September 26. From the format which is displayed by a photo for the latest issue of *Tribune* (August 22-September 4) it is clear that *Tribune* is to become a semi-agitational paper.

Its price is being reduced from 6d. to 4d. This will enable it to become a mass paper having as its immediate object bringing the Tories down and propelling into power a Labor Party full of hope and faith in the socialist future.

All the sectarian journals will be eclipsed by this new move on the part of the editors of *Tribune*. In my opinion it is essential that British socialists help to build up the circulation of *Tribune* in their wards, trade-union branches, cooperative guilds, League of Youth, etc. This is not because it is a perfect paper—it is not by any means—but rather because *Tribune* will draw the most advanced sections of the Labor Party into its immediate orbit, and assist immeasurably in posing the questions in the right spirit and with the right emphasis, if not actually always clarifying many controversial issues.

Other journals like *Forward*, *Labor's Northern Voice* and the *South West Herald* are very local in their approach. Their circulation is more or less static. The *South Wales Democrat* is, however, a new advance in this respect. Though restricted in its appeal, it is able to grapple with many issues in a popular and readable way. It is open to criticism in my own opinion because it tends to evade the burning controversies of our day, often appearing to lend support to those sections of our movement who "as they grow older, settle down by the wayside," to quote Dalton.

The report of the NEC covers a vast ground, dealing not only with resolutions passed by the NEC but also with reports on conferences, financial situation of various sections of the movement, etc.

### ORG FIGURES

The individual membership of the party at the end of 1951 was 876,275, a decrease of 31,886 compared with the previous year. This shows a certain organizational laxity which must be overcome. The target of a million individual party members has not been reached, and definite steps to make sure of this target this year will be demanded by the delegates at the conference.

Another good omen, as far as the left is concerned, is the space devoted in the report to the Labor League of Youth. According to the latest comprehensive check of the head office (in Transport House), 670 branches are recorded. Also twelve parliamentary candidates were League of Youth members in the October election of last year—and no less than 20 election agents (in charge of running a campaign) belonged to the LLY. Not least important is the rise in the sales of *Socialist Advance*, due not only to its technical and journalistic improvements but also to the fact that it reflects (even if in somewhat distorted fashion) like a prism, the strong left-wing pressure within the League of Youth.

As far as publications are concerned, Transport House [central office of the Labor Party] has brought out three series of pamphlets. The first dealt with policy, the second with policy discussion, and the third with party education. These pamphlets were as follows:

On policy: (1) *Our First Party Peace*; (2) *Labor's Foreign Policy*; (3) *Towards World Plenty*; (4) *Facing the Facts*.

On education: (1) *Trade-Unionism, Its Origins, Growth and Role in Modern Society*; (2) *The Cooperative Movement*; (3) *The Real Nature of Conservatism*.

On education: (1) *Trade-Unionism, Its Origins, Growth and Role in Modern Society*; (2) *The Cooperative Movement*; (3) *The Real Nature of Conservatism*.

On education: (1) *Trade-Unionism, Its Origins, Growth and Role in Modern Society*; (2) *The Cooperative Movement*; (3) *The Real Nature of Conservatism*.

# On The Mark Haskell Tour Starts in Calif.

Shortly after this issue of LABOR ACTION reaches you, the national tour of Gordon Haskell, assistant editor, will have opened in Los Angeles, California. Haskell will speak at public meetings in behalf of the Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League.

The tour will also concern itself with organizational matters of the ISL and the SYL. For that reason Haskell will spend three weeks on the West Coast, where in addition to speaking at public meetings he will meet with ISL branches and units of the SYL to discuss political and practical problems of the two organizations. Starting in Los Angeles on September 15, Haskell will move up the coast to the Bay and Seattle areas, staying one week in each place.

From Seattle, the tour will pick up again in the Middle East. The Chicago area meetings will include Madison, Wisconsin and Streator, Illinois. While in Detroit, Haskell will go to Ann Arbor. From Cleveland, he will also cover Akron and Oberlin and then complete the tour in the East at Pittsburgh, Philadelphia and Reading.

### Watch for Announcements

The chief topic of discussion at Haskell's meetings will be the presidential election campaign, which is itself now going into high gear. He will present a socialist position on the elections as a guide to worker militants.

Other meetings will deal with the war situation, the war economy and inflation. Branches of the ISL and units of the SYL are planning debates and social affairs in connection with the tour.

Readers of LABOR ACTION are advised to watch the columns of the paper for details of the tour in the various cities listed and to keep in touch with the ISL branches in order not to miss any of the meetings and affairs.

Below is the schedule which the tour will follow. Although no date is given for Newark, this will be the final stop on the tour.

Los Angeles	September 15-21
Bay Area	September 22-28
Seattle Area	September 29-October 5
Kansas City	October 6-7
Chicago Area	October 10-15
Detroit Area	October 16-19
Cleveland Area	October 20-22
Pittsburgh	October 23-24
Philadelphia	October 25
Reading	October 26

# No Reuther Slate — —

(Continued from page 1)

Stellato was vigorously rejected at a large right-wing caucus.)

The failure of the anti-Stellato slate to get the backing of UAW President Reuther was the main reason for the withdrawal from the election, the caucus declared.

That Stellato was pleased with the current developments was shown in his startling statement, praising the administrators and Reuther. Without cracking a smile he said the skepticism he previously had that Reuther would play politics with the administration had been proven wrong, and he commended the administrators for their non-factionalism. This created quite a furor among his own followers this past week.

Stellato added, "I continue my opposition to the efforts of the Communist Party members or any other outside force to infiltrate this local union or any other local union, and I will cooperate with the efforts of the International union to keep all elements with ulterior motives out of leadership positions."

Stellato added, "I continue my opposition to the efforts of the Communist Party members or any other outside force to infiltrate this local union or any other local union, and I will cooperate with the efforts of the International union to keep all elements with ulterior motives out of leadership positions."

Stellato added, "I continue my opposition to the efforts of the Communist Party members or any other outside force to infiltrate this local union or any other local union, and I will cooperate with the efforts of the International union to keep all elements with ulterior motives out of leadership positions."

Trade Unionists. They blasted the Reuther leadership for not suspending the four top Local 600 officials, for not exposing the subversive of Stellato to the Communist Party, for not removing more local union officials. They wanted a vicious all-out red-baiting campaign, and they didn't get it.

This group will continue to build and fight against both Stellato and the Stalinists, and seek to excite anti-Reuther sentiment for their own purposes. The non-ACTU elements in the right-wing caucus have no future. They were left holding the bag after fighting the Stellato and CP forces.

### STELLATO IN MIDDLE

The Stalinist forces found they could not defeat Stellato in the unit elections. His slates defeated their candidates in many instances, and they are being squeezed by the events.

However, Stellato has a tight-roped to walk, between his reputation as the leader of the "anti-Reuther" sentiments of the Ford 600 rank and file and his apparent "understanding" with Reuther, for the recent developments assist both Stellato and Reuther.

Once again, the events in the UAW demonstrated that bureaucratic methods via administrators was NOT the way to fight successfully against any opposition. The Reuther forces failed to make a dent in the rank and file, and this remains Stellato's strength and Reuther's weakness.

### ANVIL and STUDENT PARTISAN

In this issue:  
Debate on American Foreign Policy  
Faulkner's Writing and the Southern Myth,  
by Irving Howe  
God, the Devil and Jean-Paul Sartre  
Can Asia Avert Totalitarianism?  
plus other articles and student reports

20 cents per copy Order bundles now  
ANVIL and STUDENT PARTISAN  
247 Lexington Avenue, New York City

# The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## INTERESTED? Get Acquainted

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

- 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.....

## HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

**LABOR ACTION**  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:  
 Six months (26 issues) at \$1.80  
 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

- NEW  RENEWAL  
 Bill me.  Payment enclosed.

NAME .....  
ADDRESS .....  
CITY .....  
ZONE ..... STATE .....



# Debunking Myths on 'Heredity, Race and Society'

HEREDITY, RACE AND SOCIETY, by L. C. Dunn and Th. Dobzhansky.—New American Library, 144 pages, 35 cents.

By PHILIP COBEN

In this revised and expanded edition of their work, again published as a pocket/book, the two Columbia professors have made a substantial improvement. The new material is now among the most interesting and valuable parts of the book.

*Heredity, Race and Society*, as it was, a simple, popular and non-technical discussion of racial and other group differences among people. It gives only enough of the modern theory of genetics to provide a background for this discussion, no more. It gives a light once-over to the work that has been done in seeking to determine the relative influence of "nature and nurture," heredity and environment, on human traits. But the sections that have been greatly expanded are those dealing with social conclusions and ideas that have become involved in this whole field.

The first of these taken up is "social-Darwinism," which tried to apply "the survival of the fittest" (a phrase coined by Herbert Spencer, not Darwin) from the animal world to man's social world, in a mechanistic and reactionary way. The conclusion aimed at was: Those people (nations and races as well as individuals) that are on top now are those who best deserve to be on top. As the authors write:

"Since the 19th and early 20th centuries were the period when powerful nations were building their colonial empires, it was comforting to think that when savages armed with a sling or with bow and arrow were killed or enslaved by cannon and machine gun we were simply witnessing biologically inferior stocks being replaced by biologically superior ones. The same 'law of nature' works to justify wars between the 'superior' nations. . . . To be sure, the physically more fit individuals are the ones most likely to be killed off in modern warfare, but this can be compensated by systematic atrocities against the civilians!"

"The idea that the stronger is biologically and 'scientifically' justified in destroying the weaker has as much application to the struggles within as between nations. One simply says that the existing pyramid of wealth and power is the outcome of valuable heredity concentrating at the top and the biologically inferior classes settling further and further down."

## EUGENICS AND SOCIAL REFORM

The authors proceed to take this notion apart; it has been done many times before, of course, but they do it very skillfully and with an admirable approach—essentially based on the reminder that man is an animal that lives in a society.

"What, then, are the properties which make man biologically fit? The answer is clear: In man, biological fitness largely coincides with his fitness to live in the society of which he is a member. The demands made by different societies are variable. Some exact submission of the individual, others set a higher value on personal independence and initiative; some favor greed, while others magnify generosity; in some, selfishness is encouraged, in others self-sacrifice. . . .

It will lead the reader to question the characteristics which bring the capitalist to the top of the social heap under the conditions of this society. Dunn and Dobzhansky also make an arful dissection of the claims made by many for eugenics. They are interested particularly in the tendency to counterpose eugenic programs to social betterment: "You may hear eloquent laments that individuals, groups, nations, or races are biologically primitive, tainted or corrupt, so that all efforts spent on their education or on the improvement of their lot will be wasted."

Their pricking of the eugenics bubble is a noteworthy effort in clear reasoning, on the basis of the scientific facts, mostly devoted to showing that it is immensely harder to effect a change in the population by sterilization programs than might be thought. But their attitude toward the idea within limits is not entirely negative. As they write:

"What has to be very carefully watched is that eugenic programs of various kinds should not be substituted for measures designed to improve the living conditions and the opportunities of people to secure their share of happiness in life. Unfortunately, eugenic propaganda has in the past often been combined with a disposition to do nothing in the field of social reform."

Likewise under the chapter heading of "Controlling Man's Heredity," there is a passage on the new radiation hazards affecting human genes. Radiation is one of the known ways by which artificial mutations can be induced, though with unpredictable effects; and the important background fact is that most mutations inevitably tend to be harmful. (That is simply because there are far more ways of doing something wrong than doing it right.) One such hazard is the wide use of X-rays. The authors also fix attention on atomic energy. They do not go in for a wild alarm, but they also do not imitate the complacency of those scientists who have pooh-poohed any danger whatsoever. The strongest language they use here is:

"Misuse of atomic energy may result in eventual harm to mankind which is fearful to contemplate. If atomic weapons are resorted to in major wars, large masses of humanity will unavoidably be exposed to mutation-inducing radiations. Persons killed or maimed will be the obvious victims, but those who survive will transmit to their immediate and remote progeny some defective heredity which will add to human misery during centuries and perhaps during millennia. . . . Those in whose power it lies to plunge mankind into this calamity, or to save it from this trial, should be made conscious of the magnitude of their responsibility. They do not show this consciousness now."

Assurances from some quarters based on post-atomic births in Hiroshima and Nagasaki may be comforting, but it is far too early for such comfort to be taken seriously.

## EDUCATION AND THE BIRTH RATE

There are many other very interesting angles which Dunn and Dobzhansky take up from the point of view of geneticists who understand the relation between their specialty and the social context. There is, for example, the oft-repeated fear that the low birth rate among the educated groups will tend to lower the average intelligence level until presumably the mass of humanity consists of morons. The authors discuss why this fear is exaggerated, and give an interesting bit of evidence:

"It has been known that in Scotland, as elsewhere in Europe, the more 'intelligent' classes produce fewer children per family than the less 'intelligent' ones. The biological selection against intelligence was, therefore, expected to produce a perceptible drop in the average intelligence within the space of 15 years. . . . More than 87 thousand children were tested in 1932, and more than 70 thousand children in 1947. The numbers of 11-year-old children in Scotland that were not tested are estimated to be less than 10 thousand; there is, then, no question that the results obtained give an accurate idea of the average I.Q. of the 11-year-old Scottish children. Now, the average score for 1947 proved to be 2.2 points higher than in 1932!"

"It is not proven that better educated mothers and fathers have fewer children only because they are better educated. It is also possible that some parents are better educated because they have fewer children. . . . Statistics show that families who live in low rental homes have on the average more children than families who occupy better homes. But it does not necessarily follow that poor housing favors childbearing, because families with many children may sometimes be forced to occupy more modest dwellings. Some people have been notoriously rash in giving biological interpretations to social and economic facts."

This "rashness," as a matter of fact, has been characteristic of reactionary ideologies. There is an easily seen link between this type of "scientific mistake" and the nature of the social ideology. As soon as one gives "biological interpretations to social and economic facts," an element of relative unchangeableness is introduced; the social and economic setup is viewed as relatively fixed—as fixed, at least, as the biological basis which is assigned. It has always been one of the special endeavors of ideologists of the ruling class to freeze the status quo not only in fact but also in theory.

# READING from LEFT to RIGHT

THE CHANCES OF A MAO-STALIN RIFT, by Franz Borkenau.—Commentary, August.

Borkenau's thesis is similar to that put forward by the Paris periodical *Masses-Information*, quoted in *LABOR ACTION* July 28. It is briefly this: that, at least at the present stage and for an indefinite time, the tug-of-war goes on between Moscow and Mao Tsetung within the Stalinist world, most particularly for domination of the Stalinist movements of Asia. (The *Masses-Information* study dealt also with repercussions in Czechoslovakia.)

It is a national-Stalinism that Borkenau is writing about, though he does not use that term, and therefore (in this sense) can be equated with the more ambiguous term "Titoism." But that does not automatically mean that a Tito-type break is due. There is no inevitability that the Kremlin will barge into the Chinese problem as wide open as it did in the case of Yugoslavia.

"The struggles for power of the totalitarian era are struggles for party control. This was shown in the case of Tito, which as a result of lack of experience on both sides was a premature explosion of half-understood forces. The problem presented by Russo-Chinese relations is developing much more slowly, but will inevitably have more far-reaching historical results."

The bulk of Borkenau's article is devoted to tracing the evidence for Mao's relative independence from Moscow. Much of it, of course, he summarizes from other sources; he himself puts the spotlight on the period after Mao withdrew to Yanan, and forced the "Muscovites"—Li Li-san and Wan Min—into submission.

For the present period he fixes central attention on the struggle over control of the

Indian Communist Party. This, he claims, is the focal point of the conflict between Moscow and Peking. With this approach he reviews the peculiar splits and internal dissensions of the CP of India.

"These indications," he summarizes, "should lead us to watch systematically the developments which are taking place inside Asian Communism. Their importance has hitherto not been understood, and their study has in consequence been seriously neglected. But a warning is proper. We generally find in history that the most significant political conflicts, just because of the terrifying scope of their consequences, come only very slowly to the surface. Nothing would be more perilous than to let our recognition of this struggle over party type and party control lead us to expect a sensational eruption between Moscow and Peking in the near future. Only in the most severe sort of world political crisis, and even then only under very special conditions, could such conflicts lead to a sudden break between Moscow and Peking—even aside from the fact that all the talk of a supposed Chinese Titoism can only serve to bind Stalin and Mao even more strongly together."

The assumption is that the Kremlin has learned something from its precipitate action in the case of Yugoslavia; and in any case it must be obvious that it could not in any case consider a break with China as cavalierly as with Tito's regime.

The caution is: the choice is not between expecting hourly a sensational break with Mao, or else getting disappointed with the prospects for the Titoist deviation to soak into the Chinese Stalinist movement. It is salutary, at any rate, to keep such a third path of development in mind.

# WORLD POLITICS

## GERMAN ELECTIONS — SOUTH AFRICAN SCIENCE — ISRAEL

In six of the thirteen by-elections for the West German Federal Parliament held since 1949 the Social-Democratic Party polled more than 50 per cent of the vote. This meant an average increase in voting strength from 39 to 53.3 per cent.

The figures (in percentage) were as follows:

General Election 1949	By-election	
Hanover North	44.1	52.9 (1951)
Nürnberg-Fürth	37.2	52.8 (1951)
Bremen North	37.3	51.3 (1952)
Kassel	42.3	55.2 (1951)
Friedberg	33.2	53.9 (1952)
Neustadt	39.8	53.8 (1951)

In the seven other by-elections the increase in the total Social-Democratic vote was as follows:

General Election 1949	By-election	
Kulmbach	27.6	37.1 (1950)
Arnsberg-Soest	23.6	29.7 (1950)
Donauwörth	17.1	19.1 (1951)
Hofgeismar	27.5	47.2 (1951)
Heilbronn	26.2	36.0 (1952)
Harz	35.7	41.8 (1952)
Neumünster	30.0	32.0 (1952)

The total increase in the Social Democratic vote for all thirteen by-elections amounted to 10.8 per cent.

## Racist Scientists in South Africa

The mobilization of scientists to provide "scientific" rationalizations for a reactionary social regime is not confined only to Stalinland. In July the South African Association for the Advancement of Science met in Cape Town. The type was there too.

The *Torch*, published in Cape Town, reports (July 15): "There is Professor A. da Silva Rego, of the Geographical Society of Lisbon. In an address, he made the highly imperialistic claim that 'Africa is but an extension of Europe.' In case you think this is a harmless statement by a man who was thinking only of geographical connections, let me

quote another gem which makes it clear that this chap has a Hitlerite interest in the geography of Africa, anyway: 'Today Europe needs Africa and Africa needs Europe. Africa without Europe would be another Africa, bereaved of her own civilization—a body without its head.'"

"And this talk of the 'European head' needed to direct the 'African body' leads us to the second example: Dr. S. Bieheuvel, director of the National Institute for Personnel Research of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research. This chap rejects the idea of the I.Q. as a measuring rod of the intelligence of Whites, but immediately suggests the necessity of finding out how intelligent the Africans are by means of aptitude tests which, in effect, would boil down to the same thing: 'We do not know whether potentially Africans are equivalent to Europeans, and at the moment there is not straightforward way of finding out.' But nevertheless he decides the answer in favor of the *Herrenvolk*: 'Whatever the logic of events will

ultimately decide, for a long time the White population will have to carry the major burden,' and so he goes on to devise tests to enable the 'White population' to make hay before their sun sets."

## The Sabbath In Israel

A lead article in the *Zionist Newsletter*, which is published by the Jewish Agency and the World Zionist Organization, adequately gives the flavor of the doubletalk of Israeli Zionist leaders on the subject of the medieval religious restrictions that exist in that state and that put it among those lands where there is least separation between church and state.

In his article "The Sabbath Dilemma," Aryeh Newman attempts to defend "the measures taken by the minister of transport in accordance with the cabinet decision to conserve fuel which include the stoppage of private cars and trucks on two days of the week, one of which must include the Sabbath and the choice of any two days of the week for taxi drivers." (Our emphasis.)

As his formulation indicates, the formal basis for the restriction was to conserve fuel. "The government's attitude," he writes, "was that the measures were designed to ban luxury travel which naturally accrued with greatest force to car outings on the Sabbath." It will readily occur to anyone that the most efficient way of cutting down the consumption of gasoline would also, as experience has shown, have the effect of cutting down luxury travel, if it is what the government wanted. The Sabbath restriction, on the other hand, while no doubt having the same effect in part, has this effect in a highly selective fashion. Few workers can take time out for a trip during the work week; the Sabbath is the only time for them.

But Aryeh Newman makes it clear enough that the stated reason of the government is not the only motivation involved. As has

# Readers Take the Floor . . .

## All About Zionism and the Emotions

To the Editor:

Draper's recent articles on the Jews require, I believe, a reply from the internationalist viewpoint:

What strikes one first about Draper's writings on this question is his intense emotionalism, which contrasts so strikingly with his logic on other matters. So, in his 1951 resolution, the word "Zionist" almost never occurs alone; practically always it is preceded by the adjective "criminal." This is hardly accidental: The only people that have ever been accused of genocide in *LABOR ACTION* have been the Jews. The state of Israel is still referred to as a "ghetto." Draper has learned that some Zionists talked of Jewish tribes, and this is sufficient for him: Jewish nationalism, he declares, is nothing but tribalism. He repeats the deliberate lies of a certain Zukerman that Zionism is comparable to Nazism. (The criminality of the Nazis consisted in their assertion of racial superiority, with its justification of the enslavement and murder of all non-Germans. Does Draper claim that this is the nature of Zionism? I do not dare to mention the nation from which Nazism sprang, lest I be termed a racist in reverse; however, in spite of the fact that Draper associates it almost exclusively with the Jews, Nazism was definitely not a movement of Jewish nationalism.)

This glaring prejudice springs from one source: assimilationism. For this letter, the assimilationist must be distinguished from an assimilated person, who has simply drifted away from his old nationality. The assimilationist, however, is so insecure in his would-be one hundred per cent Americans, that he strives to obliterate all Jewish communities everywhere, lest some unkind person identify him with some remaining Jewish group.

Socialists have always opposed this reactionary assimilationism as, e.g., in Alsace, Tyrol, the Ukraine, etc. In *The Dark Side of the Moon*, a Polish girl who describes her tortures in a Russian concentration camp tells us that at no time did she suffer such agony as when she was assured that there was no such thing as a Polish nationality. The brutality of this assimilationism has all ways been apparent. Only where the Jewish nation is concerned do some individuals have the temerity not only to advocate that which we reject for the rest of mankind, but even try to palm off their insensitive and brutal chauvinism as having some connection with socialism.

Since assimilationists deny that Jews are a nation, the following must be said: In Eastern Europe, whole villages and towns were Jewish in culture: the language, religion, press, politics, all were Jewish. There is not a single attribute of nationality which these Jews lacked (including territory, which was not, however, contiguous).

become a widespread tendency of Zionism, he tries to make out a case for religious restrictions not on a religious basis *per se* (as the Mizrahim would do) but from a nationalistic point of view. He writes: "Without entering into the domain of religious controversy and the extent or obligation of Jewish observance, the importance of a profound moral basis for education, for which there is no better source than the rich Biblical and post-Biblical traditions of our people which have been the lifeblood of Jewish existence, would seem to call for even greater emphasis."

And he adds: "The fundamental principle of obligation, the sense of duty in Judaism, is being undermined. Soon we shall be faced with a Judaism which is a 'free for all,' a Judaism dependent on temperament and char-

acterized by verbiage." (Due to typographical errors, it is not clear whether Newman is or is not quoting from Bjalik, but it doesn't matter, since the sentiment is also his.)

The spectacle of a Judaism which is a "free for all"—which we can only interpret to mean one which is interpreted by the individual for himself—is obviously a horrible one. Elements in Israeli orthodox-Judaism would seem to be taking on some of the aspects of the Catholic Church.

In any case, it is highly doubtful how much of a "moral basis" for the state is provided by compulsory blue laws. One of the first jobs of liberalism—not to speak of genuine socialism—in Israel is obviously to fight for elementary rights which have not been questioned in modern civilized countries for some generations.

The fact that there were also Jews in other parts of the world where they were not a nationality (like colonies of Germans outside of Germany) does not negate the fact of the existence of the nation.

This nation is now struggling for survival. It is the duty of socialists to help it, not to make comparisons with Nazism, which both morally and objectively are light years away from the truth.

Since Comrade Shields has the advantage of having such a firm grip on his own emotions, he should utilize this distinction by taking up the criticisms which we have made of the Zionist ideology and Zionist practice in Israel. This criticism has been a very detailed and documented one, most particularly in last year's "The Triple Crisis of Zionism" (Sept. 17-24). The too-frequent Zionist habit of substituting slander for argumentation is really a waste of time in these pages.

In the 1951 resolution of the ISL on Zionism and the Jewish Question, the word Zionism or Zionist occurs 34 times. In exactly one sentence, the word "criminal" also occurs, with double justification since it is the policy of Zionism toward the Arab people under British imperialism that is referred to. With his wonderful lack of emotion, Shields reads "criminal" into the resolution "practically always."

"The only people that have ever been accused of genocide in LA have been the Jews," writes Shields. This is unbelievable slander. *LABOR ACTION* has never accused any Jews, let alone "the" Jews, of genocide. In the resolution to which Shields refers, genocide or its idea is referred to three times: once with respect to the potentialities of anti-Semitic trends under capitalism, once with respect to the policy of Zionism, and finally with respect to the policy of Stalinism.—What, we wonder, do pro-Zionists have to gain by such transparent smears?

Shields cannot distinguish "Jewish nationalism" from the chauvinist form with which the Zionist ideology fills this concept. The ISL resolution carefully and explicitly distinguishes what are to us the legitimate claims of Jewish and Israeli nationalism from Zionism. Shields is free to argue this distinction as soon as he recognizes its existence.

The "some Zionists" who talked of "Jewish tribes" were the leaders of Israel at the late World Zionist Congress. My reference to this last year apparently still rankles in Shields' mind. He should discuss it some day.

*LABOR ACTION* has never identified Zionism with Nazi fascism. We have given evidence to show that Zionism and anti-Semitism have common premises which make them "bismetric phenomena," as we did again only last week. Typically, Shields does not take this up. (The same goes

for the remarks about William Zukerman of the *Jewish Newsletter*, whom Shields unemotionally and slanderously accuses of "deliberate lies" because of his anti-Zionist viewpoint.)

The ISL resolution has a special section on "assimilationism." One of its points is that socialists do not take a position for or against it in general, but that it is a choice to be made by individual Jews in a free society. Shields equates "assimilationism" with striving "to obliterate all Jewish communities everywhere," which is typical of the Zionist apologist who equates assimilationism with anti-Semitism, the devil, or any other evil which happens to be on the tip of his pen.

It is hard to believe that Shields actually wrote that "socialists have always opposed this reactionary assimilationism." There have been various views in the socialist movement on this question, and a form of assimilationism, to one degree or another, has been perhaps the most frequent trend—from Marx to Kautsky to Lenin and points left and right.

The ISL supported the defense of Israel against the Arab assault upon its right to self-determination in favor of nationhood. We have also argued that the Zionist policies of the Israeli leadership are not only chauvinist but of harm to the people of Israel. We do not know what Shields is writing about in this connection.

Hal DRAPER.  
**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
114 W. 14 St., N.Y.C.

The Fight for Socialism—Max Shachtman	\$1.00
Socialism, Utopian & Scientific—Engels	.75
Marxism in the U.S.—Trotsky	.35
Plenty for All—Erber	.25
Principles & Program of Independent Socialism (LA special issue)	.10
Independent Socialism & War (LA special issue)	.10
Marx as Economist—Dobb	.15
Reform or Revolution—Rosa Luxemburg	.50
The Accumulation of Capital—Rosa Luxemburg	\$5.00
Studies in the Development of Capitalism—Dobb	3.50
From Hegel to Marx—Hook	4.50
Theory of Capitalist Development—Sweezy	4.50
New Data for Lenin's 'Imperialism'—Varga & Mendelsohn	2.25
Social Revolution—Kautsky	.95
The Evolution of Property—Lafargue	.95
Materialist Conception of History—Plekhanov	.20
Role of Individual in History—Plekhanov	.35
Karl Marx—Otto Rühle	1.00
Lenin on Agrarian Question—Rochester	1.75
Anti-Dühring—Engels	3.00
Materialism & Empirio-Criticism—Lenin	2.75
Theory of Marxism—Lenin	.15
Living Thoughts of Karl Marx—Trotsky	2.00

Religion & the Rise of Capitalism—Tawney	\$ .35
Bolsheviks & the World War—Gankin & Fisher	6.00
Intervention, Civil War & Communism in Russia, 1918—Bunyan	4.50
Ancient Society—Morgan	3.50
The Bending Cross (E. V. Debs)—Ginger	2.00
History of Supreme Court—Myers	3.00
American Empire—Nearing	.35
Ten Days That Shook the World—Reed	1.25

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly  
Vol. 16, No. 36 September 8, 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 rates: \$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, 1949, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER  
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL  
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

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.

## SIDNEY LENS ANALYZES THE POLITICS OF THE COLD WAR

## Why the 'Counterfeit Revolution' Is Winning

THE COUNTERFEIT REVOLUTION, by Sidney Lens.—Beacon Press, Boston, 272 pages, \$3.75.

By HAL DRAPER

Sidney Lens, author of *Right, Left and Center*, has not written just another book about the world crisis and international politics. *The Counterfeit Revolution* is undoubtedly, from our point of view, the most knowledgeable and politically sophisticated book about the cold war and the policies of the rival world blocs among the slew that have been published in recent years.

The *Counterfeit Revolution* would have been even better if it had not overextended itself. There are two chapters in particular (the first and sixth) in which it purports to go more deeply into the nature of Stalinist society, its origin and driving forces, which are its least successful. That task was too much, apparently, for a book which tries, with great effectiveness, to give a vivid, popular and readable insight into what is wrong with the West's efforts to stop Stalinist imperialism. Its approach might be called journalistic, but in the best sense of the term. In the two chapters mentioned, the result is often oversuperficial and wide of the mark; but I am not interested here in detailing any criticism of these sections since they are far overshadowed by the wider impact of Lens's discussion.

## Asking the Right Question

The central question raised by Lens (the introduction is devoted to posing it) is the source of Stalinism's appeal to the peoples of the world, both in the West and in the East. He starts where so many others leave off: Granted that the Stalinist world is one of exploitive, slave-driving despotism. . . .

"But then how do we explain the simple fact that millions of people this side of the Iron Curtain pay homage to this dictatorship, join its movement, work for it with religious fervor? . . . How do we explain the millions of Communists in Italy or France? . . . What magic does Stalinism possess that it can make otherwise sane people say that black is white and white is black?"

The standard explanation, he notes, is given with references to Moscow's deception, lies, propaganda, etc. Obviously this is no explanation. The Stalinists have no monopoly on these arts.

"Here certainly is an odd circumstance. Western propaganda for a higher standard of life and for all the democratic rights creates no fervid movement of the 'defenders of the faith' either in Europe or in Asia. But Stalin Communism, with its lies and treachery, with its frame-up trials and slave-labor camps, with its total state control and police horrors, with its miserable living standards and military aggressions—this bawdy mixture makes millions of zealots."

As is often true, at least one half of a problem is licked as soon as you ask the right question. And this is the question which most of the apologists for the Western camp cannot, dare not look in the face. Or when they do, it is to answer with banalities.

## No Alternative

What is Lens's answer? It is given most clearly and explicitly when he is explaining the attitude of the people of Europe and Asia to the United States—less clearly and less explicitly when he is writing in his own name (as it were) but perhaps clearly enough for his purpose. This is especially true of his chapter on Berlin.

He gives a conversation with "a leading Communist [who is] struggling with his doubts . . . well up in the hierarchy." This "Schmidt"

explains: "I have no other alternative than to be Communist. I cannot support the West."

Comments Lens: "We should mark this phrase well: 'I cannot support the West.' Every sincere person who accepts Stalinism is attracted not so much by the positive program or present achievements of the Communists as by his own negative opposition to the west, which for him means the old status quo. He feels that he is part of a 'historical mission' to destroy the old 'moribund system.'"

The thought, of course, will be familiar to readers of LABOR ACTION. Lens's later chapters will concretize it in very useful fashion; here he keeps illustrating it out of the feelings of the people themselves. He summarizes the answer to his leading question:

"I think there are two reasons: First, they [the people attracted to Stalinism] do not feel that the West has any alternative to Communism. They are opposed to free enterprise and capitalism. They feel that Hitler was an end product of this system, and they have little hope that the West can offer a real answer to totalitarianism. . . . The lack of an alternative to Communism wears these people down, breaks their courage, and eventually delivers them to the Stalinists."

## Bribery and Idealism

The second reason is provided by the real new opportunities which the Stalinist regime offers particularly to youth. Lens brings out a fact little publicized in the West: "While 15,000 to 30,000 people each month sneak across the frontier to Western Germany, there are a few hundred youth who go the other way, behind rather than away from the Iron Curtain. Everything that Schmidt said had an element of truth to it, but it was warped far out of its significance and context. The 30,000 people represented the small elite trying to secure some privilege, education, or a good job."

Along the same lines Lens quotes Benno Sarel, a writer whose articles have also appeared in our own press. And the case of Germany is only illustrative:

"It is the bribed layer which has a stake in the [Stalinist] regime. Even more it is a layer that, in the absence of any alternative, clings to this one with sometimes idealistic passion. We shall confront this phenomenon inside and outside the Iron Curtain again and again, in France and Italy as well as in East Berlin; the would-be anti-Communists are offered no real alternative."

## They Will Not Fight

Of course, what Lens means here is "no real alternative" to capitalism. In some sections, as mentioned, this central thought is presented somewhat more mildly by substituting words like "idealism" for the explicit political idea; Lens is perfectly correct in seeking to emphasize the "idealistic" appeal which Stalinism makes (especially where it has not yet imposed its powers) and the context can take care of making clear that this "idealism" is the aspiration for a new society, for "something new" by contrast with the old world of capitalism:

"The [Stalinist] farce could easily be exposed and made impotent except for one thing: by and large the Western powers and their major political parties stand for the status quo. That is particularly catastrophic in the backward areas of the world where the contrast between status quo and social change is very glaring, but it is also disastrous in the more advanced countries. . . .

"Visitors to France today find a similar passivity. Tens of thousands of Stalinist workers are disillusioned with the Communist Party. . . . But the demoralized members said: 'We have no place to go'; the parties of the center and right stand for the status quo, the Socialists are too tepid. The Communist rank and file therefore just stay where they're at. Even when they quit the party formally they will vote for

it, as the 1951 elections proved. . . . Those who oppose change stand little chance in competition with the Stalinists for the allegiance of the masses. . . ."

Much more along these lines could be quoted—the observations are acute and justified: "Moscow appears radical to young idealists only because the rest of the world is so hopelessly conservative. It appears vibrant because the rest of the world is so steeped in lassitude. . . ." "A loss for the Communists does not mean a gain for the West. . . . The European people will not fight again for nothing. Give them all the guns, tanks, planes, and money possible—and they still will not fight. . . . The Europeans from one end of the Continent to the other will not fight Communism in order to defend the 'American way of life' or 'free enterprise' or the words 'freedom and liberty.'"

## What Good Is the Marshall Plan?

These conclusions, we wish to emphasize, are not thrown out by Lens as *ex cathedra* judgments but in the course of much concrete analysis of Western policies. Lens is often at his very best here. He explains why U. S. support of the Adenauer regime in West Germany is "self-defeating." He has no illusions about the effect or consequences of the Marshall Plan. He quotes an anti-Stalinist Catholic trade-unionist in France:

"He was bitter. 'What good is the Marshall Plan? We still are living on one half the real wages we had before the war. Every day I and my fellow workers install new Marshall Plan machinery, but what has it done for us? Nothing.' . . ."

Lens explains why, very well, and, in line with the general aim of the book, in terms of what it means concretely to the workers and people generally. What he emphasizes is that the Marshall Plan has helped France and Italy (for example) to achieve economic recovery, but the whole point is that this recovery has been achieved without any rise in the well-being of the masses and above all by merely restoring the *status quo ante bellum*. Therefore:

"What has it done to wean the worker and peasant from Stalinism? Exceedingly little. Its benefits have not seeped down to the average man . . . the recent losses of the Communist Parties in Western Europe are due to their own tactical mistakes, not to the Marshall Plan."

He is as concrete in taking up the consequences of American support to, and the nature of, the Rhee regime in Korea; the Western alliance with the Vatican and what it means; the alliance with Franco:

"An anti-Fascist in Barcelona criticized our attitude toward Franco. 'If you were actually fighting Fascism in this last war, why didn't you cross the Pyrenees and eliminate Fascism here?'—A good question—I couldn't answer it."

## Case of the Philippines

Likewise for Asia. And he adds: "Nor is this backwardness [of feudal-landlord systems allied with foreign capitalists] limited to colonies or former colonies of Britain and France. American businessmen too have similar interests. Despite a half-century of American control, the Philippines today still has 75 per cent of its population on the land using agricultural methods similar to those in vogue a hundred years ago. Grants of large estates made by the Spanish in the 19th century to their cronies at the expense of individual landowners were recognized by the United States, and nothing was done to give the land back to its original owners. Tenant farmers, who frequently are more than 70 per cent of the farm population, lack capital, know-how, or incentive to increase production. Not a single rolling-mill exists in the whole Philippines, even though scrap iron is available in large quantities. Albert Ravenholt, Chicago Daily News correspondent, insists that 'a surprisingly large number

(Continued on page 7)

## Student Co-op Movement? — —

(Continued from page 8)

assimilate at the same time? and what does one want to assimilate new members to?

In the present situation it is impossible for any organization of liberal or socialist orientation, whether it is a political or a living group, to expand rapidly without absorbing some characteristic of a foreign environment. The problem of membership, then, is meaningful only if education of the new members is still possible. The solution to this is also the creation of an intellectual climate conducive to a liberal ideology. This, past experience shows, can be done partially through such technical devices as expansion by small units.

The co-ops, to maintain their vitality as an organization and to regain some of their lost dynamism, must conceive of themselves not only as living groups, but consciously recognize their solidarity with political groups that work on different levels toward the same goals. There is a need for the co-ops to formulate a program for action on the political level.

What would such a program include? In very general terms the task of any liberal or socialist organization—whether specifically political or, like the co-ops, politically oriented—is one of preparation, to "explain patiently," which the political groups do by propaganda, the co-ops by day-to-day living. The task is to develop in

the mass of the students not only habits of independent thought but also of independent action. Self-confidence, self-reliance in terms of action, in terms of the defense of their own interests, is what students must be accustomed to. Partial struggles on specific issues, often on a local level, are an indispensable training ground to teach habits of action that will announce the pattern of larger struggles. To fulfil these educational functions, the co-ops must formulate a program of action on the political level.

## What the Co-ops Can Do

In terms of student activity, this would imply (for instance) that the co-ops initiate and support in their own name campaigns for civil rights, for academic freedom, against conscription, and issues of the same nature whenever the occasion arises, perhaps jointly with liberal or socialist organizations. It would also imply that the co-ops publish a political press on the local level wherever forces permit, and that more emphasis be placed in *Co-ops on Campus* on political and social discussion.

On the local level, again, it would imply support of all activity encouraging student responsibility. Broad movements could be initiated, or pressure on the student government could be brought to bear concerning issues like these: to

raise the wages of students employed by the universities, which are generally very low—if necessary, demand access to the books of the university; defend the right of students to organize in unions; demand admission of Negro teachers on the faculty and elimination of all discriminatory practices at the universities where they exist; investigate student housing especially in regard to the housing facilities offered to Negro students.

A conscious political activity of the co-ops on this general pattern would not only strengthen the democratic tendencies in the student movement, substantially increase the basis for opposition to the regimentation of the campus and prepare the student movement for independent action, but also help the co-ops themselves to survive the crisis of the non-conformist movements.

Today the distinction, once meaningful, between the non-conformist political organization and the non-conformist living group is disappearing rapidly. The climate of regimentation and repression is affecting both equally. The co-ops, however, are today less well equipped to resist these pressures than organizations organized on a "political" basis. A clearer recognition of the political implications of their ideology might furnish the co-ops with weapons they should not neglect to use.

## The 'Counterfeit Revolution' — —

(Continued from page 6)

of intelligent, friendly Filipinos are convinced the United States deliberately blocked industrialization of their country. They believe the Americans wanted to prevent development of manufacturing here so as to provide a market for U. S. products."

He makes equally clear that Stalinism, for all that he has justly described as its appeal, is thoroughly counter-revolutionary. Perhaps his most interesting single passage consists of several pages on the post-World War II revolutionary upsurge in Europe which was aborted by the Stalinists. For he has elsewhere emphasized that "Revolutions in which the masses themselves are the dynamo are *verboten* in the Stalinist world." (A French writer, Clarion, has excellently described the Stalinist "revolution" as the "prefabricated revolution.") Moscow will permit a "revolution" under the aegis of the Russian army or with sufficient MVD agents around "to guard it from falling into the hands of independent revolutionaries—but not otherwise." It is a very important point, in view of the illusions even of some socialist anti-Stalinists.

## Revolts in World War II

This gives special relevance to his aforementioned section on the end-of-the-war stirrings. We can quote only a little.

"Reason to revolt was present everywhere, and on a minor scale such revolts, mutinies, strikes, seizure of power in single cities, uprisings of partisan groups, were much more widespread than our press has indicated. But the Stalinists, instead of fanning these into full-scale revolutions, engulfed them—circumscribed and straitjacketed them. I have no statistics on such phenomena because no serious study of this phase of the Second World War has yet been made. But everywhere I heard tales to support this view."

He gives many brief accounts: among German troops in Norway; mass desertions within Germany; seizure of factories in French cities; a four-day general strike in Copenhagen in 1944; local seizures of power in Italy. . . . "A soldier of the German Wehrmacht told me that in the first six weeks of the war he thought that revolution was quite likely. Army morale was exceedingly low, the people themselves didn't want war, and old-time soldiers spoke openly in his and other barracks of the 1918 German Revolution; how they had disarmed and arrested officers and founded their soldier soviets. . . . Had the Stalin Communists conducted serious propaganda within the German army, instead of apologizing for Hitler as 'striving for the

earliest termination of the war and for peace,' what might have been the outcome?"

He does not say this to raise any illusions about Stalinism but rather to explain the difference between "Stalin Communism" and "the old Leninist type." He indicates how the former acted as a straitjacket on revolutionary stirrings among the peoples of Eastern Europe too. He quotes an excellent phrase of another writer: "The Russians now appear to be afraid of Hot Revolutions and want only today well-mannered Cold Revolutions."

## Guns and Politics

The above may indicate why *The Counterfeit Revolution* is an admirable book for independent socialists to put in the hands of people who know (and think) only what they read in the big press. Naturally the question arises what conclusions all this brings Lens to. There is only one possible direction which emerges from his material, and in his own way Lens states it in his final chapter.

We should mention here that, in his expository chapters, Lens has already made clear that the Kremlin is most deathly afraid of groups to the left of itself. (We would put it differently? I think, without using "left" or "right" for the Stalinist phenomenon: they are most afraid of groups which, while militantly anti-Stalinist and not to be snared by them, are also militantly anti-capitalist.) "The Kremlin is obsessed with the fear that these forces will wean workers away from the Communist Parties. It answers this danger by ceaselessly berating those to the left of it as false radicals, as agents of the class enemy in disguise. . . . A union official I know is fond of saying: 'No one turns my left end. The Communists too are wary of groups to the left of them.'"

When Lens comes to stating briefly his positive proposals, he makes short shrift of the "co-existence" fairy tale. He has no truck with proposals for negotiations and deals with Moscow to preserve peace. He stresses that the fight against Stalinism must be fought on the political front, that military victory will not decide—

"Without a progressive political purpose, guns that are mere guns for shooting people are a horrible liability to us. They are worse than no guns at all. Only guns that are subordinate to a sincere policy of eliminating poverty and industrializing the world can be an important deterrent to those nations and forces that would attack such changes."

His three-point program:

(1) An assault on "the poverty, hopeless-

ness and under-industrialization which today cover almost the entire world." Point Four, of course, but, he emphasizes, a program linked with encouragement of basic social change.

(2) "We must build, sponsor, or subsidize existing or new anti-Stalinist organizations" which will put steam behind this aim.

(3) "We must attempt to widen the schisms, within the ranks of world Stalinism. . . ."

The crux, of course, is point 2. What organizations? Not the UN, says Lens—it cannot do it. Not the Catholic Church, which "is the main prop of the old order in Europe."

## For a New Movement

How about the Social-Democracy, as proposed by Fritz Sternberg in his *How to Stop the Russians Without War?* Lens does not think it has the dynamic qualities necessary, "as presently constituted." Nor has Titoism. Therefore:

"In a transition period, I feel that both our government and all kinds of private groups should help subsidize those organizations capable of fighting Stalinism from the left. That would include trade unions, nationalist movements, all types of Socialist groups, various émigré forces providing they are not rightist, and the like. The Communist Parties the world over are given ample financial support by Moscow to do the job; we too must supply the funds needed by progressive anti-Stalinist movements."

The proposal is breathtaking in its simplicity, in various ways. It is most certainly the inescapable conclusion of such a forceful analysis of the cold war as Lens has made.

We need not discuss it as a proposal for this American government to support and build revolutionary socialist groups (for that, someone would first have to convince us that Lens seriously thinks this a realizable goal). In fact, an American government willing to carry out this proposal would not be one subject to the damning indictment which the author has drawn up. But it does point to the only road by which Stalinism can be defeated, and that is all that one may have a right to ask of the book. As Lens writes in his very final words:

"The only question is: Who will do it and how?"

"Neither of the two present contending blocs with their present programs—suffering one from lethargy and a status-quo philosophy and the other from the brutal callousness of the Counterfeit Revolution—can achieve this goal. But the American people do have the wherewithal, the material resources necessary, to accomplish this task smoothly and peaceably. . . . Will the American people rise to the occasion?"

## What's Happening to the Student Co-op Movement?

By DANIEL FABER

From September 4 to September 8 the North American Student Co-operative League (NASCL) is holding its annual convention in Ann Arbor, Michigan. NASCL is the central organization of campus co-ops in the U. S., with a few affiliates in Canada. Its annual conference is an occasion for discussing local and general co-op problems, for taking stock of the situation and for setting down NASCL policy until the next conference.

**The campus co-ops are in many ways unique organizations, and they deserve close attention because of their special role in the social and political life of the campus.**

In most cases a campus co-op is a living group for 20 or 30 students—although sizes vary between half a dozen and several hundred. It is usually managed by the students themselves, through elected functionaries and house meetings. Very often the housework is done by the students themselves.

The co-op houses are organized on the pattern outlined by the Rochdale principles, the most significant of which involve open membership regardless of race, color or creed, one vote per member, and continuous expansion. In the past the co-ops have attracted at many universities the most active liberal and radical students, and have become in these places the centers of liberal political activity or of political life in general.

### State of the Movement

This year's NASCL conference takes place in a period of decline of the co-ops as a movement on a national scale. To analyze this decline, to work out a policy for meeting the situation and preventing the spread of the decline, are perhaps the most important tasks before the conference.

**The problems besetting a campus co-op and, consequently, the larger student co-op organizations are numerous: there are the ever-present technical questions of management and administration; there are the problems of maintaining membership and of expanding wherever possible; then there is the problem of keeping the organization alive—on what basis to do so and by what means. One might say that this latter problem has not received the attention it deserves among the NASCL leadership or, indeed, among broader student co-op circles. The prevailing attitude has been so far one of "let's ignore it, maybe it will go away." Where awareness of the problem exists, it has not often been expressed in terms of seeking a solution.**

### Get Acquainted

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

114 W. 14th St.

New York 11, N. Y.

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

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... ZONE..... STATE.....

SCHOOL (IF STUDENT) .....

That there is a problem is by now fairly obvious. There are today very few healthy co-op organizations on a local level. Among those that may be called relatively healthy are those of the University of Kansas in Lawrence; and when people from KU are told this, they seem mostly surprised. The co-ops in Austin Texas and at UCLA also have a certain vitality, but the character of the units is very different because of their size (several hundred members per unit). In places like Chicago, Columbia (Missouri), Lincoln (Nebraska), Baldwin (Kansas), etc., the best that can be said for the organization is that it is stagnant or barely existing.

NASCL as an organization is also largely dead. It is maintained by a small and devoted bureaucracy which puts out an approximately bi-monthly paper—*Co-ops on Campus*—and periodically calls for dues. There is very little internal life, in the sense of internal discussion of co-op problems and perspectives. Theoretical discussion of the role of co-ops in society, their role on the campus, etc., is very scarce.

### The Social Climate

There is little identification of the members of NASCL with the organization, little participation, communication or sense of "belonging." The same is true of the regional organizations, only more so. The low level of internal life is reflected in the co-op press. *Co-ops on Campus* has only recently risen above the level of cheerful platitudes on the "cooperative way of life." There is no other press to speak of, excepting, for the record, a few local information bulletins.

**Why is this? Obviously the crisis of the co-ops is only one aspect of the general crisis of the American campus, other aspects of which have been more publicized and are more familiar to us. Unlike organizations that are formed primarily for the defense of a body of ideas, like socialist or liberal organizations, the student co-ops are primarily living groups, and therefore more dependent on a favorable social climate.**

It is true that the co-ops, too, have an "ideological" basis without which they have no reason for existence. It is not accidental that they attract mainly the liberal or radical sections of the student body and that they are often "leftist" political centers. By their emphasis on co-operation rather than competition, by their strong emphasis on democracy and equalitarianism (as illustrated by their militant stand on the race issue), by their libertarian attitude (as illustrated by their emphasis on individual and group responsibility and by the value they attach to their autonomy), they are definitely in contradiction with the prevailing values of our society. This contradiction can be observed on the campus level in contrast with the "conformist" organizations, such as fraternities and sororities, with their criteria of exclusiveness, social prestige, hierarchy and privilege.

### Abstention as a Luxury

The difficulty that the co-ops are facing today may principally arise from their refusal to recognize the implications of their ideological basis or, at least, their refusal to act upon it. The official position of the co-ops has always been to abstain from politics as such. This in spite of the fact that they have unofficially been traditional political centers; also, from past experience, active participation in political activity seems to be either a concomitant of a healthy co-op organization or causally related.

**However, an abstentionist or neutral position**

**toward politics is possible only when the organization is not swimming against the prevailing social currents and not threatened by the developments in society at large. In the present situation, in which the trend toward regimentation, militarization and conformity are threatening not only the left political groups but also broader organizations such as the co-ops, which are less equipped to resist, abstention from politics is a luxury one can no longer afford. To maintain living groups like the co-ops in an unfavorable atmosphere requires much more political consciousness, militancy and vigilance than is displayed today by NASCL and its affiliates.**

### Politics for Democracy

Even though the co-ops fulfil a function on the campus different from the political student organizations, they are yet affected by the same pressures as these latter. (I am not referring to the Young Democrats or the Young Republicans which are often junior rackets.) To defend themselves against these pressures, the co-ops will have to adopt, to a certain extent, certain characteristics of a political organization—in today's context this means the characteristics of a militant organization.

What this involves is a clear recognition of the progressive social role that the co-ops are called upon to play, and a conscious alignment with the organized groups which, in the main, fight for the same kind of democracy which the co-ops are striving for. The function of the co-ops today is essentially a political one: to lead, to educate, perhaps to train cadres for a more democratic society, to the future rise of which we all hope to contribute.

This requires a relatively high level of social awareness and of political understanding. It also requires a definite sense of social responsibility. These elements are lacking at the present time, and the problem before the co-ops is to develop an atmosphere within themselves that is conducive to these attitudes and resistant to contrary tendencies. This does not mean an enforced homogeneity in the intellectual life of the co-ops but rather the preservation of a framework in which any intellectual life is possible at all.

### For a Program of Action

Perhaps the biggest single obstacle to such an outlook in the past has been the great concern for membership that dominates most co-op organizations. They have preferred to adapt themselves to an environment they fundamentally disagree with in order not to "scare people away." While standing always in reality for consistent democratic principles and swimming against the current, they have not only tried to minimize this fact but to pretend that they were swimming in the middle of the mainstream. As a result they are on the way to losing their justification for an independent existence.

But the problem of the co-ops is obviously not only to expand but also to assimilate, to educate. If this is true, two questions must be clear to begin with: How rapidly can one expand and

(Continued on page 7)

**STUDENT SOCIALIST**

Section of LABOR ACTION

Published for the  
SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE