

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 16, 1953

FIVE CENTS

BETTER LATE THAN NEVER AFL Council Cracks Down on Longshore Mob Rule

By BEN HALL

Less than a year after an official AFL "investigating" committee had virtually whitewashed the International Longshoremen's Association, the AFL Executive Council has been compelled by the spotlight of publicity to issue an ultimatum to the leadership of that union. Last week, in a letter addressed to "the leaders and members" of the ILA the council warned that the ILA had to rid itself of gangster control by April 30 or face expulsion from the federation.

The ILA in the Port of New York, in the hands of criminals, thugs, and gangsters, had degenerated to the point where it was losing the right to be called a legitimate union of any sort. The AFL action is a belated recognition of what everyone has known for some time.

In October and November 1951, the rank-and-file longshoremen in the Port of New York struck against the new contract signed by Joe Ryan, president of the ILA, and the shippers. The walk-out was "unofficial" and "unauthorized," of course. The strikers used this opportunity to focus attention upon gangster elements that had fastened upon the union with the aid and tolerance of Ryan.

After tying up the port for many days, the strikers returned to work when it was announced that an impartial citizens' panel would investigate their grievances. In January of last year, this panel reported that longshoremen were the prey of racketeering union officials, supported by the employers.

It was following this report that the AFL chose its own committee to absolve Ryan from responsibility and to counteract the damaging effects of the state panel's investigations.

THE AFL CLIMATE

But the stench was too great. In the past month, at hearings of a New York State Crime Commission, a pattern of murder, theft, racketeering and bribery—a whole thesaurus of crime—was exposed on the New York waterfront. It was obvious that the employers were spending vast sums in bribes and in shakedowns to gunmen who had wormed their way into control of the ILA and were using their position, in collusion with employers, to squeeze tribute from the men they were supposedly representing. And to maintain their control against the membership of the ILA and

against one another, murder and assault were normal matter-of-fact tactics.

Now the AFL has called a halt. Very good.

But one has to think—even if the AFL itself had not shoved its head into the sand last year: In what kind of atmosphere does our labor movement live, how could so important a union function with such utter contempt for its membership for years, without the most powerful voice of protest from within the family of labor?

The answer is, perhaps, not hard to discover. The ILA has become notorious for gangsterism and crime and it is this that has finally embarrassed responsible leaders of American labor. They are anxious, of course, to shield the labor movement from criminals; they themselves want honest unionism. But their own unions, though honest and free of racketeering, are not models of democracy; they are deaf to the voice of an indignant membership crying out against its leadership, even when this leadership is rotten to the core.

What the AFL would not do in response to the actions and demands of the rank-and-file longshoremen it has now been compelled to do by the exposé of the State Crime Commission.

'No Aid to Franco, Defend His Labor Victims,' Say Trade-Unionists, Thomas at Chicago Rally

By DICK OLIVER

CHICAGO, Feb. 5—Rallying to protest the executions and mass arrests of Spanish unionists and anti-fascists by the totalitarian regime of dictator Franco, Chicago unionists, liberals and socialists filled the big Sinha Hall amphitheater of Roosevelt College yesterday evening to support a spirited indictment of his rule and the aid it receives from millions of dollars in American government loans.

The meeting was sponsored by the Chicago Committee to Defend Labor Victims of Franco as its first big public activity since its formation last year. From the point of view of attendance this protest rally was the most successful of its type here in many years, in spite of the total unanimous silence of the big daily press about it, and despite the general political climate today in which dissenting voices meet with skepticism or slander.

Chairman of the meeting was Francis Heisler, well-known labor and civil-liberties lawyer, who opened with a statement of the committee's purpose to condemn the persecutions in Spain and arouse support for the victims in

all effective ways, including opposition to the granting of aid to the Francoists from the U. S. government, because such aid enables the fascists to continue stifling all opposition.

Speakers of the evening were: Ed Marciniak, editor of *Work*, organ of the Catholic Labor Alliance; Abraham Plotkin, Midwest organizer of the ILGWU (AFL); Jacob Siegel, chairman of the Jewish Labor Committees; Harold Crane, general counsel of the UAW-CIO; and Norman Thomas, chairman of the New York Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims.

LABOR MEN SPEAK

Ed Marciniak, who is also a vice-president of the Chicago Newspaper Guild, reported some difficulties he had run into in discussions with some unionists who had feared this issue was tainted with "communism." But for him, he stated, in this Spanish situation "the basic issue is the right of groups of people to get together," to associate and organize and speak and assemble freely, and those rights we must uphold in the face of totalitarianism everywhere.

Plotkin of the ILGWU spoke

as an ardent defender of past and present American foreign policy. But in defending Franco's labor victims he found it "a shame that our government does not see and fails to adopt" a democratic policy on Spain, with the result that "it is destroying itself in the eyes of the moral world."

Jacob Siegel, who is also editor of the *Jewish Daily Forward* here, stressed that "dictatorship cannot live wherever a free trade-union movement exists." Deploring the barbarous treatment of workers and the Jewish people under Hitler and Stalin, he warned that the world cannot long exist half slave and half free. Stating that he was "not going to apologize for the State Department on Spanish policy," he declared the labor victims of Franco fascism, lacking any rights to fair trial, "must not be persecuted for their freedom-loving ideas and activities."

Before launching into his vigorously delivered prepared speech, Harold Crane expressed the regrets of both himself and Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW-CIO, at Mazey's inability to speak before this meeting because of pressing union work. He congratulated the Chicago audience

ACADEMIC FREEDOM And the Witchhunt in the Schools

See Four-Page Section Inside—
"THE STUDENT SOCIALIST"

Three-Cornered Fight Rips Israel's Mapam

... page 2

Marx, Engels and the 'Russian Menace'—II

... page 7

DULLES IN EUROPE

New 'Tough' Line: Speak Loudly and Wave a Big Stick

By GORDON HASKELL

There is a special difficulty in assessing the net effect of the various foreign-policy moves of the Eisenhower administration since the State of the Union message announced the new policy for Asia. The difficulty arises primarily from the fact that the known reactions to the Formosa policy, and to the trip of Secretary of State Dulles to Europe, must be gained from an American press which is overwhelmingly pro-Eisenhower and which seeks to cast the best light possible on everything his government is doing.

It is evident that Dulles applied a degree of pressure on the major governments of Western Europe which in the past has been used by the State Department only in crises.

It appears that the governments of France, Britain and Western Germany have given him assurances that they will proceed toward the formation of a Euro-

pean army at a rapid pace. Although the British still refuse to make any direct commitment toward their own participation in such an army, it seems that they have agreed to give it greater cooperation than they had been willing to do in the past, and that this in turn is giving the French government greater courage in complying with American wishes on this score.

ON A JAG?

What is lacking, at the moment, is any real information on the reaction of the peoples of Europe to the new American pressure for a rapid expansion of military forces in their countries. In Britain, the Labor Party press, as well as many organs of Liberal and Conservative complexion, have "viewed with alarm" or denounced outright the Asian turn. Yet the debate in the House of Commons seems to have been more a formality than a real effort by either wing of the Labor Party to make political capital out of the issue against the Tory government.

As far as Western Germany is concerned, the picture is also none too clear. The German Social-Democrats have been opposing the attempts of the Adenauer government to make commitments in the military sphere at least until Germany has full freedom of action as a sovereign nation. It is not likely that Dulles' open threats to cut off American aid to Europe, if it does not move rapidly in the direction of greater rearmament, will change the position of the Social-Democrats.

The general impression which the American press seeks to convey is one of almost stunned acquiescence by the British and European governments to the Asia policy and the demands of the Americans on them, with the peoples sitting back and watching to see what will come of it. One almost has the impression that both governments and peoples in Europe feel that they are dealing with a government which is under the influence of liquor or worse; that any resistance to its whims right now might lead it to do something very rash; and that the best thing, for the moment, is to let it have its way in the hope that it will work off its jag and calm down after a while.

TAFT SOUNDS OFF

The real intentions of the American government in Asia are becoming clearer from day to day, and they in no way serve to allay

on their willingness to fight on this issue, when in America these days newspaper headlines and character assassination attuned to anti-Communist hysteria have virtually destroyed the right to a fair trial in cases involving controversial political issues.

[As soon as copies are available from the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims, LABOR ACTION will publish sections of Harold Crane's address.—Ed.]

SEND PROTEST

Prolonged applause greeted Crane's militant presentation, which was especially welcome for its forthrightness in attempting honestly to probe deeply into the labor-liberal dilemma of breaking clearly and bluntly with an important aspect of U. S. foreign policy. This fact, plus the obvious passion of his address—both of which reflect the best sentiments of the more advanced militants of the labor movement today—brought him the tremendous accolade of the audience.

A collection speech then netted \$235.21, to be sent to aid the work (Turn to last page)

(Turn to last page)

Russia's Anti-Jewish Drive Tears Israeli Mapam in 3-Corner Fight

By AL FINDLEY

The anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist character of the Stalinist trials in Prague nowhere aroused as much agitation as in Israel. In one week over 300 protest meetings were held; bombs were even thrown at Stalinist institutions.

LABOR ACTION of last Dec. 22 reported the first repercussions of the trials on the Mapam and its factions. (The Mapam is the pro-Stalinist Zionist party of Israel. It has, however, always been distinct from the Communist Party of Israel. The Mapam, unlike the CP, is by and large Zionist first and pro-Stalinist second.)

A shift took place away from the generally accepted Stalinoid orientation of the Mapam, and a polarization took place. The most Stalinist wing became more Stalinist; and the least Stalinist wing, while not breaking with its previous theoretical concepts, became more anti-Stalinist. The former, the Sneh-Riftin group of the Mapam, adopted the Stalinist line in toto, while the latter, the Achdut Avodah group, moved in a more anti-Stalinist direction.

With respect to the third group in the Mapam, the Hashomer Hatzair, there was an error in our last report. It had voted to condemn the anti-Zionist aspect of the Prague trial, but we reported that it was moving in the direction of the Stalinist Sneh-Riftin tendency. This was based at the time on news dispatches from Israel according to which a Stalinist-type resolution of Sneh's was being co-sponsored by Yaari, the leader of Hashomer Hatzair.

Fortunately this pro-Stalinist shift did not take place. The press dispatches were either entirely without foundation or it is possible that Yaari may have wavered and had his mind changed by Chasan, the other top leader of Hashomer, and by the reaction of the Israelis to the Prague trial.

CONFERENCE FIGHT

The Mapam party conference of December 25 adopted a resolution which showed a considerable strengthening of the influence of the Achdut Avodah group but which at the same time was a typical Mapam compromise through which the Hashomer tried to maintain the unity of the party.

The core of the resolution protested against the anti-Zionist nature of the trial, declared the continued fidelity of the Mapam to the "People's Democracies," defended Zionism, and rejected the confession of Mordecai Oren (the Mapam leader who was arrested in Czechoslovakia and forced to confess at the Prague trial). The Sneh-Riftin faction won a point in that, by implication, the resolution accepted the guilt of Slansky and his co-defendants and placed the blame for the Stalinist change of line on Israel and the foreign policy of the Ben-Gurion government.

The Achdut Avodah group scored its victory when the resolution deplored the anti-Semitic "tone" of the trial. The anti-Jewish aspect, said the resolution, is "dangerous but we are sure it is only a passing phase" since it is incompatible with the principles upon which Russia and the "People's Democracies" are built.

The conference also expressed the conviction that even the anti-Zionism of the Stalinist world would once again be reversed, as

it was once by Gromyko. This reference, of course, is to Gromyko's vote and declaration in the UN on the creation of the state of Israel—an act which was not Gromyko's, naturally, but simply his translation of the then line of the Kremlin.

The vote for the resolution was 232 to 48. Eighteen abstained because there was no open acceptance of Slansky's guilt and no condemnation of Titoism. The conference defeated a motion to include a statement that Mapam would defend Israel against "any aggressor."

After the adoption of this resolution, the Achdut Avodah demanded that those who opposed the policy of the party be removed from the party leadership. The Sneh-Riftin faction had only 48 votes, as we have seen, but it had a disproportionate amount of influence in the Mapam representation to the Knesset (the Israeli parliament)—5 out of 11 deputies—and it held the editorship of the press as well as other positions of public prominence.

The Hashomer Hatzair leaders refused to accede to this demand and maintained the Stalinists in their positions. Achdut Avodah then announced that it would not be bound by the discipline of a leadership which opposed the party's policy.

SNEH FORMS FACTION

As we had predicted in LABOR ACTION, the patched-up unity established by the conference was bound to break soon, under the impact of the blows rained by the Stalinists on the heads of the Jews.

Not long after the conference, the executive committee of Mapam decided to send a delegate to the conference of the "Democratic Youth Movement" to be held in Prague. They even were able to induce an individual to go to the city where their leader Oren had been kidnapped and compelled to testify against the Mapam. The Achdut Avodah declared that this decision again threatened the unity of the party.

The problem of the youth conference became ironical, if not farcical, when the Czech Stalinist government refused to grant a visa to the Mapam delegate, despite the party's willingness to prostrate itself before Stalin. This slap in the face was made doubly insulting when the delegate from the Israeli CP applied a week later and was granted a visa immediately.

The Sneh-Riftin group then organized its own formal faction in the party and in the party's parliamentary group in the Knesset, under the name of the "Left Brigade." They accepted the guilt of the Zionist organization and demanded that Mapam leave the World Jewish Congress, the Jewish Agency, and other world Jewish organizations.

SPLIT FORCED

Now at this point it must be explained that the organization of factions in the party had been prohibited by the last convention of Mapam. In actual fact the Achdut Avodah and the Hashomer Hatzair groups were factions, to be sure, but in theory at least they merely acted as representatives of the "non-factional, non-political" groupings of the collective settlements of Kibbutz Artzi and Kibbutz Hameuchad respectively.

The open organization of the Stalinist wing in the "Left Brigade" was answered by Achdut Avodah when the latter demonstratively called a special caucus of its own, with the implied threat of a split by this group which represented 35-40 per cent of the party. It became clear that either the Sneh group or Achdut Avodah would leave Mapam.

The executive committee of the party moved against the Stalinist wing. The defenders of the Stalin-

ist line on the Slansky trial were removed from their posts of leadership. Riftin was ousted as political secretary of the party. Eliezer Peri was removed as editor of the official organ *Al-Hamishmar*, and Moshe Sneh was out of his post as secretary of the Israel-Soviet Friendship League. Local party secretaries who followed the line of the Sneh-Riftin caucus were also to be dismissed.

The five deputies in the Knesset who were organized in the "Left Brigade" were given the choice of dissolving their faction and parliamentary group or resigning their seats in the parliament.

3-WAY RIFT

The split spread to the collective settlements. The large Kibbutz Yad Channa resigned from the Hashomer and went over to the Communist Party. There were many defections in other Kibbutzim, including some of the Achdut Avodah collective settlements. A total of 15 per cent of Hashomer Hatzair was reported to be behind the Sneh-Riftin group, though their voting strength was reduced by the bloc-voting system based on the principle of "ideological collectivism."

Then came the Moscow charges against the Jewish doctors.

Here was something that was not merely "dangerous" but which was close to the old-fashioned "blood libel." Whereas one could talk of Titoism, politics and all the Machiavellism that some associated with but forgave with respect to the Stalinist trials, the leaders of the Mapam described themselves as "shocked" by the arrest of the doctors and the lumping of the Joint Distribution Committee with a "Jewish plot" right in the papal seat of Stalinism, Moscow itself.

The parliamentary group of Mapam now split three ways when it had to vote on the government resolution condemning the Moscow accusations. Sneh and two others voted with the CP; Achdut Avodah voted with the government; and Hashomer Hatzair took still a different position. From incomplete press reports it appears Hashomer declared that the question of the guilt or innocence of the doctors was an internal question for Russia, played down the anti-Semitic angle involved, and concentrated on defense of the "Joint" and the Zionist organizations.

EXPULSION

In the Histadrut, the Israeli federation of labor, the federation leadership proposed to outlaw the CP as a force in the organization—that is, it did not propose to exclude individual Stalinists from the Histadrut but would make it impossible for the party to enter the Histadrut's election contests under its own name. The Mapam usually puts up a fight on such issues, but this time it refused to vote on the question on the ground that the motion was illegal; in effect, it abstained.

There have also been reports, now, that the Stalinists are losing strength among the Arabs of Israel as a result of their anti-Semitic policy.

The strong reaction of the people of Israel and the ranks of the Mapam changed the nature of the struggle of the Sneh-Riftin group. It was no longer a question for them of maintaining their leadership posts in the Mapam but of defending their continued membership in the party.

When the Sneh group of the Knesset refused to obey the ultimatum of the executive committee they were expelled by a special party conference, by a vote of 221 to 21, with 9 abstentions.

Three of the Knesset deputies were ousted: Moshe Sneh, Adolph Berman (brother of the Polish Stalinist leader, recently reported arrested), and R. Bustoni, an Arab member of the Knesset who had been elected on the Mapam-

associated Arab list. The other two members of the parliamentary group, Riftin and Rubin, did not leave the party but it is reported that Sneh still hopes to win them away from the Mapam.

These expellees proceeded to form a new party, the "Socialist Workers Party" of Israel. How much support this new party can muster from among its former followers in Mapam is very doubtful. It may get some of the city locals organized by or dominated by Sneh. In the agricultural collectives, where the principle of "ideological collectivism" would mean that any of his supporters would lose their livelihood, home and friends, it is improbable that many of the 15 per cent that formerly supported him will go along with his new party. The apparent defection of his main associate Riftin probably shows the tendency in Hashomer Hatzair. It is not known yet whether there are entire kibbutzim that support him.

NO UNITY

It is also unlikely that he can attract any support from the CP or go into that organization as a leader, since the reports coming from Prague this week have branded, as the chief spy of Israel against the "People's Democracies," none other than—MOSHE SNEH!

The troubles of the Mapam are far from over. The removal of the extreme Stalinist wing may make it easier to maintain the rest of the organization intact, but differences in emphasis and degree of Stalinization still remain between Hashomer Hatzair and Achdut Avodah. Although the latter is by no means a principled anti-Stalinist group, its orientation is clearly quite different from that of Hashomer.

That the differences within the "purged" Mapam are still great is shown by the fact that Mapam delegates to the Histadrut executive split on the question of barring the CP from the labor federation as "an enemy of the Jewish people." Two Mapam delegates voted against this motion, and one voted for the exclusion. All three voted against the anti-Zionism of the CP.

The plea made by Chasan, the Hashomer leader, for the liquidation of the remaining "factions" in the organization will be as effective as was the dissolution of factions at last year's convention.

LONDON LETTER

British Tories Have Own Angle On Formosa

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Feb. 4—The news that the U. S. government was changing its policy on Chiang Kai-shek's role on Formosa, to permit attacks by him on the Chinese mainland, came as a shock to all political parties in Britain.

One can understand easily that the Labor Party is unwilling to extend the war in the Far East. Outside of the general reluctance to take any steps which would bring World War III closer, and in terms of the Labor Party leaders' own foreign-policy views, the manpower is just not available for such a war of attrition nor is the wealth which would be consumed and destroyed by it.

It was interesting to see that the Conservative government showed such a sharp reaction to the news. Foreign Minister Anthony Eden telegraphed a protest to the State Department the following day. The whole House of Commons agreed to debate the matter in the course of a general discussion on the Far Eastern situation.

It would be unfair to question the truth of the statement that the Tories also do not want to extend the war. For them, however, a further motive is added.

The colony of Hong Kong depends for its very existence upon trade with Stalinist China. Goods from India, Ceylon, Malaya, Indonesia and Europe go through this port.

The new policy by Washington will leave the Chinese Nationalists of Chiang free to stop any shipping and confiscate all goods bound for Stalinist China. This will mean, in effect, that many Allied ships will be searched for contraband, and will cause irritating friction between the Allied governments recognizing opposing regimes in China.

An economic debacle for Hong Kong will certainly be very unhelpful for British business. Many people in this country feel also that in spreading the area of conflict, the new American move will provoke the Chinese into attacking or interfering with other British colonies. In Malaya, as in Indo-China, they have already shown their hand. In Northern Burma there is a party of Chinese Nationalists whose existence might attract them to invade that country, directly or indirectly.

For living Marxism—read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Labor Action FORUM • New York

Beginning next Thursday, 8:30 p.m.

Problems of Socialist Anti-War Policy

by

Hal Draper

Editor, Labor Action

Thursday, Feb. 19

WAR AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Discussing the national-defense element in the First, Second and Third World Wars.

Thursday, Feb. 26

LENIN'S "REVOLUTIONARY DEFEATISM"

Discussing Lenin's changing formulations of the slogan, and the opposition to it.

Thursday, March 5

WAR AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Discussing problems of anti-war policy in the light of the new elements of World War 3.

LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14 Street, New York City

You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of LA. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views.

Keep them to 500 words.

Marx, Engels, and 'The Russian Menace'

II—National Independence, the Slavs, and the Balkan Problem

This is the second part of an article dealing with the material contained in the recently published book *The Russian Menace to Europe, a collection of writings by Marx and Engels, edited by Paul W. Blackstock and Bert F. Hoselitz* (Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 288 pages, \$3.75).

By HAL DRAPER

We have noted that Engels' repeated predictions with regard to the fate of most of the Slav nationalities of the Balkans turned out to be quite wrong. Slav nation-states were carved out of the area following the First World War. But this fact bears on only one side of Engels' opinion. There are two other aspects to be made clear:

(1) The artificially carved-out Slav nations of the Balkans did not thereby cease to present essentially the same picture of rival jumbled nationalities bidding for autonomy and independence which Engels had drawn. Within most of these Slav states (most particularly Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia) the Balkan conditions were merely reduplicated; nothing was solved, as is well known.

The situation within Yugoslavia is perhaps best known; Serbia (which Marx had already pointed to in 1853 as the most Westernized of the nationalities) became the national oppressor within "its" state, while the national aspirations and antagonisms of the Croats and other peoples of the country became redirected against it. A similar condition existed between the Czechs and the Slovaks.

Everyone of these states held within its borders national minorities of every bordering state. Instead of one "prison of the peoples" (the Hapsburg empire) the Balkan situation spawned smaller and more numerous prisons of the peoples. Instead of the domination and utilization of these peoples by Russian imperialism, following the war and the Russian Revolution it was Allied (in particular French) imperialism which took the new states in tow.

Even in the birth of these states Engels' main point of stress—that these nationalities could fight for their own autonomy only at the expense of the progressive aspirations of other peoples—was still illustrated. We refer to the notorious case of the "Czech Legion" which, deep in Russia at the end of the war, marched back to Czechoslovakia through Russian territory as a foreign legion of counter-revolutionary Western intervention against the Russian Revolution, offering this service to world imperialism as evidence for the Czechs' right to be granted a state at Versailles.

(2) But as a matter of fact we have not yet presented the full view of Marx and Engels on the Slav problem. The aspect we have discussed so far is, to be sure, the one which sticks out most prominently in Engels' discussions. It was the one he kept hammering away at because, nine times out of ten, he was looking at the question solely through the spectacles of revolutionary hatred of the Russian tsarist menace and its Pan-Slav stooges. This is what gave his discussions their one-sided character, however firm was the underlying basis.

But more than once, turning their attention to the problem in more rounded fashion, both Marx and Engels made very important qualifications to their main emphasis. The importance of these remarks is that, way back then, they pointed to a progressive solution of the Balkan problem and of the problem of Slav national independence. The Versailles setup was not only not a progressive solution, it was no solution at all. In its essentials, the full viewpoint of Marx and Engels is included in that of modern socialism today.

(a) Progressive Nationalism

This rounding-out of their analysis of the Slav question consisted of three ideas:

(a) We, supporters of revolutionary democracy and working-class emancipation—they wrote as far back as 1849—CAN become proponents of Slav national independence provided that such movements cease to be the pawns of Russian counter-revolution and, instead, ally themselves with the progressive struggles of Europe.

By this, incidentally, they did not mean "provided only they become socialist first." In this Europe of the last century, Marx and Engels recognized a progressive role for national-independence movements which, while not socialist-led or socialist in program, were fighting for the real freedom of peoples (and need we add again: especially when they were fighting independently of imperialism against the Russian power).

So, of the Poles, whom they held up as models for all the Slav peoples, Engels wrote in 1882: "Thus I hold the view that there are two nations in Europe which do not only have the right but the duty to be nationalistic before they become internationalists: the Irish and the Poles. They are internationalists of the best kind if they are very nationalistic. . . ." (You will have to read the rest of this passage, on page 118, to get the complete thought he has in mind, but this is sufficient to illustrate the immediate point.)

In the 1849 article referred to above, Engels pointed sympathetically to abortive attempts among the South Slavs to develop a progressive national-independence movement:

"It is true that among the educated South Slavs there existed a small democratic party, which, to be sure, did not work to renounce its nationality, but which did seek to put it at the disposal of freedom. This illusion by

which it also succeeded in arousing the sympathies of Western European democrats, sympathies which were fully justified so long as the Slavic democrats were joining the fight against the common enemy—this illusion was broken by the bombardment of Prague."

And the same thought in hypothetical terms:

"If in any period of their oppression the Slavs had begun a new revolutionary history, they would have shown their vitality in this way alone. From that moment on the Revolution would have had an interest in their liberation, and the separate interests of the Germans and Magyars would have disappeared before the greater interests of the European Revolution."

But this didn't happen, he adds. The reader will note that Engels here links up the vitality (viability) of these nationalities with their entrance into the ranks of the revolutionary democracy. Why, in his view? Were European democrats to vouchsafe support to Slav national aspirations in this case simply as a "reward" for being on the right side, and were they opponents of the same movements in order to "punish" the Slavs for being on the side of reaction?

That, of course, is involved too, as it must be, from anyone's viewpoint. A modern example, conclusive enough, is the case of those movements in India, Burma, Korea and other South Asian countries which, in order to further national independence, adopted the "clever" strategy of allying themselves during the Second World War with Japanese imperialism, hoping to buy autonomy from the Japanese in return for their services, or at least to "use" the Japanese to get the British off their necks. (The Japanese used them, to be sure.) We socialists did not support these pro-Japanese "independence movements," and could have looked upon them with interest only insofar as there was opportunity to wrest them away from their alliance with the Japanese.

But while this was involved in the case of the Slavs, too, who sought their own aims by doing the tsar's dirty work, how does it bear on the question of their vitality as a nation, which would seem to be quite another matter?

In the context of 19th century Europe, Engels is saying two things about this, in effect: (i) the South Slavs' dependence on the tsar was the evidence for their lack of inner vitality, because it was not their own real interests which drove them into Moscow's net but only the fact that there was not enough revolutionary élan behind their movement to make possible a national-independence struggle in which they relied on their own strength and fighting spirit. Their alliance with Moscow was enforced as a substitute for a vital national struggle. (ii) Their subordination to Moscow would have as a consequence the swallowing-up of Slav national aspirations by the fierce Russian imperialist appetite, despite the Slavs' illusions. This needs no further illustration in view of what has happened to pro-Russian illusions in Eastern Europe today!

(b) Russian Collapse

(b) But while Engels had to record sadly that in his day the South Slavs showed no signs as yet of developing a democratic, progressive national movement, he did not stop there but looked ahead to possible future developments which would change the picture. And there was one big thing which would change everything, including his categorical predictions of the disappearance of the nationalities themselves.

This he brought out in 1882. A letter from Karl Kautsky had posed the question to him more sharply. He replies at first in the vein we have already seen: "Now you may ask me whether I have no sympathy whatever for the small Slavic peoples, and remnants of peoples, which have been severed asunder by the three wedges driven in the flesh of Slavdom: the German, Magyars and Turks? In fact I have damned little sympathy for them. . . ." And he explains why again, referring to the Czechs and also "the same with the others, Serbs, Bulgarians, Slovenes, Galician Ruthenians (at least in part)." But then he adds:

"Only when with the collapse of Czarism the nationalist ambitions of these dwarfs of peoples will be freed from association with Pan-Slavist tendencies of world domination, only then we can let them fete their fate in their own hands."

He is, of course, here merely making perfectly explicit what follows indeed from the whole discussion above. It was in fact the collapse of Czarism in the war which was the *sine qua non* for the Versailles settlement of statehood on the new Balkan states—that collapse and also the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Hapsburg empire in the war as well.

If Engels was right in looking to the overthrow of the Russian autocracy as a precondition for Slav statehood, he was, however, still wrong in the next sentence which he added to the above: "And I am certain that six months of independence will suffice for most Austro-Hungarian Slavs to bring them to a point where they will beg to be readmitted [to the Hapsburg empire]." And one of the reasons why he was wrong here is precisely this: that by that time, decades after his death, elements of democratic, progressive national movements had developed there, along with greater economic and social advances in their culture—the other precondition which he had found missing.

(c) Balkan Federation

(c) But we were speaking above of a progressive solution to the problem of Slav independence. This was not the Pan-Slav solution of Engels' time, which was deeply

reactionary. This was not the Versailles solution of our day (our yesterday, that is). Nor was it Engels' expectation of a united Austro-Hungarian empire, whose centrifugal forces he greatly underestimated, as he plainly did the Slavs' will to national existence.

It WAS, however, the idea of a "Federal Republic of Slavonic States"—a state form within which the Slav nationalities of the Balkans COULD achieve a meaningful national existence independent of Russia and independent of Austria-Hungary; a state form within which the jumbled peoples could contribute to a viable nationhood-in-association without either subordination or "Balkanization."

It was this solution which was put forward by Marx, although almost in passing, in the course of a cutting analysis of the policy of the Western European powers as "too impotent and too timid to undertake the reconstruction of the Ottoman Empire by the establishment of a Greek empire, or of a Federal Republic of Slavonic States. . . ." (Incidentally, the article from which we quote was one of those written for the New York Tribune in 1853 and signed by that newspaper's European correspondent Karl Marx, though it may have been actually drafted by Engels, who then had more English than his friend.)

It should be clear enough by now that these latter conceptions, which we have detailed, were not the ones they pushed to the forefront in the agitation against the Pan-Slavists but were in truth mentioned as incidental qualifications. But this is often the problem in trying to reconstruct Marx and Engels' views, when one is interested in a problem which they were not directly discussing as such, and when one has available only incidental remarks from discussions of other problems, in which their attention is fixed, sometimes one-sidedly, in a different direction. The present discussion is an excellent case to illustrate this point.

Again: The Scholar at Work

Even an honest scholar, therefore, can be misled if he merely searches for "quotations" without understanding what he is reading. This, however, does not yet cover the case of A. A. Berle which we broached last week.

We recall that, blasting current Stalinist anti-Semitism, Berle inserted a snide reference to the term "ethnic trash" as used by Engels in one of his discussions of the Slav problem. This he made equivalent to a "racialist" slur. There is one last point to be made to close this account.

We have already seen, above, that Engels had no belief that most of the South Slav peoples could survive as viable nations. We have mentioned his detailed historical surveys of the fractionalization of the Slav nationalities which had long gone on in the Balkans. We have already quoted a passage in which he refers to the Slav "remnants of peoples" and "dwarfs of peoples," indicating his view that most of the South Slav nationalities were nationalities-in-dissolution of which only dwarf-remnants were left.

This idea recurs often: he refers to "remnants of peoples" and "small relics of peoples" who throughout history have figured on the stage for a while and then been absorbed (page 100); to the "dissecta membra" of the Slavs (page 86), thus translating into Latin the same thought which elsewhere reads ethnic remnants; and in the very passage (page 63) which our scholar Berle pounced on, the thought is clearer than anywhere else!

"There is no country in Europe," he writes, "which does not contain in some corner one or several ruins of people, left-overs of earlier inhabitants, pushed back by and made subject to the nation which later became the carrier of historical development."

"These remains of nations which have been mercilessly trampled down by the passage of history," he writes in the same paragraph. These "waste products of a highly confused development which has gone on for a thousand years," he writes, this time specifically of the South Slavs. And here it is that he uses that dreadful term "ethnic trash" to refer to these remnants of nationalities in the process of dissolution or stagnation.

A real scholar like Berle can pluck this phrase out of its paragraph and casually hint at "racism." The Kremlin has scholars with equal capacity. What is peculiar about Berle—since he is, after all, not a Kremlin scholar—is that he goes on to say that "Marx" (he meant Engels) is referring here to "the peoples of Central Europe," presumably inclusively. Now liberals know that anti-Slav prejudice is endemic to America (see our immigration laws) and Berle is conveying the idea that Engels is "anti-Slav" too by singling out "the peoples of Central Europe" for a derogatory "slur."

It happens that, in the passage in question, Engels gives immediately a number of examples to illustrate the case of "ruins of people," "left-overs," "remnants," "waste products," "ethnic trash," etc. The first example is—the Gaels of Scotland. The second is—the Bretons of France. The third is—the Basques of Spain. And the fourth is—the "Pan-Slavist South Slavs" of Austria! A very inclusive "racialist," this Engels!

The allusion to "the peoples of Central Europe" was simply invented by Berle. It would cover the Poles, Magyars, Germans and Austrians, as Berle should know after all, as well as some smaller nationalities which Engels was not including in his strictures.

With this discussion of the larger Slavic problem, via a detour through Adolf A. Berle, we can now turn to a review of other interesting aspects of the Blackstock-Hoselitz collection of Marx and Engels' writings.

(Continued next week)

THE FRANCO 'WAY OF LIFE': This Is the Regime That U.S. Dollars Help

Reports in the European press and to the New York Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims indicate that 27 anti-fascist trade-unionists of the CNT (National Confederation of Labor) are soon to be tried by the Franco government. They are charged with membership in an illegal organization (their union), sabotage, and other activities against the regime.

Death sentences are to be asked for three men, while the other sentences vary in length. Some of those to be tried have been held in prison as long as five years, awaiting trial.

Why men are terrorized by Franco for belonging to workers' unions was underlined recently by the emigration headquarters of the Spanish UGT (General Workers Union), as it pointed to excerpts from Franco's statutes of March 9, 1939 which leave no doubt as to the character of the government-sponsored unions.

From Chapter 12 of the statutes: "Article 1. The national syndical organization of the state shall be inspired by the principles of unity, totality and hierarchy."

"Article 2. All the sections of the economy will be integrated, according to branches of production or service, in vertical syndicates."

"Article 3. The vertical syndicate is a corporation under public law and constituted by the integration of all elements which work in the economic process into a unitary organism, according to branch of production or service, organized hierarchically under the direction of the state."

"Article 4. The posts of authority in the syndicate will necessarily be given to the militants of the Spanish Falange and of the J.O.N.S."

"Article 5. The vertical syndicate is an instrument in the service of the state through which the state will make its economic policy."

These syndicates are the official "unions" of Franco Spain. The

statute makes it clear that they are creatures of the state and that by law their leaders must be drawn from quasi-official fascist organizations such as the Falange.

While on the subject of the frankness of Franco law, the following provisions of the law of July 29, 1943 are relevant to two questions.

"Article 3. The University, inspired by Catholic spirit, co-substantial with the Spanish tradition, will accommodate its teaching to those of Catholic dogma and morality, and to the norms of canon law, vigorously."

"Article 4. The Spanish University, in harmony with the ideals of the national-syndicalist state, will adjust its teaching and educational program to the points of the program of the movement."

This is the ideology of the state which has recently been admitted into the UN's educational, scientific and cultural organization UNESCO.

The reference to the Catholic spirit also raises another question, especially for those who maintain that Stalinist teachers have no right to be employed because they are not free intellectual agents. Does the Catholic hierarchy repudiate the "Catholic spirit" which is imputed to it by the Spanish government?

Censorship in fascist Spain has hit a new target, noteworthy because this victim is no underground revolutionary. A book written by the Duke of Maura has been banned. The noble duke is a monarchist and a practising Catholic, no radical; he admits in his book that he took an active part in the civil war on Franco's side.

Where he overstepped the line, however, was in suggesting certain measures needed to bring Spanish public life back to normal, in his view. Worse still, he wrote that Franco was "opposed to the situation becoming normal again."

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 unremitting 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!

Anti-Franco Rally

(Continued from page 1)

of the non-Stalinist Spanish anti-fascist emigration in defending its victimized brothers in Spain, as well as in helping prevent the threatened deportation from the U. S. of anti-fascists back into Franco's clutches.

Chairman Heisler presented the following telegram to President Eisenhower, to be sent as expressing the opinion of the meeting, and it was adopted with vigorous applause:

"We, 250 citizens in public meeting assembled at the call of the Chicago Committee to Defend Labor Victims of Franco, protest the executions and imprisonment of free trade-unionists and republicans by the Franco regime. In view of the recent admission of Spain to the UNESCO we urge you to protest Spain's violations of the UN Declaration of Human

Rights. We urge you to oppose all aid to Franco regime so long as fundamental civil liberties continue to be denied to the Spanish people. Dictatorship must be opposed on both sides of the Iron Curtain."

Copies of this telegram are to be sent to the CIO, AFL, Railroad Brotherhoods and Miner's unions urging them to take similar action and to start some continuing program to follow through on this question. A telegram was read from the Workers Defense League solidarizing itself with the Chicago committee's work.

APPEAL TO LABOR

Norman Thomas concluded the program with a vigorous appeal for aid to Franco's victims. There were no signs whatever, he said, that the \$65 million loan to Franco

will be used to contribute to the vitality of the Spanish people; this, he pointed out, does not matter to the military, who want bases, but it matters to us. He cited Washington's opposition to sending anti-Stalinist prisoners back to the North Korean regime and their death, whereas it does attempt to deport anti-fascists back to Spain.

Our opposition to Stalin-Communism, he argued, flows fundamentally from its denial of human dignity and decency, and we prove the sincerity of such opposition by protesting the crimes of Franco and the attempts to whitewash the infamies of the Madrid regime. He read a letter from Spanish socialists in emigration in Paris thanking the committee for the funds, however inadequate, which it had been able to send.

Concluding he urged that we must voice our protest "not as

a pious duty to principles but to show the new administration where the workers stand." Deriding timid officials of AFL and CIO unions who ignorantly ask over the phone "What is this meeting of protest? It must be communist," Thomas cried, "take this issue into the labor movement, where it belongs. Labor has to redeem itself. It doesn't take courage to say the obvious about the Franco regime!"

Members of the Chicago Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims were greatly encouraged by this rally. Many cards of application for membership were turned in, and much interest was expressed in its future activities. A meeting of the committee in the near future for further planning of activities was also announced.

Prior to the meeting, copies of LABOR ACTION were distributed to the audience outside the hall, with excellent coverage.

New 'Tough' Line—

(Continued from page 1)

the fears widely expressed in Europe that what the United States really has in mind are steps which can lead to an extension of the war to China.

In a radio program on Sunday, February 8, Senator Taft said that the United States is already at "full war" with China, and that neither a bombing of Manchuria nor a blockade of the Chinese coast could be expected to extend the war. He stated further that although at the moment no full-scale invasion of the Chinese mainland by Chiang Kai-shek's troops is contemplated, "if it seems advisable, we would help and send out troops to do it."

This statement was accompanied by demands from Senator Knowland (often referred to as "the senator from Formosa") for a full blockade of China with hints that Eisenhower has been lending an ear to Admiral Radford, commander of the Pacific Fleet, who is advocating the same strategy.

One of the difficulties in attempting to estimate just how far this government is planning to go in its militarist policy is the lack of anything like a real opposition in Congress. During the Truman administration the Republicans made it a point to examine every policy proposal and criticize it publicly. Even though there tended to be a good deal of agreement on foreign-policy questions in

general, every specific step of the government had to be justified to Congress, and the ensuing debates and questionings by congressional committees gave the country some idea of what was going on.

TEMPORARY CALM

To date, whatever questioning there has been has proceeded chiefly from Republicans who got their signals mixed or who have some personal axe to grind. The Democrats have, by and large, been sitting out the initial moves of the administration in silence, only seeking to set the record straight when some particularly outrageous charge was made against their former government by the men now in office. With an almost unanimous press and with a virtually silent "opposition," we have at the moment more "one party" government than we can ever remember in the past.

There seems little reason to believe, however, that the present attitudes toward the Eisenhower administration either at home or abroad will last very long. Right now, the fact that this government is doing "something new" on both the foreign and domestic fronts seems enough to keep people quiet and somewhat goggle-eyed. The country and the world had got accustomed to a Fair Deal government which had lost its drive and had ended in a blind alley. If this government is will-

ing to stamp around where the last one had learned to tread warily, at least that seems to be something.

But as it continues to stamp, toes and even more will be trod upon. The American Federation of Labor has already issued a call for a general push for higher wages, and it does not seem likely that with their heady feeling of renewed power the capitalists are going to yield easily. The whole drive for lifting controls and letting the capitalists have their heads has more meaning in terms of the new spirit of the times than in strictly economic consequences. As the fight in this field gets more bitter, we can expect the labor movement to become more critical of the administration in ALL fields, including that of foreign policy.

Similarly, the reactions in Europe are not likely to remain static. The real problems which have been bedeviling the governments of Western Europe and the peoples alike cannot be brushed away by a "tough" Dulles policy. They will reassert themselves, and things will continue to move slowly if at all. The real test will come when the administration starts carrying out some of its threats, if it dares to. It is sowing a whirlwind.

Get it EVERY week!
An LA sub is \$2 a year

INTERESTED? Get Acquainted —

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

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE.....

STATE TEL.....



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 17, No. 7

February 16, 1953

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address: Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, 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.

STUDENT SOCIALIST

FEBRUARY 16, 1953

STUDENT-YOUTH SECTION of LABOR ACTION

FIVE CENTS

McCarthy's Shadow Over the Schools

By SAM FELIKS

The Congressional open season on investigation into alleged subversive activities in the schools and colleges starts with the spring semester. In friendly rivalry to see who would lead the witchhunters, Senator Joe McCarthy reluctantly yielded the first crack at headline-hunting to his competitors, Senator William Jenner of the Senate Judiciary Committee and Representative Harold Velde of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The scope of the present congressional investigations appears to be much wider than past inquiries into Stalinist activities at least in the educational field. There have been the almost casual statements by these reactionaries that the investigations will seek out the "Communists and Communist-type thinkers." It is especially the inclusion of the vague "Communist-type thinkers" which indicates that the assault on academic freedom is being enlarged.

The question of what is a "Communist-type thinker" is a broadly dropped hint by Senator McCarthy that he is not merely concerned with Stalinists. A "Communist-type-thinker" to Joe McCarthy is a liberal or an anti-Stalinist radical given the studied avoidance of clear definition, the term could be and is easily expanded to include any critic of the existing social institutions, including even the mildest reformers.

The news of the impending investigations has produced a pall of anxiety among those concerned with education and academic freedom. Even those who have formally welcomed the inquiries have expressed doubt about the need for them and have pointed to their dangerous consequences to the educational system and the country.

VELDE ADMITS

This position was forthrightly stated by the retired president of Harvard University (now U. S. high commissioner to Germany), James B. Conant:

"There are no known adherents to the party on our staff, and I do not believe there are any disguised Communists either. But even if there were, the damage that would be done to the spirit of this academic community by an investigation of the university aimed at finding a crypto-Communist would be far greater than any conceivable harm such a person might do."

Representative Harold Velde, an ex-FBI agent, candidly proclaimed the reactionary point of view:

"It's a lot better to wrongly accuse one person of being a Communist than to allow so many to get away with such Communist acts as those that have brought us to the brink of World War 3."

And as a further demonstration of this judicious approach, ex-agent Velde implies the disloyalty of anyone who opposes his investigation. "It's true that 99 and 9/10ths per cent of the professors and students in American colleges today are loyal, but it's the other element that is protesting

the proposed investigations. . . ."

It is not necessary to go far afield to realize the effect of a search for "crypto-Communists" or "Communist-type thinkers" on dissident points of view, on free discussion and expression of opinion, especially if it is conducted by a man who beforehand announces lack of concern for innocently accused individuals.

The investigations into the schools and colleges, which started out to drive the Stalinists from the educational system, now are beginning to bare the other edge of the sword. It is admittedly to be directed also against non-Communist Party teachers.

These congressional hunting expeditions are spearheaded by forces holding reactionary and authoritarian attitudes on education. Under cover of going after the "Communists and Communist-type thinkers," reactionary economic interests, professional pa-

triotis and those who want to indoctrinate students with religious education seek to impose their views on all educational institutions.

RIGHTISTS PUSH

These are the groups that represent the clear and present danger today. The Stalinists are presently an insignificant minority in the teaching profession, with less influence than they have ever had. To consider the problem of academic freedom today to be Stalinist distortion of the educational process does not come to grips with the real danger to academic freedom, and even to the public educational system, from right-wing reactionaries.

Under the guise of their denunciation of Stalinist attempts to convince or indoctrinate students, these conservative groups are pushing their own indoctrination program to the conservative and chauvinist point of view. These reactionaries are no more interested in a free and democratic education, aiming at teaching a student to think critically and intelligently of the world about them, than are the Stalinists.

WHAT THEY WANT

The importance of the investigation of "Communist-type thinkers" and "crypto-Communists" is that these conservative and reactionary groups are gunning for liberal and democratic thinkers in education. Perhaps the current expeditions will not openly reveal their full intent by attacking

known liberals, perhaps they will be content for the moment with known Stalinists and their sympathizers, but the signposts are up for all who care to see. The ouster of Dean Lenz of Queens College in New York City, known for his activity in ADA and the Liberal Party, in the spring of 1952, due to the pressure of the American Legion and the Catholic War Veterans, should illustrate the point.

Groups such as Allan Zoll's National Council of American Education, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, Catholic War Veterans and the American Economic Foundation have long fought for a conservative economic, chauvinist and religious orientation in education. They believe, by and large, in the "agent" theory of education. That is, the teacher is the agent of the society and as such should be expected to indoctrinate the students to the dominant social institutions.

They believe that the teacher should indoctrinate loyalty to the status quo. Some are opposed to public education; they want to emphasize flag drills and the daily ritual of singing patriotic songs; they want religious education and daily prayers in the public schools, a "return to the Three Rs," the teaching of conservative economic ideas, and they oppose social science that emphasizes progress and change in existing institutions.

While not all of these groups push all of these ideas, there certainly is no widespread disagree-

ment among them. Together they form a conservative and reactionary spur behind the current investigations. From their point of view they are opposed to the liberals as well as the Stalinists.

THE SUSPECTS

A liberal educator, who believes that education should not teach loyalty to existing institutions but loyalty to democratic ideals and that the main emphasis should be on how to teach the student to think critically, is certainly suspect in their eyes. And if the educator also believes and teaches that a democratic education serves as a way of institutionalizing "revolution through peaceful change" to a better society, then such an educator is more than suspect in their eyes. Some might even go so far as to call him a "Communist-type thinker."

The liberal who entertains such ideas is put in the same bag with those who believe in collectivism. The attacks directed against the New Deal and Fair Deal as "creeping socialism on the road to crawling Communism" is also intended as an attack against this educational theory. The McCarrans, the McCarrans, the Velde and the Jenners more or less agree with this basic idea. Their basic opposition to Stalinism is on the grounds of a conservative economic and social outlook which tends to lump liberals, socialists and Stalinists into the same "collectivist" bag.

To these reactionary forces the
(Continued on 4-5)

The Know-Nothings of 1953 Who's Behind the Attack on the Public Schools?

By DON HARRIS

Under the sponsorship of the National Student Association, Academic Freedom Week is being celebrated for the first time this year. The idea of such a week, during which student organizations would draw the attention of the entire campus to the problem of academic freedom, is an excellent one particularly in times such as these when the basic idea of academic freedom is being attacked on all sides.

Even as academic Freedom Week is about to begin, the actual start of the long-awaited congressional hearings into "Communism in the colleges" is announced. These hearings undoubtedly represent the most serious threat to academic freedom, which is why we give a most prominent place to a discussion of them and of the rationalizations which are today being used to defend them as "proper procedure."

But at the same time there are other forces at work, expressing the same tendency in the direction of stifling freedom of thought within the schools and harnessing them to the "national interests." These threats strike at every section of our educational institutions.

LABOR ACTION, in its regular Youth and Student Column, has carried news of such "incidents" as the banning of UNESCO material from the Los Angeles public schools, of the firing of teachers in various cities, and of various other aspects of the academic witchhunt. In this issue of the *Student Socialist* we can only cite a few additional instances,

and comment upon the total significance of the entire trend.

In addition to the congressional inquiry by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor (dealt with elsewhere in this issue) probably the most serious attack on our schools—as they have been traditionally administered—is taking place on the elementary and high school level.

For several years now organizations devoted to attacking the concepts and principles of "progressive education" have been feeding upon the public hysteria about anything "communist," and by linking modern educational practices with "communism" have mounted an attack on the public school system.

REAL AIMS

Naturally, the real aims and forces behind such movements are not confined to those of zealous patriots seeking in their own way to eradicate totalitarian ideology or even to instill "Americanism" into school children. Such patriotic (chauvinistic would be a more proper term) sentiments are utilized in the attack on the

schools, and the attack is for the most part conducted under their banner, but basically it reflects entirely different and much less reputable motivations.

Among such organized groups (and it is organized effort which created the "Pasadena Case" and the "Englewood Incident") the National Council for American Education is both typical and prominent. Superficially, perhaps, such an organization might seem to represent nothing more than a new career for its "leader," Allan Zoll.

It is true that, for Zoll personally, the organization is little more than a racket—the type of racket that his previous organization represented and the same as many

(Continued on 4-5)

STUDENT SOCIALIST

Section of LABOR ACTION

Published for the
SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

The Columbia 'Spectator' Takes a Poll

By JACK STUART

NEW YORK, Feb. 7.—The coming "investigations into Communism" on the campus have raised anew the question of whether "Communists have the right to teach," and, with it, what the actual practice is with respect to known or suspected Stalinist professors.

On Friday, January 9, the Columbia University undergraduate college newspaper, the *Columbia Spectator*, devoted some four pages in a special supplement to a survey of Communists teaching in the seven Ivy League schools as well as its sister college Barnard. This survey was initiated by the staff of the *Spectator*, which sent questionnaires to the staffs of the undergraduate newspapers at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, Dartmouth and Cornell, which together with Columbia form the so-called Ivy League.

In general the report concludes that there are no known members of the Communist Party on the faculties of these universities.

Be that as it may, the most interesting results of the survey do not concern the actual presence or absence of Stalinist teachers, but the attitudes toward the problem by administrators and the student newspaper staffs. Here we will summarize the results.

HARVARD: The oldest school in the Ivy League and the one with the longest and best tradition of academic freedom leads our list. Harvard's recent president, James B. Conant, has stated that "I certainly would not hire a Communist professor, for I believe that a Communist by the nature of the organized conspiracy to which he belongs is an incapable teacher." With regard to whether or not Harvard would hire teachers who had been "under fire as alleged Communists" the *Harvard Crimson* declined to say what would be done. (With regard to President Conant, many liberals feel that by accepting the job as high commissioner in Germany Conant is going to a calmer birth for himself during the troubled days of congressional investigations ahead.)

BOHM CASE

PRINCETON: This university is next on our list because it was the only one of the seven to suspend a member of its faculty because of "alleged Communist associations."

In December 1950 Princeton professor of physics David Joseph Bohm was suspended from the Princeton faculty because he was indicted by a federal grand jury for contempt of Congress. This indictment resulted from Bohm's refusal to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee regarding alleged Communist activity at the University of California during the last war. He was acquitted of this charge by a federal court but he was never reinstated.

The *Princetonian* is rather naive when it states that "it was impossible to directly relate this fact [Bohm's failure to be returned to the staff at Princeton] to his indictment since his three-year term here expired while he was suspended." It is interesting to note that this man was unable to obtain a staff appointment at any other college in the United States and is currently in Brazil (where the State Department has relieved him of his passport).

While Bohm's case was never made into a *cause célèbre* it was a very important battle in the current fight for academic freedom which the McCarthy-McCarran opposition won by default. It is impossible not to believe that Bohm's contract was let go because there was some question as to his affiliations at some time past.

Finally, the *Princetonian* said it would "certainly not favor the university's hiring a Communist teacher merely to have a different viewpoint on the faculty," as if any serious person ever suggested this.

YALE: The *Yale Daily News* on the other hand stated in an editorial that "a Communist professor might under certain circumstances be a most worthwhile addition to the faculty in just the same way that Yale benefited from the presence of a Jesuit professor of philosophy. . . ." This paper also said that "a teacher must be judged on his teaching competence in his field and on that alone . . . the assumption that all Communists are incompetent teachers is unproved and dangerous . . ."—an interesting contrast to President Conant's statement mentioned earlier.

On the other hand, former President Charles Seymore of Yale has stated that if he ever found a Communist on the faculty he would fire him, and President A. W. Griswold has been quoted as having the same position.

OTHER COLLEGES

CORNELL: This university has formulated no clear-cut policy on Communist teachers; however, the university faculty, which has considerable power in hiring and firing, has passed a resolution which states that any member of the staff who advocated overthrow of the government by force or violence is guilty of misconduct! Of course any staff member guilty of misconduct may be dismissed.

The *Cornell Sun*, however, feels that the university would support any staff member "under fire."

The situation at the University of Pennsylvania and Dartmouth is much the same. At the former, the president must submit an annual report stating that there are no Communists on the staff; however, there is no individual loyalty oath as such. At Dartmouth there is no formal policy to exclude Communists.

Finally we come to Columbia and Barnard Colleges. In March 1952 the trustees at Columbia stated that they "would not countenance the presence of an avowed Communist on the faculty." However, no administrative action has been taken against anthropology instructor Dr. Gene A. Weltfish, who has been accused of being a Communist several times and has refused to answer questions by a congressional investigating committee.

Two other Columbia staff mem-

bers who have been "under fire" are Walter Gelhorn, professor of law, and Dr. Philip Jessup, professor of international law, and no action against them has been taken by the trustees.

SPECTATOR'S IDEA

In their own summary and comment upon these results the editors of the *Spectator* advance a novel (and perhaps naive) idea. They suggest that the trustees of Columbia (and presumably all other institutions of higher learning) reverse their formal stand against hiring Communist teachers, and "let college presidents and administrators announce which of their teachers are Communists. Then we avoid the danger of students being influenced by men who hide their real sympathies."

And further: "These Communist teachers should not be fired. They should be kept on the rolls of the faculty. Such a policy would permit students to come into contact with favorable statements of the Communist program."

While such a proposal demonstrates the desire of its authors to defend the essential principles of academic freedom, it also concedes that teachers adjudged to be "Communist" (presumably against their own claims) should be singled out—after a "trial," perhaps—for administrative labeling. It concedes to them, it is true, the right to hold their views and still remain on the faculty; but in turn it subjects them a special "listing" as suspect characters.

The attack on the right of Stalinists to teach comes principally from those who declare the ideas of Stalinism to be incompatible with democracy. With this we certainly agree, without thereby declaring it sufficient grounds for dismissal. For in the first place there are many other types of views held by teachers which would endanger democracy if carried into practice, or actually do constitute an anti-democratic threat—the views, for example, of the Jesuit professor at Yale.

Then there are scientists who, as scientists or as citizens, uphold the theory or practice of racial superiority. There are Catholics who "in advance and without investigation" grant the Church the right to determine truth in certain areas.

And the more "orthodox" believe in (and teach, as they must if they are good Catholics) the replacement of the American constitutional system by a hierarchically ruled theocracy.

LABELS

The "problem," however, at least for exponents of academic freedom as a basic democratic ideal, is who is to decide what ideas constitute a threat to democracy, and what shall be used as criteria? If "card-holding membership" is the basis for firing, there are likely to be few found who can be persuaded to display their card upon request. And if anything less stringent is proposed, who is to be endowed with the power to decide whether or not a teacher is really a "Communist"?

The difficulty with granting on anyone this power is that once granted, that power can be used against any individual or ideological tendency and the principle of academic freedom becomes freedom for all who are believed by the enabling authority to be "safe" and innocuous in their political and economic ideas.

The proposal to establish any kind of "listing" (along the lines of the *Spectator's* editorial) also involves the same danger: establishment of an authority which is delegated to ideologically screen all faculty members for the purpose of putting a label on them. But if it can label "Communists," what is to prevent such an authority from arrogating to itself the privilege of also labeling "atheists," "deists," "creeping-socialists," "New Deal bureaucrats," "pacifists," persons unfriendly to business and the "American Way of Life," and so forth?

And once the label has been established, who is to say that faculty tenure is secure in any case, much less that of any "Communist"? We doubt if many teachers would wish to exchange their present security for such a doubtful status.

FALLACY

One fallacy in the proposal rests upon the idea that a Stalinist professor is "dangerous" because his position is "concealed" or "hidden." It is implied that somehow he is able insidiously to

influence his students while (say) pretending merely to an interest in English literature. It is assumed that the student ought to be "protected" against him by being put in a position to distinguish his real views hidden in his lectures; that otherwise, he will be able to "poison" his students' minds by stealthy indirection, etc.

It is certainly true that Stalinist teachers in a variety of subjects can "angle" their instruction in accordance with their views. It is not less true that every other teacher does so also, and that among those who do so most blatantly are often those who are most reactionary in their social ideology. In any case, "listing" serves not so much to "protect" the student (the very notion of such "protection" would deserve some discussion in itself) but to prejudice the student against listening with an open critical mind of his own.

Moreover, just how much "poison" a Stalinist teacher can inculcate into his students by such insinuating methods—under conditions where the vast majority of the latter's other instructors are "safe and sound"—is also a question: One may ask "Just what are you afraid of?"

The fact is that it is not practically possible for a Stalinist teacher to really win students to his ideas except through more or less open presentation and discussion, and the same means are or should be available to the anti-Stalinist teachers (who are naturally much more numerous too!). From the point of view of effectively fighting Stalinist ideas, the answer is not less academic freedom but more: open confrontation of ideas and their full discussion in the classrooms and in extra-curricular activities wherever they relevantly appear.

From this point of view, we agree with the judgment of the *Yale Daily News* that "a teacher must be judged on his teaching competence in his field and on that alone . . . the assumption that all Communists are incompetent teachers is unproved and dangerous."

It is no contradiction to add: although a teacher must be judged for competence as an individual, there can be a relationship between his competence and his Stalinist views in individual cases; but the criterion must still be competence.

Detroit: We Get a Look Into the Mechanics of a Case Of 'Anti-Red' Hysteria in a City's Public School System

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Feb. 8.—Considering the times and the mood of American society today, the following story must surely be classified as a variation of the man-bites-dog theme in journalism.

Many Detroiters did the same double-take act last Friday as this writer, when he glanced at the headlines of the *Detroit Times*, a Hearst newspaper here. In big double-banner headlines the *Times* said, "No Evidence of Reds in Detroit's Schools." A bright red caption overhead emphasized: "U. S. Probers Admit." The subhead of the story read: "Senate Group Under Fire: Backs Down."

And the story underneath, thanks to the energetic drive of the Detroit Federation of Teachers against witchhunting, was as amazing as the headlines. It told of two official expeditions to Washington, D. C., to get information on the recent claims of the Senate Internal Security subcommittee that between 100 to 200 Detroit teachers are "reds."

One expedition consisted of Police Commissioner Don Leonard, School Board Attorney Clarence E. Page, and Arthur Neff, provost of Wayne University. The other consisted of Mary E. Kastead, executive secretary of the Detroit Federation of Teachers, who ar-

rived at the same time but conducted her investigation separately.

Everywhere the Detroiters went, they were told, "We never said that," referring to the wild charges about the Detroit school teachers.

Finally Mrs. Kastead traced the whole thing down, and this is how it all began, thanks to Senator Homer Ferguson of Michigan who conducted the hearings in New York City in September 1952.

THE SOURCE

On September 8, 1952, during the interrogation of Bella V. Dodd, Senator Ferguson asked, "In what cities have you attended conventions and operated with Communists of those cities in the school system?"

Mrs. Dodd: "Philadelphia, New York, Buffalo, Madison (Wisc.), Cleveland, Cedar Rapids, Boston."

Senator Ferguson: "Have you ever been in Michigan?"

Mrs. Dodd: "Yes, I was in Detroit twice. We had a convention in 1940 and 1941."

Senator Ferguson: "Did you find any Communists there?"

Mrs. Dodd: "There were some."

Senator Ferguson: "That cooperated in these caucuses?"

Mrs. Dodd: "Yes."

The Detroit delegation found out that from that unsubstantiated tes-

timony, the Senate committee admits, came the Internal Security subcommittee report of last January 2, which touched off the Detroit furor with this statement:

"Testimony before the committee indicated specifically that Communist activity took place among teachers in Philadelphia, Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, Buffalo and Madison, Wisc., as well as reflecting the certainty of substantial Communist activity among teachers in other areas."

The Senate subcommittee denied it had ever mentioned a number of suspected Communists in Detroit schools and admitted it had no secret evidence.

Police Commissioner Leonard declared, "We have found nothing, but we believe this trip was worthwhile because it at least clears up the idea that Congress has any concrete evidence against Detroit teachers."

Mrs. Kastead criticized the sensational publicity arising from the report of the Senate subcommittee and said:

"I have come here from Detroit to demand proof of the charges that have undermined the public's confidence in its teachers and even created suspicion of their teachers among the children.

"We want to know on what authority and what evidence the

Senate subcommittee publicized this damaging report. This is America where the innocent are supposed to be protected from blanket accusations, and where all are innocent until proved guilty.

"Detroit has been shocked by newspaper headlines charging that many Communists (50 to 100) teach in their schools. On Monday, February 2, schools were named as having Communist teachers on their staff!"

It began to appear as if one man in Detroit, as well as the Senate subcommittee, was responsible for the persistent reappearance of the Communist scare stories, and this individual is getting into hot water. He is George Schudlich, chairman of Detroit's Loyalty Board, created by Mayor Albert Cobo two years ago to start a witchhunt. It appears that he fed Detroit's papers with the "information" about the specific schools with "red" teachers.

UNSAVORY RECORD

Not only has this been disproved by the Washington expeditions, but it seems that Schudlich has a record which needs special investigation. Last Thursday night, Guy Nunn, UAW-CIO radio commentator, broadcast a brief biography of this individual, and brought up the startling fact that he had been

(Continued on 4-S)

U. of Chi. Groups Unite On Civil Liberties Fight

By BILL HICKOK

CHICAGO, Feb. 7—For the last two weeks the students of the University of Chicago have again demonstrated their capacity for energetic response to assaults upon their political and academic rights. In that period they have re-established their All-Campus Civil Liberties Committee and brought its membership up to no less than 125 members.

The occasion for this activity was the announced intention of Senator McCarthy and Representative Velde to turn their talents to exposing and neutralizing "Communist thinkers" on the campuses and in the faculties of some of the nation's major universities and the recurrent threat of state legislation similar to the Broyles bills of two years ago. What the ACCLC will do about this threat, what tactics and political outlook it will employ, and what sort of leaders it will elect, are now the central questions that consume the interests and energies of the politically alert on the campus.

They are also questions that pose important problems, for which some political understanding is necessary. This is particularly the case in the perennial question of the group's relationship to the Stalinists.

CAUCUS VOTE

At its meeting of January 28, the ACCLC demonstrated at once its potential for a concerted civil liberties fight and its limitations in developing a satisfactory direction and leadership. The former was apparent as the result of seven hours of debate on the rules of the organization. The limitations appeared with the election of the two executive officers.

Here the classic dilemma of campus politics presented itself. Only two candidates were possible: one an activist from the liberal Independent Students League, the other a member of the new coalition (Student Representative Party—SRP) of Stalinists with those uncritical of the Stalinists. In light of the Stalinists' fight for "freedom of action" on the rules debate and the independent character of the (in this case, non-Stalinist) SRP candidate, the election of Matt Dillon of the Independent Students League was distinctly the lesser evil.

The strictly caucus-line vote by which he won and the absence of any candidate of an anti-Stalinist socialist character is the lamentable circumstance of the election. It means that the non-Stalinist and temperamentally leftish elements of SRP, the very individuals who should be playing an independent role, were driven more solidly into a caucus alignment where only the Stalinists provide a directing force. It means they were driven there for the wrong reasons—for reasons of the personnel in the leadership of ACCLC.

RULES FIGHT

The development in the vote on the rules held more signs of hope. It is from this that the non-Stalinist "radicals" of SRP and the non-machine liberal followers of the Independent Students League alike have something to learn.

The rules struggle centered around defining the relation between represented student organizations and ACCLC. The recom-

mendation of the majority of the rules committee provided that member organizations and individual members designated by petition of ACCLC would have to register plans with the steering committee for any independent activities and policy statements within the area of competence of ACCLC. If the steering committee disapproved of plans for policy statements to be distributed off campus or independent activities on or off campus, and such plans were carried out in spite of its decision, a majority of the ACCLC quorum could expel the member in question.

No limitations were placed on any group's right to write or distribute propaganda or hold a meeting on campus. At least such an interpretation was possible before debate started.

The rules committee minority, Stalinists plus "innocent" associates, submitted an "amendment" which simply wiped out the provision of Section VI. It prohibited any power to ACCLC to limit any activity of any student group carried out in its own name.

The motive of the amendment was clearly to give the Stalinists a free hand to employ any tactics in a campaign in their own interests without concern for the result for the rest of the campus. Throughout the debate, speakers for the amendment denounced the proposed rule because it supposedly stifled freedom of opinion.

The non-Stalinist supporters of the minority argued against the conservative, do-nothing "respectable" approach of the Independent Students League liberals. While their evaluation of the ISL is certainly valid, it had nothing to do with the point at issue, which was whether or not the ACCLC should have control over all student action for civil liberties. Their error was serious.

AMENDMENT WINS

The amazing development was the inability of four successive major spokesmen for Independent Students League, including the shortly-to-be-elected chairman, to answer the charges of infraction of freedom of speech. Yet freedom of criticism was clearly provided in Section VI.

Although unspoken on the floor, the motivation behind the views of several SRP endorsers of the minority recommendation was the old "unity" nonsense. They felt that no restrictions should be placed on the separate actions of a certain group so that ACCLC might be favored with their participation. This view, so far from being an effective means to maximize concerted campus effort, really militates against the idea of an all-campus representative action group to fight the witch-hunters. Such a group, it should go without saying, if it is to serve its function, must be empowered to assert its priority in the field.

The socialist Politics Club representative took the floor to denounce the accusations raised by the Stalinists and their associates as demagogic. He questioned, as well, the objectives of the Independent Students League people who were so consistently incapable of providing the proper interpretation of their own rules in their replies to the minority; and he pointed out that their behavior required that the majority report be amended to make explicit a guarantee of freedom of criticism. He advocated defeat of the minority amendment on the ground that those groups (obviously the LYL) who promised not to take any action outside of the spirit of ACCLC but opposed formal discipline by ACCLC were irresponsible to the only representative action group on campus. The amendment was defeated 74-49 on the same caucus lines that elected the chairman.

However, an interesting shift occurred when an amendment by the

Politics Club representative specifically reserving the right of groups to publish and distribute opinion and hold meetings on campus was accepted 56-52, this time with the support of the Stalinoid caucus and of independent liberals drawn away from the Independent Students League over the opposing vote of the ISL core.

On no other point was the political character of every tendency more clearly shown. The "innocents" of the minority were overjoyed. This was "all that they wanted." No Stalinist was overheard saying the same thing. They were left no alternative but to support the amendment or abstain. If any of them retain any notion at this time of pulling out of ACCLC, as some did at the time of the defeat of the minority amendment, they must also realize the act would be suicidal.

The great conservative development of the Independent Students League in the past year is all too clearly evident now from their indefensible vote on the Politics Club amendment. For that reason, the election of Matt Dillon must be considered only a poor lesser evil and not evaluated, as one would have done in the past—namely as the proper democratic liberal alternative to Stalinist personnel in the absence of a socialist alternative.

The Politics Club did not come to this ACCLC, as it did to the last, as the center of an organized socialist caucus, capable of influencing and moving an independent democratic segment of the liberals. Then, at least, it had a reliably liberal ISL that it could in all conscience support as a proper alternative to any Stalinist leadership.

Today the importance of keeping ACCLC free from Stalinist control and its corruption into a mere sounding board for their most current dogma is as clear as ever, though the danger of that happening is not very great. What is worse, however, is the apparent retreat of the Independent Students League from the more stalwart outlook of its recent past.

PROSPECTS

The more peripheral elements of both caucuses will probably not leave, as they should, to form any third force, and that not simply because of the inability of the Politics Club to present itself as an already existing effective center. Those near the SRP gravitate toward Stalinism for reasons of their own.

These are few and simple: their inability or reluctance to examine the political alternatives before them in any but the most provincial and short-sighted fashion. Stalinism or socialism, for them, has little history outside their own little campus. They do not arrive at a generalized evaluation of these movements based on any broader theory or experience. They remain and function where they are because of their personal associations and a preoccupation with immediate activities.

As far as the Independent Students League periphery is concerned, it is not true they align themselves purely on a narrow-viewed basis without a generalized acceptance of liberalism and rejection of "all radicalism." For that reason alone they are of less interest to any potential third force.

At time of writing ACCLC has yet to select the remaining seven members of its steering committee and embark upon its activities proper. It will be important to get an effective and vocal minority on the steering committee from the independent left. Anything more optimistic is impossible, given the predominance of conservative and ISL forces and the small fraction of socialist forces. Anything less will be a block to satisfactory aggressive action by ACCLC.

SYL Fund Drive Gets Up Steam

By DON HARRIS

The 1953 Socialist Youth League fund drive jumped off to a flying start with plans completed in almost every unit, and, even before the drive is officially begun, with a large part of the different unit quotas already pledged.

Contrary to the estimates made in the SYL Fund Drive announcement sent to units two weeks ago, it would now appear that rather than having a difficult time to make its quota, the SYL can hope to really "make a run for its money." Which means that we will be able to push hard for top listing among the Independent Socialist League branches.

We have at least a good chance of ending up with an oversubscribed quota (in 1952 it went 33 per cent over) at the head of the entire list. And with energy and hard work we can be among the first two or three branches for most of the drive.

In order to insure this requires, it is now plain, only a "youthful" amount of energy in collecting pledges, and securing pledges from SYL sympathizers.

Final quotas for units have been slightly revised in the light of further information. The following quotas are now final, and where the information is available, we give an indication of how well the unit can be expected to do.

SET TO GO

New York, with the largest quota of \$550, has already collected over \$500 worth of pledges (and twenty-five dollars in cash). With a large number of members and sympathizers still to see, its prospects are more than bright—so bright that it is willing to accept a challenge to compete for first place in the drive with any other unit (N. B., Chicago!).

The second largest quota, for Chicago, is set at the revised figure of \$375 on the basis of reports that it will almost certainly be able to make \$450. Last year Chicago swept all honors, overfulfilling its quota by 90 per cent.

Berkeley's revised quota is set at \$130, and we are assured that it will aim to make at least \$150. The only regular unit that re-

mains unheard from on the drive is Los Angeles, again with a revised quota of \$75. Last year Los Angeles had everyone worried, but in the final week of the drive it came through with its full quota.

Finally, in the "General" listing we have a quota of \$120. While this is always a little slower in coming in, this year we have excellent prospects for making "General" a big success.

Comrades in Connecticut have promised \$20; an anonymous friend has already sent in \$25 and promised more by May; and a couple in Idaho have pledged another \$25. This is only a beginning since many of our scattered friends have not yet even been contacted for the purpose of informing them about the drive.

The success of the SYL fund drive can really be assured only if all pledges are collected as soon to its program and ideas: here is a national office. For this purpose, the SYL has set up a suggested schedule which it hopes units will attempt to follow.

MAKE THE GOAL

By next week, the beginning of the drive, it hopes that 10 per cent of the total quota, or \$150, will have been collected and remitted. It is well on the way to this initial goal, with \$50 having been turned into New York and "General." LABOR ACTION will carry the news on whether this, as well as later goals, have been reached.

By the end of February, it is hoped that one-third of the quota, or \$500, will have been raised; by March 15 two-thirds or \$1000; by the end of March, 80 per cent or \$1200; and by April 15, the full quota of \$1500.

With such excellent prospects for oversubscribing all quotas, there seems little reason why these goals should not be reached in the time proposed, so that the later stages of the drive can be devoted mainly to visiting sympathizers to collect their pledges.

For those students and youth who read this, who are not members of the SYL but sympathetic to President Conant, many your chance. Fill out the pledge blank below, and send it into the Socialist Youth League.

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

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

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the ISL-SYL 1953 Fund Drive.

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

New York SYL BOOK BAZAAR

Come and fill out your library with our bargains!

POLITICS, FICTION, SCIENCE, etc.
at give-away prices!

FRIDAY, February 20 — 8 to 10:30 p.m.

LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

(Don't forget to bring any of your own books that you want to contribute to the sale.)

FOLLOW

The SYL's views and news on youth and socialism

EVERY WEEK

in the regular Youth and Student Corner of

LABOR ACTION

McCarthy's Shadow Over the Schools — —

(Continued from 1-S)

ousting of Stalinist teachers is but the first step of an entire anti-democratic tendency in education. Anyone who gives support to these witchhunters strengthens these anti-democratic forces.

Those educators and liberals who have "welcomed" the investigation—though they may add, "Is it really necessary?"—and who hope to take the edge off one side of the witchhunting sword, are ignoring the real forces behind these investigations. They are chancing that by accepting the reactionaries on campus and by appearing to take them at face value (i.e., "merely" kick the Stalinists out), they will be spared a more sweeping attack against the schools and colleges.

What they are actually doing is giving legitimacy on the campus to those who have no right to be there. The "investigators" are there as inquisitors of the unorthodox and the dissident, and not to protect a free and unstifled academic life. They are undermining a academic freedom and creating fear of free expression in the nation's schools, and they are not disinterested legislators opposed to "indoctrinating students."

The way to defend academic

freedom and resist McCarthy is—first of all, not to capitulate to it. You cannot resist reaction by accepting the legitimacy of its methods and agreeing with half its program. Some former staunch defenders of academic freedom have come around to the position that it was a mistake to defend the rights of Stalinist teachers, and now argue for kicking them out of the schools.

GALLAGHER'S LINE

To this end they have developed a series of arguments based on totalitarian nature of the Communist Party and the argument that Stalinists have primary loyalty to the CP and Russia. From this accurate analysis of the CP, they conclude that the Stalinist has given up his independent role as a scholar, that he does not practice academic freedom and therefore is not qualified to engage in the "sensitive" occupation of teaching.

A more abstract variant of this argument is given by Dr. Buell Gallagher, president of the City College of New York:

"No one who adheres to the closed dogma can be trusted to teach children and youth for life in a democracy. It is scarcely an

infringement of our fundamental rights and liberties to prevent the abuse and destruction of these rights and liberties. Democracy has the right to defend itself. It has therefore the obligation not to put into the sensitive occupation of the school teaching profession those who have sworn to destroy democracy or who have given their minds and souls captive to a closed dogma which is anti-democratic. . . . The strength of democracy lies precisely in its embracing unity which gladly welcomes its diversities. . . . Totalitarians of the left or right are incapable of imparting to youths what they themselves do not possess, namely, an affection for diversity. This is why exclusion of fascists, racists, communists and others of the closed mind from responsible teaching posts in our colleges and schools is essential. They hate diversity with a perfect hatred. Against them we have the right and duty to protect ourselves and our children."

What is apparent in this argument is that it abandons the idea of judging the qualification of a teacher on the basis of competence. For competence is substituted a political qualification. What the teacher believes, and not teaching ability, determines

whether he can enter the "sensitive occupation of the teaching profession." It is precisely at this point that the reactionaries enter the door shouting that there is a cold war going on, and that all "subversives" should be kicked out of the schools.

CLASSIC ROAD

The TEST of whether a teacher (who is accused of being a Stalinist) really DOES teach in such a way as to violate the precepts of democratic education is to be made not by investigators into his political opinions but by his authorized and educationally qualified supervisors using the criterion of COMPETENCE.

If the Stalinist "closed mind" prevents (say) a biology teacher from giving a fair and competent presentation of a theory of heredity, then the Stalinist can be expelled on the same grounds that any other teacher is expelled—incompetence as a teacher. But in all of the cases of Stalinist teachers, not one charge of this nature has been brought up. Instead educational boards have resorted to all kinds of subterfuges and kangaroo courts.

The criterion established by Dr. Gallagher is itself broad enough to start a witchhunt of its

own. For just exactly how does one define a closed mind? There are those who would apply it as well to those who adhere to the orthodox point of view. Perhaps the best criterion for others would be a mind that does not hold any points of view. Also where does a closed "dogma" end and a well-defined "point of view" begin? A point that should be obvious is that many of the groups which are spearheading this attack on academic freedom cannot make any pretense to having an open mind. A devout practicing Catholic, for example, does not have an open mind on many subjects which a teacher may have to teach.

The drive to exclude Stalinist teachers has opened a floodgate of reaction in the school systems, and even among those who fear its methods and consequences, there is tendency to adapt to it, to compromise with it, to yield to its major premises—to go along with much of it in order to make a stand on less fundamental aspects.

This is a classic road on which would-be defenders of democracy are pushed to fall in line, more and more, with the advance of reaction. A fight for the principles of academic freedom is also the practical fight.

The Know-Nothings of 1953 — —

(Continued from 1-S)

of the other small American fascist organizations. A past "national commander" of American Patriots, Inc., Zoll has found a more fruitful reception for his efforts in the field of education, bringing to it the same ideas and techniques he learned from such associates as Gerald L. K. Smith, Elizabeth Dilling, and other speakers for the American Patriots.

FASCIST LINE

For example, his pamphlets attacking education are priced to sell at sums well beyond their actual cost. Since the sales are wide, this is by no means an insignificant source of income. *McCalls*, for example, reports that Zoll's income from pamphlet sales and contributions in 1949 alone amounted to \$45,000.

The actual content of Zoll's attack on "progressive education" is in terms of its generally democratic and liberal philosophy. One of his pamphlets, for example, describes progressive education as "shot through . . . with the blight of Pragmatism," and permeated by such "subversive principles" as the denial of absolute truths (contradicting Christianity). In addition, it currently tries to "plug hard for the democratic equality of all men."

For the most part, as those know who are familiar with the standard content of fascist propaganda, this is the same stuff that used to be handed out with more or less anti-Semitic additions by the practised purveyors of fascist ideology. The problem is: at a time when open fascist movements are insignificant and without influence, why should their ideology find a response in the attack on public education?

Public hysteria about Communism by itself is certainly not a sufficient explanation, because that is the fascist stock in trade. The real explanation, we feel, is that using the hysteria over Communism as a cover, the numerous forces which are opposed to public education as such, or to specific aspects of it, have chosen this opportunity to advance their cause.

The public school system—as a tax-supported institution—is always subject to being regarded as an "extravagance" by sections of the business community which regard themselves as entitled to determine the uses to which "their" tax money is put. This is particularly the case in the small community where considerations of the narrowest and pettiest kind are apt to dominate the business leaders and thereby the local schoolboard. Aside from their resentment at public education in general (sentiment which in its extreme form goes as far as to advocate the abolition of public education entirely); the small-town druggist and farm machinery dealer are often prone to oppose any "progressive" ideas which involve greater expendi-

tures, say for smaller classes, better equipment, etc.

Needless to say, such ideas are far from being universally held even in the business community and they are certainly not "capitalist" in essence. They represent primarily the penny-pinching view of the small businessman in the small community.

More responsible spokesmen (i.e., those more representative of business-management interests) recognize the necessary role of education in modern society, and even prefer the progressive theory and methods for their own sake. Thus, in a recent public statement, the National Association of Manufacturers called upon all of its members to assume greater financial responsibilities with respect to support of public education and at the same time urged support of "enlightened" and progressive education as the best bulwark for strengthening "our democratic heritage." These shades of Henry Wallace's "progressive capitalists" understand, for example, the real value of modern education in creating the necessary consensus for waging a total war.

This does not mean, however, that elements like Zoll can do no harm to a school system which, whatever its defects and shortcomings, provides universal instruction along many democratic lines. This is particularly true when many additional forces are at work for similar purposes.

Thus, in their effort to secure government subsidies for parochial schools, Catholic prelates and politicians bring their own criticism of "secularism" to bear. And religious groups in general are now pushing their claims for "more religion" in the elementary school program. While not directly involved in the attack on public education these religious elements gain a favorable public hearing for their claims when the suspicion of "atheistic-communism" has been aroused by the explicitly political groups.

MUNGER'S OUTFIT

Attacking as it does the very foundations of the modern educational system, the reactionary approach has up to now found little direct response in the educational world. Rather, school administrators and leaders have responded by making concessions while defending themselves from the most obviously malicious accusations.

Among students, the reactionary attack has had little effect, at

least until recently. In the past year, however, the operations of a group on campus which levels the same kind of attack against the schools has begun to be felt, if only sporadically.

This group, first organized as Students for McArthur and later changed in name to "Students for America," exists primarily as the instrument of its West Coast student leader, Bob Munger.

Claiming a far larger membership and influence than it actually wields, Munger's outfit functions primarily from an off-campus base; by lecturing to Rotary Clubs and businessmen about the "subversive threat in our colleges" Munger manages to enlist their financial support for his organ *The American Student*. On campus Munger's efforts were strengthened considerably by the recent publicity he received through Walter Winchell's nationally syndicated column, which devoted considerable space to praising Munger's efforts to bring Americanism to our colleges.

Possibly as the effect of this or other aid, Munger's influence has been felt in several places recently. Chicago and New York have seen organizational attempts to establish chapters of Munger's group.

More significant, perhaps, is the account carried in the University of Pittsburgh's *Pitt News* of a meeting of the Student Council

where the question of affiliation to the National Students Association was under discussion. Munger's organ has been carrying on a campaign "exposing" the NSA for such things as advocating an FEPC law, federal scholarships, academic freedom, and other "radical and subversive" doctrines. The *Pitt News* reports that these charges were raised against NSA, using *The American Student* as the source of reference.

Whatever the future of SFA may be (and it is undoubtedly bound up with the personal fortunes of its politically ambitious leader) its emergence marks a new stage in the development of the reactionary trend. We would expect that its general line of attacking all known liberals as "reds" will find at least limited acceptance, to a degree perhaps approaching that which the same charge has gotten in other circles, particularly the official bodies now about to begin their "investigations."

All of these attacks—stemming from sources both on and off campus—can be expected to increase in the immediate future. The efforts of all real believers in academic freedom must be mobilized against all such attacks whether they come from the reactionary opponents of public education, religious elements, ambitious campus politicians, or the professional investigators.

Detroit Hysteria — —

(Continued from 2-S)

arrested for manslaughter, following a traffic accident in which his car plowed through a safety zone and killed a woman. He was described by a police report as drunk at the time. His trial was due last April but somehow never came off! Questions about this and other notorious activities of Schudlich are embarrassing the Cobo administration at the moment. It appears that Schudlich is hardly a "paragon of virtue" capable of saving this country from the wicked Communists. This past week the Wayne

County CIO Council announced its endorsement of the Citizens Committee to challenge the Trucks Act. Its making its support public, the CIO Council took pains to distinguish itself and the Citizens Committee from a Stalinist committee which has been appealing directly to local unions for assistance.

Meanwhile the Supreme Court held a hearing on the Michigan law, and there are reports it is likely that the court will refer back to the Michigan courts the question of the legality of the Trucks Act, including its definition of a Communist.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

114 W. 14th St.

New York 11, N. Y.

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

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

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

SCHOOL (IF STUDENT).....

NOT IN THE HEADLINES . . .

A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, socialism, minority groups, national and world politics — \$2 a year.