

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 18, 1954

FIVE CENTS

**Behind the Fantastic  
Developments in  
THE REUTHER SHOOTING CASE**

... page 3

**CONVENTION CALL  
FOR YOUNG SOCIALIST UNITY**

... page 4

## The Eisenhower Program: 'Fair Deal' for Big Business

By GORDON HASKELL

President Eisenhower's State of the Union message did not spell out the program of the Republican administration. But it was enough to give one pretty much the "smell" of what the president is going to urge the Congress to do. There can be no doubt that the program which will actually be legislated will have a far

ranker odor than that which issued from the message itself.

The reactions to the president's message are, in some respects, more significant than the generally vague contents of the program itself. The right wing of the Republican Party was heard to mutter something about "Fair-Dealism"; the Eisenhower wing pretended to be delighted;

the Democrats were found mostly looking at each other with a "where-do-we-go-from-here" expression on their faces.

Only a scattering of isolated individual Democrats, who can in no way pretend to speak for their party, were heard to make scattered criticisms of isolated parts of the president's program. Not one of them, neither the most liberal nor the most conservative, even pretended that he had an alternative program to present to his party or to the country as a whole.

Is Eisenhower's program a "Fair-Dealish" program or not? One could easily get into a quibble over words on this question. But one thing is certain. It had every bit as much reference to social welfare legislation in it as was contained in the last two State of the Union messages presented to Congress by Harry Truman, and perhaps even more. But this is so only because those messages by Truman were almost completely empty of such proposals!

The Fair Deal, as a continuation of the first years of the New Deal, was dumped down the drain when the war in Korea started, and was never hauled out again thereafter. Only the words remained.

THEY REMEMBER 1929

This assertion is not just windjamming. It is based on a review of the last two Truman messages, and on the record of the 82nd Congress. That is one of the reasons why the Democrats, and even the "Fair Dealers" among them, have nothing to say. They do not even have a recent tradition on which to base an alternative program.

But programs are not just built-in features of political parties. Even in the United States

(Turn to last page)

## Going McCarthy One Better: Ike's De-Citizenship Plan

By H. W. BENSON

Congress listened coldly while Eisenhower skimmed over the tepid "liberal" platitudes of his State of the Union message; it applauded politely everything conservative. At one point only was it raised to a high pitch of enthusiasm, punctuated by shrieks of delight and rebel calls. It was when the president reported:

"I recommend that Congress enact legislation to provide that a citizen of the United States who is convicted in the courts of hereafter conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this government by force and violence be treated as having, by such act, renounced his allegiance to the United States and forfeited his United States citizenship."

Here and there a congressman muttered a muffled objection to the unexpected, unprecedented, and perhaps unconstitutional character of Eisenhower's plan. But on the whole, the de-citizenship proposal has been greeted by Congress and by the press with open support, implied sympathy, or an expressed willingness to be convinced. The voice of vigorous protest is tiny indeed.

"AKIN TO TREASON"

Only in England—where newspapers of every political complexion including the conservative *London Times* immediately voiced their opposition—was a fitting hostility expressed. But then, that's another country and, by U. S. standards, one somewhat overaddicted to democracy.

In the United States, public opinion has been softened up for acceptance of this, and almost any other, assault on the rights of "Communists."

In his definition of the "offense," Eisenhower has not been compelled to invent anything new. The field was laid out for him by the previous Democratic administration and cultivated by a

whole school of self-confessed liberal ideologists who have dedicated themselves to demonstrating that the defense of the democratic spirit lies in the state suppression of the Communist Party or its rights or the rights of its members or of its sympathizers. The crime is therefore the familiar "conspiring to advocate," a crime created and defined in the old Smith Act.

Eisenhower's claim to originality on this score lies in defining the crime as "akin to treason," a new twist which is worthy of attention. The Constitution carefully and closely defines treason as "levying war" against the United States or "giving aid and comfort" to its enemies. It was a meticulous effort to take weapons out of the hands of unscrupulous politicians in future years, who would crush internal opposition with charges of "treason." By creating the new category "akin to treason" Eisenhower

(Continued on page 7)

## Going Taft One Better: Ike's Strikebreaking Plan

By PHILIP COBEN

The one question on which, it had been forecast, Eisenhower's congressional program was going to make some real concession to labor was the issue of amending the Taft-Hartley anti-labor law. Even the late Senator Taft himself, who was no pro-laborite, had okayed a number of changes which would have improved the act somewhat from labor's point of view.

It is true that a message embodying these changes, which had already been drawn up for Eisenhower and approved by then-Secretary Durkin, got dumped under industrialist pressure, and that Durkin himself subsequently slunk out of the cabinet; but it was still expected that Eisenhower's recommendations would add up to some degree of easement in the law. The surprise now contained in Eisenhower's

message of January 11—dealing with the question "Just how anti-labor can we afford to be?"—is that it bids fair to add up to a worsening of the T-H millstone around labor's neck.

It has been candidly reported in the press that a contest in pressuring the White House has been going on in the whole last period. In the face of the previously wide agreement, even from the right-wing side of the boss parties, that some pro-labor concessions should be made on T-H, a fierce campaign has been put on to put even more anti-labor teeth in the act, a campaign openly waged by the National Association of Manufacturers and the U. S. Chamber of Commerce. They decided to fight for "more-Taft-Hartley," not less.

There can be little doubt that, at least at the

(Turn to last page)

MORE

on Eisenhower's program inside. See:

'WHAT EVERY CITY-DWELLER SHOULD KNOW'

page 2

'VOTE FOR 18-YEAR-OLDS?'

page 6

# What Every City-Dweller Should Know

## About Eisenhower's Farm Program and the Farm Crisis

By L. G. SMITH

"Can you solve the farm problem without reducing the number of farmers?" a reporter asked Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson on the day when Eisenhower's farm program was released to the nation.

Benson appeared taken aback for a moment, stumbled over his words, and finally said: "I don't know." He joined in the ensuing laughter.

Recovering a bit, he said he thought "We can—yes." At that moment another reporter suggested he had an easier question. "I'll take it," Mr. Benson said with a grin, "just to get away from the other question."

Few of the readers of LABOR ACTION are farmers, and most of them may want to turn the page when they see a headline which refers to "farm prices" or "parity." Yet the problems faced by American agriculture are exceptionally difficult and complicated ones, and in the long run are bound to affect the bulk of the rest of the population.

The "solution" proposed in Eisenhower's message on the farm problem merely highlights the insolubility of the question for the administration.

The farm sector of our economy has been the first one to come out of the iron lung of the war-foreign aid-and-armament boom. Even the oxygen tent of parity-payments for certain crops is no longer sufficient to keep the patient healthy. And the costs involved in pumping the oxygen of "parity" into agriculture have become so vast, and threaten to expand at such a rate in the future, that the Eisenhower administration is proposing to cut them back drastically.

It is not likely that this phase of his program will meet with success in Congress. Too many Republican and Democratic congressmen from farm states are anxious to hold on to their jobs, and a vote against maximum parity is enough to kill them politically. But a look at the problems of the farmers, and the devices which have been used or which are proposed for use to solve them, is very instructive for anyone who wants to understand the nature of the capitalist system, and the KIND of problem which it will come up against in one sector of the economy after another in the future.

### Hit Hardest

The reason that the farmers have been hit first and hardest is twofold:

(1) Productivity in farming has increased more rapidly during the past thirteen years than in most other sectors of the economy. Fewer farmers and farm workers today can produce far more food and other farm crops than could be produced by the much greater farm population before the war.

(2) Farming is an industry in which production can be increased or contracted, or shifted from one product to another, more rapidly and easily than is the case in any other sphere of production. It is also an industry in which millions of individual enterprises are competing with each other. Thus, in a sense, there is more unrestricted, genuine, unadulterated "free enterprise," and "competitive enterprise" in farming than in most other productive industries.

The consequences of capitalism operate more brutally and inexorably here than in industries with some degree of monopoly control of prices and markets—which includes most of the major industries of the country.

This is an oversimplification of the structure of American agriculture, but it is enough to get started with. And it is also enough to say that the government has had one, and only one, major answer to the problem of how to keep American farming from going bankrupt ever since 1930. That is to subsidize the farmers and control their production by a combination of parity-payments and controls over the crops which they may plant.

Parity is a simple idea. It means that the farmers are guaranteed a certain price by the government for their crops, regardless of market conditions. If the principle of parity were to be applied to the automobile industry, the government would pledge itself to buy at a fixed price all automobiles the industry makes in any year and cannot sell.

If we stretch the analogy a little, and attempted to apply the principle of parity to wage-earners, it would mean that the government would guarantee to buy up the labor-power of all workers at a fixed rate in any one year.

### Why the Farmers Get It

Parity for certain major crops has been fixed at 90 per cent of an average of the price of what farmers have to buy from industry. As long as the market is good for farm products and their prices are high, the government need not buy any of their products. But when prices drop below the parity formula, the government must buy everything the farmers have to offer over and above what they can place in the market.

Thus, to go back to our wage analogy: as long as full

employment exists, the government would not have to pay workers anything under a parity guarantee of the market for their labor-power. But the moment employment drops off (i.e., the moment the market for labor-power shrinks) the government would guarantee all unemployed or partially employed workers 90 per cent of parity wages. Parity, in this case, could be a figure representing the average of wages in each industry, or a wage large enough to buy a certain amount of goods and services at current prices. In any event, it would be far above anything the government has ever dreamed of paying in the way of unemployment compensation.

Why has the government been willing to guarantee farm prices for basic commodities at parity, while it would denounce any demand that it do the same for wages as "galloping socialism"? The answer is a complicated one.

Politically speaking, for one thing, the electoral system in America is heavily weighted in favor of the farmers as against the vote of the workers. Thus the farmers can throw their political weight around, and they have been pretty well organized to do it.

Secondly, when a worker is unemployed, there is nothing visible left of the wastage of his labor power. If he cannot find a market for it each day, it does not accumulate in a big pile around him. As long as neither he nor any member of his family dies of starvation, there is no material remainder which has to be disposed of.

### Parity in Peacetime

It is different with farm goods. If the farmer cannot get a profitable price, he will leave his wheat to rot in the fields. The warehouses will soon bulge with products which have to be destroyed if they cannot be sold. The farmer will fail to plant his fields next year, and they will lie fallow for all to see. If he cannot meet his payments, the whole rural economy around him begins to tumble.

The towns in farming areas begin to decay very quickly when the farmer is ruined. In the cities, workers by the thousands and hundreds of thousands can be unemployed or partially employed, and they are lost in the general population, except around the employment offices and factory gates.

So parity has been the answer for the farmers for these many years. And as long as the war boom kept up, it was a pretty good answer. If one crop or another got overproduced one year, the government would buy up the surplus, and get the farmers to agree to plant less the following year in exchange for their parity checks. Next year another crop might get out of hand, but in the meantime the surplus of the first one was sold, even if at a loss.

Thus as long as there was a market here or abroad for all that the farmers could produce, it was just a matter of adjusting from year to year which crops they should produce more of and which less. The government lost billions of dollars in the process, but when a war is on, what is a billion more or less among friends?

But what happens when there is no more war, and when other countries have been able to increase their crop production to take care of most of their own needs, and when the government can no longer find political justification for buying up vast crops to give to political allies abroad? What happens when not just one or two crops are being overproduced, but when overproduction shows up in four, five, six or ALL major crops?

What good does it do the government to get farmers to promise to cut the acreage they will put in wheat next year, when all this means is that they will grow more oats or sorghum instead, and the prices of these commodities are already showing signs of tumbling?

### What Can Eisenhower Do?

That is the situation Eisenhower faces now.

"During the last year, the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in farm commodities more than doubled, increasing by about \$2,500,000,000. As a result, the financial obligations of the corporation are pressing hard against the \$6,750,000,000 limitation on its borrowing authority." That is what he told Congress.

The government now owns, or has obligated itself to acquire, 840 million bushels of wheat, which is "more than the domestic wheat requirements of the entire nation for a full year." It has 9,600,000 bales of cotton, or enough to supply our domestic needs for a full year.

To prevent this surplus from swamping it completely, the government will have to force farmers to cut down the acreage planted with wheat by 16,500,000 acres; corn, by between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 acres; cotton, by 3,500,000. But, as Eisenhower pointed out, if 25 mil-

lion acres of land were to be taken out of their present crops and transferred to others in a single year, it could have "a most unfortunate impact on the whole economy." That is a polite phrase for disaster.

But even such drastic measures would not solve the problem, even for these crops. Farmers who agree to cut down their acreage for a certain crop have a tendency to pick the least productive land for the cutback, and to increase the yield on their best land by concentrating their labor, fertilizer and the like on it. Thus such cutbacks would only reduce production to current consumption levels, leaving the government holding the bag with the present surpluses.

What can the government do?

One approach would be to apply its alleged philosophy of "free enterprise," cut out parity, and let the farmers fend for themselves. That would mean immediate ruin for the bulk of the farm population, and a Donnybrook for all the industries which rely on the farmers to buy their products. No government would dare propose it.

Another approach would be to keep parity at present levels, and just continue to shovel subsidies to the farmers. The costs would be astronomical, and the surpluses would have to be burned, dumped in the ocean or buried, as they were in part during the New Deal era.

But the Eisenhower administration is a "middle of the road" bunch—as long as the road keeps veering sharply to the right. So what they are proposing is what amounts to a gradual reduction in parity levels over the years, with no actual impact to be felt by the farmers at least till after the elections this fall. After that, the impact would grow greater and greater, and the farmers would have to gradually adjust themselves to a lower standard of living.

In the government's language, this is known as adjusting the farmers to "modernized parity."

### Crisis of Glut, Again

The government also wants to avoid the wheat-burning, pig-killing and plowing-under of cotton which shocked the moral sensibilities of all thinking people during the depression. Thus they propose to "isolate" the present surpluses from the market, so as to remove the threat which they involve for the farmers today. They are to be used in school lunch programs, for foreign aid to distressed allies, and the like.

That is all very well, but it simply means that the taxpayer will have to foot the bill in full. For those of the common people who are not farmers, the only consolation is that under this program prices of food are bound to come down somewhat in the long run.

In facing the farm problem, we get a pretty good look into the whole insane jumble which is the vaunted system of "free enterprise." Our liberals can shout all they want to about the "new" capitalism which is altogether different from the old, and only looks the same to people who insist on keeping on their socialist blinders. But as far as the farmers are concerned, the old grey mare is much too much like she used to be for comfort.

They have used modern science and technology to increase their productivity as never before. They are willing and able to produce a flood of the basic necessities of life. A large section of the American people are still underfed, and in the world at large two thirds of humanity never get enough to eat. But their products have become a liability to the government rather than a boon to mankind.

And the only real answer their government and their economic system has for them is to force them to cut production, and eventually, to force their own standard of living down along with that of the rest of the working population, if not ahead of it.

### Plow-Under Farmers?

The program Eisenhower presented to Congress is full of technical provisions to "modernize" parity for this crop, or to keep it at present levels for another one, or to give an outright cash subsidy to farmers for a third, while permitting their products to seek their own price level on the open market. (For wool-growers Eisenhower slipped in a provision modeled exactly on the Brannan plan, which was so roundly denounced and rejected by Congress under Truman. The big farm interests opposed the Brannan plan because it would show up the subsidy in much more naked terms than does the parity formula, and thus make it politically more vulnerable.)

The idea seems to be that people will be impressed by the technical complexity of the program, and will conclude that anything which appears to be so carefully worked out in such detail must have, hidden in it, a principle which will solve the problem.

But in their hearts, the government officials know that there is only one real solution under capitalism: reduce the farm population along with the acreage to a point at which the fewer farmers left can operate profitably in an economy of scarcity.

Hence, when this "solution" was thrown at Benson point-blank, he was at a loss for words. It is so obvious, but so brutal an indictment of the system, that his tongue got tied up between his inclination to tell the truth, and his knowledge of how dangerous the truth is for his government and the system which it protects.

# What's Behind the Fantastic Course of The Reuther Shooting Case?

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, Jan. 9—From beginning to whatever end it may have, the handling of the "Reuther shooting case" borders on sheer fantasy, suggesting that a mockery of the whole tragic affair may well be the only outcome of the sensational headlines currently displayed in the daily papers in this city and no doubt also in the rest of the nation.

If the attempted assassination of Walter P. Reuther in April 1948 were not such an important political as well as personal matter, the subsequent developments could easily be dismissed as a Mickey Spillane pulp story, or a grade B movie mystery.

**But the social and political implications are far too grave for that kind of outlook, which apparently is accepted by Detroit's newspapers as the sum total of the issues involved. Nor is it likely that the United Auto Workers (CIO) can allow a continuation of this kind of handling of such a vital event.**

At the moment, the disappearance of the key witness has all the earmarks of another situation like that involving the notorious Abe Reles, the vital witness against Murder Inc. in Brooklyn 12 years ago. Reles, on whom the then Prosecutor William O'Dwyer depended for his entire case, "committed suicide" while under guard by six policemen in a hotel room in Coney Island.

The Detroit witness, now identified as Don Ritchie, an ex-convict, walked out of a hotel room here while being guarded by three policemen! Ritchie had signed a sworn statement describing the whole shooting, the payoffs, and had named the notorious racketeer, Sam Perrone, of Kefauver Committee fame, as the kingpin of the deal!

Adding a further note of fantasy to this affair, the escaped witness called the Detroit *Free Press* and offered (for \$500) to tell it an exclusive story on the whole deal. Then he repudiated his confession, when the Detroit paper refused to go along. Meanwhile, police spent hours denying that the witness had escaped!

**Now it appears the case against the men named by Ritchie has collapsed. This would indeed be a convenient ending for the Reuther case, just as Reles' death in New York was convenient for many politicians and racketeers. In Michigan before the war, a state senator who promised to talk to a grand jury on the tie-up between racketeers and politicians, involving the highest names in the state, was murdered on his way to talking!**

## A Question About the FBI

But to understand the over-all picture, it is worthwhile recalling what has happened in the Reuther assassination investigation since 1948. At that time Reuther suggested three possibilities: (1) a manufacturer, (2) racketeers, and (3) the Stalinists.

A special word is necessary on the last-named possibility.

The day after the shooting, and while Reuther was in danger of losing his life, there was considerable tension and anxiety in the shops, a frustrated bitterness among the auto workers that "They" got our leader. At this point George Edwards, now a judge, issued an hysterical statement that "The Communists did it," and there was a field day against the Stalinists and many persons formerly associated with them. Demands that the FBI get into the case were made, but the FBI declined, at least publicly. From Ford Local 600, various Stalinists were picked up and questioned by police for complicity in the Reuther shooting.

It just happens, however, that today in federal court the six leading Stalinists are on trial under the Smith Act, and among the more interesting aspects of the case is the constant flow of highly placed FBI informants parading as witnesses against the CP.

**From these individuals and from the reports of the complete surveillance which the FBI has kept over key CP figures since 1946, one thing is clear: The FBI knew that the Stalinists in Michigan were NOT involved in the Reuther shooting; that the whole series of arrests, questioning, etc. of the Stalinists here by local police was up a blind alley!**

Why did the FBI permit this situation, which only made a solution of the Reuther case more difficult? It would be interesting to have a congressional committee return to Detroit and go into this and other vital aspects of the Reuther shooting.

## Company-Gangster Tieup

The next important farce or tragedy in the Reuther shooting case was the arrest and trial of Carl Bolton, former committeeman of Ford Local 400, as the alleged killer. He was found not guilty.

Now all this time the Detroit police and the FBI knew that there existed in this area a gang which had good reason to want to kill Reuther, and whose people today are finally named as the murder gang.

**But it took the devastating Kefauver hearings, in Detroit 3 years ago, to bring out the tie-up between racketeers and a major industrial concern that reminded one of (and in fact grew out of) the tie-up between the Ford Motor Company and the notorious "Purple" gang of the 1920s, as exposed in Keith Sward's monumental work *The Legend of Henry Ford*.**

In brief outline, the Kefauver committee uncovered the connections between the Briggs Manufacturing Company, the Michigan Stove Company, and Perrone, who from an allegedly ignorant Italian immigrant background suddenly got a scrap-iron business from the Michigan Stove Company, making more than \$50,000 yearly.

Behind this facade, however, is another story. For years, Perrone was the leader of a gang accused of smuggling aliens into America via

AS WE GO TO PRESS, the news is that Donald Ritchie has given himself up to the police, after his wife was arrested.

Canada. These helpless individuals found themselves working as terrified slaves at the Michigan Stove Company, which resisted all attempts to unionize it successfully (until a year ago, but that is another part of our story).

Perrone's son-in-law, Carl Renda, suddenly found himself given a scrap-iron business from Briggs, worth \$100,000 profit yearly, although he had no office, no knowledge of the business, no experience or anything. During these years, however, six Briggs Local 212 officials were badly beaten up, with Ken Morris, current president of that local, escaping death by sheer luck after an especially brutal workout with lead pipes.

**Dean Robinson, son-in-law of the late Walter Briggs and president of the corporation, simply couldn't explain these financial deals, although one high official at Briggs had resigned when the racketeer elements were allowed in.**

## Hints at Motives

Even after the Kefauver hearings, Perrone and Company tried to block the unionization of Michigan Stove Corporation, and threatened many people. The UAW-CIO found some witnesses brave enough, and Perrone was brought to trial. He and some henchmen got off with light fines and probation!

Besides Perrone and Renda, the two men named in the Reuther shooting indictments are Clarence Jacobs, a Canadian associate of Perrone, who is considered a shotgun artist and has been named as the actual trigger-man, and Pete Lombardo, now in prison, a former member of the old Purple gang. Four other "John Doe" warrants have been issued but public officials refuse to say who is involved.

All of Detroit's papers hint broadly that two factors were involved in the "motives" for the Reuther shooting. One was control of the union, and in this case the names of some top anti-Reuther leaders are being bandied about, including one former regional director who denied knowing Perrone but who turns out to be a friend and confidant during the crucial years. The other motive was fear that Reuther would move to bust up the rackets within the auto shops, which involve millions of dollars yearly in the "take."

## UAW's Racketeer Problem

**Among the gruesome ironies of this case is the fact that soon the statute of limitations will apply, and the accused men will automatically be freed since the charges against them have collapsed by the convenient disappearance of the key witness. This merits investigation. Why Perrone was not picked up, while the others were, is also an interesting question. Through friends he informs the press that he isn't ready to give himself up!**

Since Jacobs is a Canadian and is fighting extradition to America, international law is involved, all of which gives the FBI reasons for entering the case, but as yet there is no indication that it has done so.

The fantastic profits made by the Perrone gang in its various operations should have made them fair game for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, but as yet there has been no indication of activity in that direction since the Kefauver committee was here.

Thus the United Auto Workers and the citizens of Detroit face two major problems: (1) a decent and effective handling of the Reuther shooting case and an investigation into the various travesties of justice that took place since 1948 in this situation; (2) what to do about the huge-scale racketeering that goes on in all the plants, and in which there is an annual increase in the temptation of the racketeers to involve themselves more and more into the control of local unions and the bargaining structures? By convention mandate the UAW-CIO ordered its stewards and committeemen *not* to bargain for racketeers caught and fired in plants. It is also publishing a pamphlet against gambling, but this is small potatoes compared with the real problem in the plants.

That this is a far graver problem than anybody acknowledged or understood previously may be shown by the recent events in the Reuther shooting case.

## Would you stoolpigeon for the FBI?

That's the theme of "The Emperor's Clothes"—except that, as a matter of fact, the setting is laid in an East European police-state.

This unusual play has been revived, off Broadway, by the theater group of the Greenwich Mews Playhouse. It deals in memorable fashion with the dilemma of a man in a police-state under the pressure of conformism and state terror. Should he equal or stand up to his inquisitors? Should he be a rat or a "hero"? Should he sell himself and his child to the police for the job he wants?

N. Y. ISL Theater Party for  
"The Emperor's Clothes"

Tuesday eve., January 26

Write for tickets to:  
New York ISL, 114 West 14 Street.  
Contribution: \$1.50

# Youth and Student Corner

## Youth Unity Moved Up to February 12

By joint agreement the Socialist Youth League and the Young People's Socialist League have agreed to advance the date of the youth unity convention one week, to the weekend of February 12-14. This was done in order to make possible the attendance of delegates from the West Coast. The Convention Call, published on this page explains the procedure in some detail for the organization of the convention.

### BULLETIN OUT

The second issue of the Joint Discussion Bulletin of the YPSL-SYL is ready for sale. This issue contains articles and documents of relevance to the new united youth organization.

The third issue of the bulletin, which will contain the draft program, the draft constitution, and resolutions for the Convention, will be ready by the end of the week.

The bulletin (10 cents per copy) is a joint SYL-YPSL production open to all members of the two youth groups. Order your copies from the SYL, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

### ANVIL NEWS

The spring 1954 issue of *Anvil*, the student anti-war quarterly, has been prepared and should go to press very shortly. The publication, however, finds itself in urgent need of funds—funds without which the publication can be held up indefinitely. We need all possible help, but most of all, the outstanding *Anvil* debts should be sent in to the *Anvil* business office at once.

There has been a slight change in the Peacemaker personnel on the *Anvil* editorial board (the revolutionary pacifist organization has three representatives on the *Anvil* board). The new board member is David Dellinger, who has a long record of militant pacifist and anti-war activity. Dellinger, a prison C.O. (i.e., a conscientious objector who refused to go to the C.O. "camps" and instead went to jail) is well known in student anti-war circles. His addition to the board helps further to broaden the backing of *Anvil*.

Have you read . . .

## "NEXT— A LABOR PARTY!"

by  
Jack Ranger

A discussion for trade-unionists of American labor's greatest lack and greatest need.

25 cents

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



## LABOR ACTION

January 18, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 3

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—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.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

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

# Joint Convention Call

**TO: All members of the Young People's Socialist League, the Socialist Youth League, independent socialist campus clubs and unaffiliated young socialists.**

Dear Comrades:

A unity convention of the Third Camp socialist youth will be held on the weekend of February 12-14. This convention is being called jointly by the Young People's Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League for the purpose of establishing a new unified Third Camp socialist youth organization.

All sections of the YPSL and the SYL are to elect delegates to the unity convention; campus socialist clubs and individual socialists in basic agreement with the intent of the convention may elect delegates on the same basis.

The SYL and the YPSL are the only two national organizations in the youth field which are opposed to both imperialist war camps. Their political agreement on opposition to both capitalism and Stalinism and for a socialist Third Camp have made unity both possible and necessary. Their joint devotion to the principles of socialism and democracy—democracy for all, even the Stalinists—and their joint cooperation on the campuses, in anti-war work and the political arena, give evidence that this unity should not be hard to achieve. A period of close fraternal cooperation has preceded this convention call.

Naturally the delegates from the YPSL and the SYL will first meet in their own conventions and will also meet separately after the joint convention to ratify its results.

The alarming growth of reaction at home, the apathy on the campus, the weakness of liberal student organizations, all give evidence that the need for an organization of principled socialist youth is greater than ever. The unification of the two major socialist youth groups now provides the opportunity for a pooling of the forces available in the youth field for more effective socialist activity. This unity also should provide a home for the independent socialists on the campus who need a national organization to make their local efforts nationally effective.

### DELEGATES

All local sections are entitled to one delegate for every five members or major fraction thereof. Members-at-large will be balloted by their respective national committees. Sections that are geographically too far away to participate in the convention may designate comrades nearer to the convention site to represent them.

### AGENDA

Following is the proposed agenda:

- (1) a. Seating of delegates and roll call.  
b. Adoption of agenda.  
c. Adoption of convention rules.  
d. Election of convention committees.
- (2) a. Reporter from YPSL.  
b. Reporter from SYL.  
c. Greetings from fraternal organizations.
- (3) Constitution.
- (4) Draft program.
- (5) Report on *Anvil*.
- (6) Reports from local sections.
- (7) Resolutions.
- (8) Election of the national executive committee.

Enclosed with the convention call you will find a copy of the draft program and constitution for the new organization. [This sentence refers to the mailing that is scheduled—Ed.] The proposed name is: **THE YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE.**

### THE BASIS OF UNITY

Through discussion between the YPSL and the SYL, the following tentative agreements have been reached, subject to modification by the convention:

(1) The new organization will provide the widest possible internal democracy, including the right of all minority groupings to publish their own press.

(2) The new organization will be open to all anti-war socialists in the youth field and will not be officially Marxist.

(3) The new organization will be independent of all adult organizations and will permit its members to belong to any adult organization of their own choice. The question of adult affiliation may not be raised until the second convention.

(4) The new organization will support *Labor Action*, in return for which it is to receive a page in that publication under its own exclusive editorship.

(5) The YPSL and SYL will submit a joint slate of officers for the national committees for approval by the convention, based on parity between the two socialist youth organizations with at least one "neutral" member on each committee.

The impact on the convention by independent socialists will, of course, depend on the number of independent delegates that come. The convention is open to all Third Camp young socialists.

**Forward to a United Socialist Youth Organization—  
Against Both Imperialist Camps!**

National Organization Committee,  
YOUNG PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST LEAGUE.  
National Coordinating Committee,  
SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE.

Send all communications to either Socialist Youth League, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C., or Young People's Socialist League, 24 Charles Street, N. Y. C.

## Open Letter to the Calif. Socialist Youth YPSL National Organization Appeals for Socialist Youth Unity

To all young members of the California Socialist Party and its youth group:

Dear Comrades:

This Open Letter is an appeal for Third Camp socialist youth unity. For many reasons, we have had very poor contact with you, even before the national organization of the YPSL split from the Socialist Party. As a result of the faction fight waged in the YPSL between the leaders of the New York YPSL and the ex-organizer of the Los Angeles League, many of you have never had the chance to hear your national organization's side of the split. This is because *while we were still in the SP* we received no communications, no dues and no addresses of new members from California.

As a result of this (whether this was caused by inefficiency or a desire to keep you from contact with us) the California YPSL was not involved in the split. To be exact, as a result of the extreme animosity that sections of your leadership have displayed for the YPSL NEC, you have never had a chance to be consulted, either in the 1953 convention (your spokesmen ignored the convention call) or through the two most recent referendums.

We take this opportunity, on the eve

of socialist youth unity, to make another appeal to you, hoping that this time it will reach you.

The first official communication your national organization has received from California since the summer of 1952 was a recent insulting letter in reference to the recently held Third Camp Conference. This letter demanded, if you please, that we—we who have taken clear majorities of both the members and the national officers—cease "usurping" the

name YPSL. The letter went on to say that no cooperation is possible between our two groups!

Why?

Have we, by the mere act of leaving a party that is so pro-war that it supports the bloody imperialist adventure in Korea, ceased to be democratic socialists? Are we, the Marxists and revolutionary pacifists who are a majority of the YPSL national organization, more alien to you than the SP which refuses to defend the civil rights of Stalinists, supports the American war camp, and is soiled by years of class collaboration?

### COMPARE!

No one, not even the staunchest partisan of the SP in the League, has ever claimed that free discussion or full internal democracy were violated in the YPSL. Yet you, most of whom we do not even know, who are so close to us programmatically, have so far refused even to discuss the views of the National YPSL and the prospects of a unified youth organization. Are personal loyalties that much more binding than political agreement?

We appeal to you to let all previous

(Continued on page 5)

# Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

## On 'How Very Different Pacifists Can Be'

To the Editor:

It seems to me there is also a bit of "fog" on the reply side of "Pacifism vs. Marxism," in your January 4th issue. I feel this is mainly due to your assumption throughout that any particular pacifist can represent pacifism. It seems to me that to attack your statement as Marxism would be equally unwarranted.

I can illustrate how very different pacifists can be in their approach to both violence and non-violence by reference to an issue which happens to have sharply divided American pacifists around the ideas of violence and non-violence—the issue of the Puerto Rican Nationalists' struggle with violence for independence.

To me, the American pacifist or non-pacifist who does not stand out against his country's rape of that island is more responsible for the violence down there, also on the steps of the Blair House, than any of the Puerto Ricans. It is difficult to name this initial, more-responsible "violence," which is of a non-overt order, in which all are responsible, knowingly or unknowingly, who do not resist. Our language falls down. Everyone will know what I mean.

I do not know how many pacifists will agree with me and I do not care, just as I do not care for Marxists to agree with me. I arrive at my view out of a background of fifteen years of experience under British imperialism with final expulsion, with some other missionaries, by the Church because of too close identification with the revolution in India. But I think my view has general application. When the Untouchable, after two thousand years, strikes back, we say, "He's violent!" But Jesus would not have said that. He would have asked, I think, "Who is the violent one?" Gandhi asked precisely that.

Our ideas about aggression illustrate the same defect in both language and thought. We say, "What happened at Pearl Harbor?" as though that is important in deciding who is the aggressor. But Pearl Harbor had nothing to do with the real aggression—the initial, responsible aggression.

### YOU'RE INVITED

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

There is one, perhaps there are two places where far too many pacifists seem to me to agree with those who accept violence in what seem to me particularly important assumptions.

They seem to think that war, which to me is mere outcome in an overt form, is the important consideration. Putting their pacifism over against war as its mere negation they become obsessed with the idea that both violence and non-violence can be dealt with just as method, which is the overt striking out or the overt refusal to strike out. The second assumption which is only part of this is the equating of resistance with violence. I have had both pacifists and professional soldiers say that there is no such thing as resisting anything, except by violence. One prominent F.O.R. pacifist who also teaches ethics in a theological college even went so far as to say that because you could not rule out the possibility of resistance being necessary, it would always be necessary for a nation to be prepared for a war emergency. If that is pacifism, I am definitely not a pacifist.

I think that I rule out violence as method more consistently even than these pacifists. But I would insist that the better part of non-violence is its consistent resistance to every life-thwarting institution or arrangement.

In concluding, I would like to say that I like your definition of democracy very much. I teach, among the social sciences, political science. I have come to believe and to teach, as in accord with the earliest theorizing and the practice of modern democracy, that basically, insofar as it has existed, democracy is twice revolution; once in its inception by the overthrow of tyranny and secondly in the arrangement of "political democracy" to provide legal opportunity for any "opposition," upon gaining a majority, to set up a new government. This latter revolutionary concept is used by political scientists as the criterion to test the degree of the democracy of any particular political arrangement. I think, now, the most important political science research is along the line of the rethinking and reformulation of democracy (and action projects too as necessary experimentation) in terms of all the later developments (later than the work of the original architects of modern democracy). Some of these which I think of as in the nature of later developments bearing upon the meaning of democracy are (1) the international crisis in revealing the inner contradictions in modern democracy; (2) the revolution in India as new

experimentation in the methodology of struggle against tyranny; (3) Socialism as the second great revolution in the democratic tradition; and (4) the new international aspect of people's revolution in its bearing upon the attempt to extend democracy beyond the national boundaries. The Third Camp interests me because it seems to be feeling after this necessary rethinking, reformulation and experimentation.

I believe that in the long run of history Gandhi's addition to democracy in the concise terms of your "ever-greater participation from below by the masses of the people," will be his greatest gift, greater than all the contributions made specifically to India. And I believe that the coming together of active non-violence (not pacifism) and socialism is an important step in this fulfillment—the fulfillment of democracy in modern terms but in the sense of the final realization of the revolution in which all democracy originated.

Ralph TEMPLIN  
Professor of Sociology  
Central State College, Ohio

## Footnote on 'Footnote'

To the Editor:

Comrade Denitch in LA, Jan. 4, has a note on my rejected letter to the *Industrial Worker*, in which I had replied to certain charges made against the Third Camp Conference by a person signing himself X23181. Since Denitch does not quote my letter directly in many of the points he takes up, readers may attribute to me certain views expressed by him which are not contained in my letter, and which I do not share. I am not of the opinion that the editor of the *Industrial Worker* was trying to suppress a difference of opinion. I have always found the paper and its various editors to be quite democratic and hospitable to the views of non-Wobblies such as myself. In the latest instance I think the editor was simply being over-cautious and over-considerate of the sensibilities of X-23181, in addition to being dismayed by the heat of the dispute. Also it is not quite accurate to say that LSC proposed holding the Third Camp Conference in Des Moines, since this novel idea was not a part of the instructions given to its delegate to the planning conference, but was his personal idea, arising from his provincial patriotism. (And I am a native of Iowa, too.)

Victor HOWARD

To the Editor:

Your criticism of the *Industrial Worker's* handling of Victor Howard's attack on me is very interesting in view of your

own handling of the same issue. The editor of the *IW* declined to print only the *ad hominem* sections of Howard's letter, inviting him to rewrite it so as to bring out the doctrinal disagreement between us. LA, on the other hand, while chiding the *IW* for not printing Howard's letter, ran only the personal-invective parts of it, without even attempting to get at Howard's actual arguments, if any. For example, you state that Howard "had a sensible word to say about the 'wild' perspective of the LSC critic," etc., but you fail to say what that "sensible word" might have been.

In addition to this, your article displayed a use of hearsay and guilt by association that was superior in its adroitness even to Howard's own. You had no way of knowing with whose book number the *IW* article was signed, yet you state—on your own, not even quoting Howard—that "he happens to be one of the leaders of the LSC group." To obviate further confusion on the part of those of your readers less omniscient than the editors, I hereby inform you that the undersigned is the holder of that number book.

You then proceed to quote Howard to the effect that I "believe both in the 'progressive' foundation of the Soviet Union and [am] an admirer of the Cannonite Socialist Workers Party!" These allegations, even if they were true, hardly contribute to an objective discussion of the Third Camp.

The *IW* was entirely justified in refusing Howard's letter. This publication has never made a pretense of holding an open forum for anyone to malign whomsoever he might wish. For example, the editor rightly refused for publication recently an article in which I . . . [here De Haan proceeds to quote what the *IW* "rightly" refused to print, and so we refuse too—Ed.]

Your most interesting point of attack on the Libertarian Socialist Committee was the accusation that it is "a loose unideological grouping," etc. If being "unideological" means not to resemble the ISL-SYL in having one inflexible sectarian dogma, and not having the appropriate revolutionary fervor to employ hearsay and smear tactics in order to implement that line, then I hereby offer fervent thanks to whatever gods may be that we are, indeed, "unideological."

Richard J. DeHAAN

I learn from Comrade Howard's note that DeHaan was speaking only for himself on the Des Moines idea. DeHaan did not make that clear to the committee.

Though Comrade DeHaan speaks of "hearsay" and "allegations," it turns out that the accuracy of no statement we made is challenged by him. We take it, in fact, that they are confirmed.

Comrade DeHaan thinks that comments on his political viewpoint constitute "personal invective." I do not. Also: comment on DeHaan's peculiar politics may not contribute to a discussion of the Third Camp but it is relevant to a discussion of DeHaan's attack on the Third Camp Conference.

I don't know what DeHaan means by his reference to "guilt by association." I associated him with (1) his own political ideas, and (2) the LSC. Both are facts, and neither is a crime.

I had not "attacked" the LSC as a "loose unideological grouping." That was presented as an accurate objective description of fact. The LSC prides itself on being loose and on having no definite ideology. If DeHaan indeed gives fervent thanks for this, I don't see why he should bridle so at the accurate picture.

Lastly—speaking of hearsay and smear tactics—the undersigned is not a member of ISL-SYL but of the YPSL.

Bogdan DENITCH

# Open Letter to SP Youth — —

(Continued from page 41)

factional disputes go by—reminding you that you have no way of being sure about the issues that were involved, having been in contact with one side only. We appeal to you to take a responsible political attitude toward organizational politics and consider the merits of the new youth organization.

Compare its proposed program with your party's. Compare its provisions for internal democracy, and means for carrying on a free discussion, with the reality you face in the SP. Compare the perspectives and possibilities open to a unified socialist youth organization, an organization that will have all the anti-war Third Camp socialists in the youth field in one organization.

Compare this with the alternative: doctrinal disputes between socialist youth groups, meaningless bickering, and, for you, sectarian isolation from any existing national youth organization.

Having compared this, consider how you will justify your continued separate existence today, in this era of witch-hunts and general assault on the left, to serious youth.

### WILL IT MAKE SENSE?

Will you say: "True, we agree with these comrades on most issues; it is true that they have a national organization; it is true that they have full internal democracy—but . . . but . . . a section of this organization used to belong to an organization which in turn had Trotskyist origins, and this is what we feel to be all important" . . . ? Do you really feel that this will make sense to a politically-interested youth?

Moreover: how can you continue to

explain your bonds with the SP? How will you, as Third Camp anti-war youth, explain away the line of the *Call* and the public statements of the party, how explain away the SP's negotiations for unity with the SDF and the rest?

Will you explain the SP by claiming (as some do) that it is the "true socialist party" while we represent "insignificant splinters"? But this would be idiotic since everyone knows that the SP is dying and that even the SYL-YPSL carries on more activity than the SP.

How will you justify the confusion that is caused on campuses when two organizations with all but identical programs compete with each other? By loyalty to which political principles? Pacifism?—but your party is no more of a pacifist organization than we are, and your party's program is infinitely less compatible with pacifist principles, not to mention that half of our NEC is composed of pacifists.

### FALSE ISSUES

Is the line of distinction to be "democracy vs. Bolshevism"? This will be and can be no divisive issue in the new youth organization. (1) By "Bolshevik" do you mean "undemocratic"? But every criterion of democratic functioning that you can think of will be met by the new organization. (2) By "Bolshevik," do you mean giving approval to the historical acts of the Bolshevik party? The new organization will have no position on such historical questions. But you know of course that the entire YPSL NEC is "anti-Bolshevik" in this sense, and disagrees with the particular evaluation of historical Bolshevism that is made by SYL comrades. (3) Or by "Bolshevik" do you mean an internationalist, revolu-

tionary anti-war socialist as opposed to a social-democrat? To that extent we also are "Bolsheviks," though we do not use the term that way.

But if you still think you have important differences with us, this need not prevent your participation in the new youth organization. Nor do we insist that you leave the SP; on the contrary we make it explicitly clear that you may belong to any adult group of your choice.

We do not believe in "unity" just for the sake of creating larger organizations; but, given the basic area of political agreement between the YPSL and SYL—agreement on opposition to both armed camps, struggle for socialism, and absolute adherence to political democracy—continued separation is criminal and its only result is to further weaken the anti-war socialist forces in the United States.

The National Office of the YPSL appeals to you to come in and help build the new youth organization, the Young Socialist League. There is no question in our minds but that you belong politically. There will be no questions raised about adequate representation for you and room on our leading committees. If you cannot send delegates, get together and select proxies in the East, but come to the convention and join the new youth organization. Our concern is not only that the new organization be as large as possible but also that rivalry on the campuses, that has no basis in political difference, be eliminated from the outset.

So join with us to help us build a solid, militant young socialist movement!

Fraternally,  
NATIONAL ORGANIZATION  
COMMITTEE, YPSL

### A Basic Pamphlet—

## SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY

by  
Max Shachtman

Read it! 10 cents

Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

## LONDON LETTER *New Terrain for 'Bevanism'?* **The Struggle Is Shifting to Industry**

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Jan. 6—The year 1954 is likely to see a slow but steady shift of emphasis in political life from Parliament to industry.

Bevanism as a current in the constituency branches of the Labor Party has now lost its original momentum, if only for the fact that an important section of "Bevanism" is now official policy of the Labor Party (and in a strictly limited sense, also the policy of the Tory government). Clearly the stage is now set for a new phase in the development of the left wing of the Labor movement.

The threatened 400,000-strong strike of the National Union of Railwaymen, the recent 24-hour Confederation strike, and the ETU's guerrilla strikes which took place toward the end of last year—these are all part of the shape of things to come this year. This is realized by everybody, Tory and Labor alike.

This week's London *Tribune*, Bevan's organ, has a front-page article on the subject (Jan. 1 issue). It begins like this:

"If the 1954 calendar of industrial events is fulfilled, this year will be an historic one. In four of Britain's major industries—engineering, shipbuilding, mining and building—wage disputes are developing which could paralyze the nation."

And farther in the same article: "The background of this dispute has already been described in *Tribune*: rising profits, rising productivity, sharp rises in the 1953 dividends—and falling real wages."

It would be foolish to assume that the respective trade unions fighting for wage increases will get their wage increases as "easily" as the NUR (railwaymen). The engineering employers have made it clear to the trade unions, all 39 of them, that they are represented in the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, as well as to the Ministry of Labor, that they are not going to budge easily from their position of flat refusal of the Engineers' demands.

As a matter of fact, where it was comparatively easy for the Railway Tribunal to give an increase of wages by passing the bill on to the public (25 million pounds has to be found somewhere), the engineering employers can give the 15 per cent wage increase (or a substantial fraction of the wage increase) only at the expense of their own record profits, or at the expense of Britain's export drive (which eventually comes to much the same thing).

The right-wing Municipal Workers Union and the Transport and General Workers Union do not exactly help matters by their half-hearted support or open hostility to the demand for the wage increase. This, and the existence of a minority CP group on the AEU Executive, will be used by the Engineering employers to the utmost.

The lack of confidence of the Confederation leadership is well shown by its decision to postpone the national ban on piecework and overtime, which was to have started on January 18.

This general picture of the situation here is generally accepted, and it will be instructive to see how the right and left wings of the Labor Party will line up as the trade unions move in on all sides and on all fronts for these wage increases. The *Tribune* has already put its position of sympathy with these trade-union demands on record. The right wing has not. Whether they like it or not, they will have to, if not now, in the near future.

### BEVAN ON ATOM PLAN

In the same issue of *Tribune*, Aneurin Bevan has written an article entitled "The Year of Hope." There is little that is new in it.

The only new feature of Bevan's present foreign-policy outlook is his apparent endorsement of and support for President Eisenhower's proposal for a common pool of atomic facilities by all countries possessing them, to be administered by the United Nations. The fissionable material would be used for peaceful international economic development.

President Eisenhower's plan was objected to by the Russian government on the grounds that the amount of fission-

able material to be set aside (in the proposal) is, small and that it would still permit atom bombs to be made. To these objections, Bevan counters: "Well, what of that? The president agreed it would be small at first. But such as it was, it would not be used for making bombs and that would be a gain in itself. And, later, the amount would be increased until fissionable material would be increasingly diverted to peaceful purposes." (My emphasis—A. V.)

It is here that we get to the core and hub of Bevan's argumentation. Like all schemes for international economic development (such as President Eisenhower's proposal at the UN, the "World Plan for Mutual Aid," etc.) the scheme is based on the idea that it is possible for the two major powers in the world, the U. S. and Stalinist Russia, to agree to such a proposal. It assumes that the two fundamentally opposed social systems can arrive at some *modus vivendi*, at some common understanding.

Even if—and this itself is unlikely—the Russians or the Americans were to carry out the provisions of President Eisenhower's plan, it could only touch on the outermost fringes of the basic problems (economic and military) facing the great powers. To assume that voluntarily Russia or America would agree to the amount of fissionable material diverted to peaceful economic reconstruction being increased to such an extent that the economic or the security interests of either one would be in the least jeopardized is to expect miracles.

The scheme is all very fine. Aneurin Bevan is quite right there. There is just one minor trouble with the scheme, just one minor technical hitch: *It won't work!*

### FOSSIL

The Socialist Party of Great Britain is now celebrating its 50th anniversary. A party of this description is exceedingly rare, and a few words about this organization might not be amiss.

The SPGB claims to have more than a thousand members. It presents itself as a Marxist party—that is, it accepts Marx's economic and political analysis of

capitalism. It, however, rejects Marx's attitude on what they call reformist parties (here they lump together Stalinists, genuine reformists, centrists, Tories and Trotskyists). For them Marx's *Critique of the Gotha Program* is based on the "fallacy" that the short-term interests of the working class coincide with the long-term interests of the working class.

**They do not support strikes, as a party, or any reforms since the latter have nothing to do with socialism! Reforms can only lead to more capitalism, and strikes only benefit one section of the working class at the expense of the other (so beautifully simple), therefore it has "nothing" to do with educating the overwhelming majority of the working class in the principles of socialism.**

The two main speakers for the SPGB at their first anniversary meeting were the famous Tony Turner and the not so famous McLatchie. Turner, looking back on 50 years of "preaching socialism," admitted that the SPGB had changed its position on the following three points:

(1) Its present, as distinct from its pre-1920, position of rejection of the "dictatorship of the proletariat." The SPGB holds that there is no transition from capitalism to socialism. This view was not accepted by its founders. (2) Its present, as distinct from its pre-1938, position of rejection of all wars as reactionary, anti-democratic and anti-socialist (even a colonial country fighting its imperialist master). (3) Its present, as distinct from pre-1920, position of accepting the idea that it is necessary for the overwhelming majority of the population to understand and want socialism before it can be introduced. Before 1920, the SPGB would have been happy with 51 per cent of the population "understanding and wanting socialism."

The SPGB is, therefore, moving away from its Marxist class-struggle origins (it broke off from the Social-Democratic Federation of Hyndman in 1904). The only positive development to date has been that because of the growth of a tendency around Tony Turner himself which rejects the class struggle (which has "nothing" to do with the socialist message), the ranks of the SPGB have been forced to reassert its origins as a class-struggle organization.

The SPGB once influenced quite a number of people now prominent in the Labor Party and Communist Party (the CP's first general secretary, Arthur Manus, was a former SPGBer), but its importance today is small in view of the fact that it does not realize that Marxism is proletarian socialism, class-struggle socialism.

## Vote for the 18-Year-Olds?

By BOGDAN DENITCH

It is not often that socialists find themselves in agreement with President Eisenhower. However, at least one of the items the president urged the Congress to adopt in the coming session has the firm support of the socialist youth in America. We refer to the president's proposal that the right to vote be extended to eighteen-year-olds.

Despite the fact that his probable motivation in urging this progressive step was strictly based on the needs of party politics—that is, on the assumption that the younger workers, not remembering the depression and the days of the New Deal, are more likely to vote Republican—this step is a good one and deserves our support.

**It deserves socialist support for any number of reasons—in addition to the usual "Old enough to fight—old enough to vote"—including, of course, the fact that in times of social stress youth tends to turn radical more rapidly than other sections of the population. As a matter of fact it should be interesting to see the effect of anti-war and anti-conscription propaganda on the future "draft bait," when that draft bait has votes.**

Both the socialist and the Stalinist movement have generally backed the eighteen-year-old vote, not the least reason being that in the youth field they have usually been more than able to compete with other political tendencies. (It is interesting to speculate how much larger the Wallace vote would have been in 1948 if the eighteen-year-olds had had the vote, considering the strength of the

Wallace movement among the youth.) Social movements opposed to the status quo have always relied heavily on the youth.

This is, of course, because the youth often tends to be less bound by traditions of the past. Whether this is necessarily good, and in what cases, raises other questions in this era of totalitarian states and the influence of mass communications in determining the values and tastes of youth.

One may also note that the one state in the U. S. which has the eighteen-year-old franchise is Georgia—hardly the bastion of progress in America!

The point is that while youth tends to be freer of the "dead hand of the past," this freedom is a two-edged thing; youth can be freer of the good as well as of the reactionary legacies of our culture and mores.

### EXPERIENCE ABROAD

But this factor can be and is sometimes overemphasized. Youth matures. During the peak of the Nazi regime, oppositionist and underground tendencies developed in the Nazi youth movement itself; the "Edelweiss" movement grew up spontaneously without any contact with the pre-Nazi undergrounds. There is also the role of the youth today in Eastern Germany: up to the Berlin uprising, the staunch support of the regime, but now...?

An interesting sidelight on the eighteen-year-old issue took place in South Africa. The reactionary Nationalist Party of Malan has been plugging for the eighteen-year-old vote (the Boers have

## From the Stalinist Jungle

Among the evidences of the continued unrest among the workers of Czechoslovakia is the constant denunciation by the regime's spokesmen of "social-democratism." For example, the CP general secretary Novotny complained at a party Central Committee meeting in December:

"Equalitarian tendencies are very frequently a sign of social-democratism. Equalitarianism, it will be remembered, is a petty-bourgeois reactionary nonsense claiming that all people should have the same needs and hobbies..."

Nonsense, indeed.

The Hungarian newspaper *Nepszava* set out to investigate why the people don't seem to like the "new socialist literature" of the Stalinist regime. In its October 8 issue, its investigator reported: "At Parafurdo I gave a talk on the decline of bourgeois literature, comparing it to our new socialist literature. When I had finished a humble peasant woman described the books that were popular in her village. Of the books which appeared during the Horthy regime, she observed: 'More was written about love and human feelings.'"

"We must take note of her remarks," *Nepszava* declared. "Readers miss, and with good reason, descriptions of deep, tender feelings and the lover interest which is absent from our literature."

The following tale has been appearing in various versions, but just in case some readers have missed it altogether, here's one of them.

It seems that Rakosi and Nagy were inspecting various public buildings in Hungary, and everywhere they went the director would try to talk them into increasing the appropriation for his particular institutions. Thus on a visit to a large public school the director enumerated all the things he needed—repairs, fuel, employees, etc. Finally Rakosi said, "All right, I'll grant the school a special allowance of 1,000 forints."

From the school, Rakosi and Nagy went to visit the prison. Here too, the prison director fell on them with pleas for more funds. After hearing his case, Rakosi said, "All right, I'll get a special allowance of 1,000,000 forints for the prison."

As they were leaving Nagy turned to Rakosi, "Matyi, I don't understand. You give the prison, where the enemies of the people are confined, a million forints, while you give the school only a thousand. Why?"

"Don't you understand?" answered Rakosi. "It's dead certain that neither of us are ever going to go to school again!"

large families) while the more moderate Union Party, primarily composed of those of English descent, has been opposing this step. The most effective single argument the Union Party used against the eighteen-year-old vote has been the fact that up to now only the Stalinist states have established it. However, now that President Eisenhower has come out for the wider franchise, unless the Union Party is willing to claim (as some members of his own party do) that Eisenhower is a Stalinist dupe, the Nationalists will carry the day. Incidentally, it is probably true that in South Africa the extension of the franchise will have genuinely reactionary consequences since the present balance of power between the Nationalists and the Unionists will be completely upset, seating the Malanites even more firmly in power.

To return to the U. S., however, no immediate drastic consequences can be expected from the extension of the franchise to the youth. The probable side effect will be to increase the frequency of demagogic "peace-loving" statements by both parties. UMT will become even more "political dynamite" than it now is, and probably it will become a dead issue in Congress—how can any sane congressman be expected to vote for UMT when his election may now depend on the vote of eighteen-year-olds in his district? And we predict that the president will probably regret having taken this progressive step, perhaps in the near future.

All that, of course, assuming that any step is taken by Congress to implement Eisenhower's proposal.

Don't miss a single week of  
**LABOR ACTION**  
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

# YOU and SCIENCE

## THE AAAS DISCUSSES THE SCIENTIST'S PLIGHT

By RICHARD BINGHAM

BOSTON, Jan. 3—The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), which recently held its annual meeting in Boston, had a very stimulating, informative and warning session on "The Scientist in American Society." This session, which was a four-man forum moderated by Dr. Condon, was well laid out and none of the speakers encroached overmuch on the others' ground, which seems remarkable in this type of topic.

It seems best to give the highlights of each participant's argument because, to this reporter, it reflects the mental horizon of the different professions represented.

The first speaker, Dr. Weiskopf, a physics professor at MIT, spoke of the effect that present-day society has upon the reality of the concept of "Science for Science's Sake."

Whereas science (in the so-called "pure" form) is an organized endeavor to understand nature, it constitutes a search for fundamentals and essentials, findings which are independent of the individual personality and therefore universal. Yet we have a case where the newspapers reported that the Nobel prize had been awarded to Dr. Urey, not for forwarding our understanding of atomic theory, but for laying the "background for the A- and H-bombs."

These conditions which emphasize the military role of science have given the public an erroneous conception of scientists, and among the results has been a lack of appreciation of the spirit of science by the public.

### NO IVORY TOWERS.

The next speaker, Professor Kemble of the Harvard Physics Department, spoke on "Scientists and Political Action."

He emphasized the exposed position of a group of men who have a monopoly of our technical secrets; yet, because of the needs of science, oppose totalitarian controls and believe in civil liberties. Because of the freedom that science requires, it is useless to hide in ivory towers when the ivory towers themselves are being swept away. Though the scientist is a political non-expert and in a dangerous position, he must become interested and active in his role to throw off the creeping controls of today.

His line of attack would be through professional organizations, with great emphasis on information. This proved very efficacious in the case of the Federation of American Scientists' handling of the Astin case. Scientists should also give collective policy opinions at crucial periods.

Following the physical scientists came Harvard Professor of Law Mark De Wolf Howe, who spoke on "The Legal Basis for Intellectual Freedom."

In tracing the constitutional background of the problem he pointed out that the Bill of Rights, when it was written, dealt with problems centering around the protection of an individual's inalienable rights, more on the spiritual aspect, not academic, political, or economic freedom. The judicial development has been not to punish the believers but only their expressions, if their immediate consequences were harmful to society. And the rules of procedure have been to protect the individual himself, not as a participant in a common effort, or not to save him for the purpose of his cause. Today we expect too much from the law, which has only limited capacities and is not set up to deal with groups. Hence the necessity of other organizations to rise to the need of protecting individual liberties. Most important for this group, naturally, are the universities, the collectivities that deal in knowledge.

He also pointed out that though society has a right to protect itself, it must also have procedures for due process of law to protect the individual. This is the great evil of congressional investigations that

### Oversight

The Hungarian Stalinist paper *Magyar Nemzet* revealed candidly why the country suffers from a shortage of babies' rubber diapers, even though there are plenty of the article in size one and size five. "Our light industry forgot to make them" in the other sizes, the journal explained straightforwardly.

have so misused government power. These committees have already pointed out the dangers of communism, but they are now being used to hunt out heretics in general, he said.

The last and most encompassing speaker was the editor of *Scientific American* who spoke on "Scientists and Other Citizens."

He went into the effects of a war economy and garrison state upon science as a socialized activity, bringing scientists into diffuse relations with the rest of society—something that must not be lost sight of. It's common knowledge now that government is the great benefactor of scientific investigation and that only a meager percentage of these funds is being used for research in the social sciences.

### SCIENCE MUST DEFEND RIGHT TO HERESY

But what is significant in a war economy is that who does the work is irrelevant, it's the design of the work that is important. The great restrictions on the nature of the design have meant a loss of freedom for the individual scientist, and this has affected all the diffuse relations of his social life. To keep his job, he has to compromise all along the line.

Since scientists play such a crucial role today, the congressional committees really feel they're on a warm track when they "get" a scientist. The full-scale assault upon scientists (and people in general) that we have today is entirely irrelevant to national security. Still science by nature must question, and it must give alternatives; it must make the facts known; it has to question accepted ideas and it must often fight orthodoxy. The present investigations are attacking, therefore, heresy, and in this process they have used the term communism to cover all shades of Marxist and socialist thinking.

This has spread to guilt by association, and guilt by thinking, not action. The role of the American university today is to protect and defend these heretics, and in many cases now the individual scientist must be braver than his employing university.

The whole presentation was enthusiastically accepted by the approximately 400 attending scientists. But it also pointed out some of the real problems of the scientist, in this case the physical scientists. As a group, it must be said, they did not seem to have a general overall understanding of the problem. Their behavior reflected largely their deep-felt emotions about the whole mess they find themselves in. Above all, they don't understand, as a group, the social forces behind the situation. They need to organize (the AAAS, for example, has no committee to deal with the problem.)

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION—  
\$2 a year does it!

## READ ABOUT SOCIALISM

- The Fight for Socialism ..... cloth \$2 paper \$1  
by Max Shachtman
- Socialism: the Hope of Humanity ..... .10  
by Max Shachtman
- Marxism in the U. S. .... .35  
by Leon Trotsky
- Plenty for All: The Meaning of Socialism ..... .25  
by Ernest Erber

The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism ..... .10  
(LA Special Issue)

Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

# De-Citizenship

(Continued from page 1)

may succeed in outwitting the founding fathers more than 150 years after.

But the Republican president deserves no special credit for making the advocacy of ideas a crime. Former President Truman takes pains to remind the public of that fact. Asked by reporters what he thought of the new scheme, he said:

"I hadn't thought about it. The Communists I handled I put in jail. If anyone is convicted and sent to a penitentiary, he automatically loses his citizenship. I convicted my Communists. That's how I took care of them. I'm the only man who ever sent a Communist to jail."

In belittling his successor, Truman inflates his own significance. Naturally, he is not the "only" man, even in this country, who ever sent a Communist (large or small "c") to jail. But he can be forgiven this oversight. He is perhaps the first man to send people to jail basically for their political views without meeting the unanimous outraged outcry of liberals and democrats everywhere. But then, he is not preoccupied with the history of civil liberties in America.

### WHAT IT MEANS

What is unprecedented in the Eisenhower plan is the penalty he would impose. Native-born citizens, for the first time, might have their citizenship revoked and be cast into a new category of statelessness. No one has yet taken the trouble to justify such a penalty, to explain its legitimacy, to describe its aim. After all, it is new and it will take independent writers, democratic politicians, free-minded educators, and objective philosophers a certain irreducible time to uncover its incontestable validity down to the very intellectual roots in tradition, law, theory and custom.

What does it mean in practice? "We do not know—and we doubt that Congress knows—just what the president had in mind," writes the *New York Times*.

What does it mean in practice? Truman sees nothing new. But he is wrong. Individuals now convicted of crimes lose certain of their citizenship rights but not all. They remain citizens. In the January 8 issue of the *Times*, W. H. Lawrence lists a whole series of rights that would be denied those who lost their citizenship under a law framed in Eisenhower's spirit.

### FASTER TREND

But even this information gives only a partial hint of the effect of Eisenhower's recommendation, if enacted. We know in general that it would begin legally to set up a category of political pariahs, men who are cast out of the pale of society in which they live, deprived of more and more rights, subject to the whim and inventive techniques of successive Congresses and administrations.

It means, above all, a faster trend toward more draconic measures of suppression of political opinion; it means that "anything goes" in the internal war to suppress "communist" views, or views considered communist.

A popular acceptance of this outrageous measure will help set the mood for the most extreme penalties, including death for oppositionists. It is another grotesque extension of the mood: "If you do not admit that we are 100 per cent pure democrats, then you must be suppressed. That will demonstrate how democratic we really are!"

### WHERE IT ENDS

But in particulars no one knows what Eisenhower means. "We do not know—and we doubt that Congress knows—just what the president had in mind," writes the *New York Times*. It should be added: the president himself does not know and cannot know. He is merely responding to the mood which demands repression and stimulating it at the same time.

Where he is going with this proposal, or where it will take him, lies in the future. He, and his supporters, are as little aware of the final implications of his plan as Truman and his supporters were aware of where their "loyalty" program would end.

Truman's scheme was a simple one: it was necessary to check the "loyalty" of federal employees and to do so he had to draw up a list of "subversive" organizations. This apparently simple aim has become part and parcel of the drive against civil liberties in general. It led to the firing and hounding of political dissenters; it became part of the intimidation of teachers; it prepared the way for the wild McCarthy spree; it helped create an atmosphere where Attorney General Brownell could dip into FBI files for political blackmail purposes against Truman himself.

A *New York Times* photographer

asked a group of public figures to select their favorite self-photos. Some men like to be considered great thinkers; some, great hunters and fishermen; others, great stamp collectors. It remained for Brownell to select as his favorite, a photo of himself with a giant reproduction of his own thumbprint in the background.

He collects fingerprints. Since the destruction of the files of the German Nazi government, Brownell's collection has become the second greatest in the world. How envious he must be when he is reminded that the files in the Kremlin outrank his own. This national pastime, fingerprint collecting, gained great popularity and made great strides under the liberal administrations of the Democratic Party. It "just happened"; just as the implications of the new Eisenhower line will "just happen."

### GUILT BY BLOOD

Few virtues officially cause greater surges of emotion than the sanctity of the family. Which brings us to some of the outcroppings of the loyalty program; not because they are most flagrant but merely because they are recent.

Hans E. Inslerman was just suspended from his job as an electronics engineer at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. He happens to be the brother of a man accused by Whittaker Chambers of espionage. But this Hans Inslerman is not himself accused of spying. He is accused of continued association with his own brother, and it is charged that "you loaned your brother Felix a sum of money for defense against charges of Communist espionage."

Hans E. explains that in 1949 his brother Felix came to him in desperation. Illness in Felix's family and repeated calls to hearings before grand juries and other bodies made it impossible for him to earn a living. Hans loaned Felix \$1,400, not because he sympathized with Felix's views but because family loyalty spurred him to make Felix's defense possible. This now becomes a crime.

Another physicist with four years' service at Monmouth was suspended on charges which had been presented once before and upon which he had been cleared. But they are revived. In brief he is accused of close and continued association with his own father; and ten charges are presented not against him but against his father.

### THE 'CLUCK, CLUCK'

Nothing like this was exactly in the minds of the clever men who first devised the "loyalty" program. But here it is.

Whatever is in the mind of Eisenhower, too, is not of decisive importance. We are even willing to grant that there is nothing there.

But that would not modify our opposition to his latest scheme.

This account would not be complete without a last reference to the *New York Times*, which, while advocating (insofar as it ever can be said to advocate) the illegalization of the Communist party, editorializes: "In this connection, we note with regret that the president did not see fit to repeat clearly and unequivocally his views on the necessity of preserving the fundamental safeguards to the individual that are being too frequently disregarded these days in the quest for internal security."

Starve her and stone her! But as we stomp on old Dame Civil Liberties when she drops to the floor, let us at least utter a cluck, cluck of sympathy over the regrettable decline of her vigor. Thus we remain liberals to the very end.

### BOOKS RECEIVED

Published by New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, January 27:

- Basic Selections from Emerson*, ed. by E. C. Lindeman, Mentor, 224 pages, 35¢.
- The Sea Around Us*, by Rachel Carson, Mentor, 176 pages, 35¢.
- Amazon Head-Hunters*, by Lewis Cotlow, Signet Giant, 240 pages, 35¢.
- Gigi and Julie de Carneilhan*, by Colette, Signet, 160 pages, 25¢.
- A Lamp for Nightfall*, by Erskine Caldwell, Signet, 160 pages, 25¢.
- A Breed Apart*, by Fleming MacLeish, Signet, 144 pages, 25¢.
- Guilty Bystander*, by Wade Miller, Signet, 168 pages, 25¢.
- By Gun and Spur*, by Joseph Wayne, Signet, 144 pages, 25¢.
- Depends What You Mean by Love*, by Nicholas Monsarrat, Signet, 176 pages, 25¢.

A Labor Action sub is \$2 a year  
Get it EVERY week!

# Eisenhower Program —

(Continued from page 1)

they are bound to have some relation to what is going on in the country. And the fact of the matter is that from 1950 on the Truman administration had a military program which guaranteed economic prosperity, and was forced to concern itself chiefly with boosting production and keeping inflation under some degree of control.

In its second year, however, the Eisenhower administration is confronted with an economic situation vastly different from that of 1951 and 1952. The economy is sagging. The cold war has let up to a point at which simply expanding military appropriations no longer makes sense to anyone (except a few Democrats who can think of nothing else).

The problem now is how to keep the recession from turning into a political liability for the Republicans. And such is the nightmare of 1929 for them, that all but the most unreconstructable of them know that only some kind of government intervention into the economy can keep them in power.

## TRICKLE-DOWN THEORY

As a businessmen's government, they plan to rely most heavily on economic measures which will pour money into the pockets of the capitalists. Their theory is that if there is enough of it there, some is bound to trickle down to the rest of the population. Or to put it technically, they work on the belief that ensuring larger returns to business will stimulate businessmen to invest more heavily in expansion of their businesses, and thus keep things rolling along.

Although the details are not yet available, Eisenhower referred to "flexible credit and debt-management policies; tax measures to stimulate consumer and business spending; suitable lending,

guaranteeing, insuring and grant-in-aid activities. . ."

Sources close to the administration claim that with regard to taxes the chief gimmick they have in mind is to reduce taxation on businesses which are expanding their plants. This will be done by permitting them to claim vast depreciation deductions and the like. This is, of course, an indirect subsidy. No one will be able to say that the federal government "gave" these businessmen large sums of money. It simply will have failed to collect large sums from them in taxes, with the rest of us plugging the holes in the income side of the budget.

## PROFITS FIRST

As far as housing and health insurance goes, the same type of method is proposed. Private builders will get their profits guaranteed instead of the government building housing without profits. Private medical and hospital insurance plans will get their operations guaranteed rather than the government insuring the health of the people. To put it in a nutshell "Profits First" is to be the theme song of the anti-depression caravan.

But there will also be a bit of genuine Fair-Dealism thrown in with the stream of profits to make the carburetor mixture just what it should be to keep the Cadillac crusade hitting on all cylinders. Eisenhower proposed to extend unemployment compensation to 6½ million workers who don't have it now, including civilian federal workers. It is an iron law of nature, however, that government employment grows during bad times, whether their cause be economic decline or war. Hence, the more depression, the less unemployment among government workers. He also proposed to add some 10 million people to eligibility for old-age pensions, and to set up some kind of program for the disabled.

Eisenhower also had a few words to say about the real booster-pill, that last element which is supposed to guarantee victory in elections no matter what else may befall—the extension of the attack on civil liberties. That, too, is an old Fair Deal item. (It is discussed in another article in this issue.)

It would be ungrateful of us if no mention were made of a really progressive measure proposed by the president. This is the extension of the vote to 18-year-olds. LABOR ACTION has been for it since the paper was founded in 1940, and even its espousal by this administration is not enough to convince us that we were mistaken.

## ROUGH SLEDDING

In its main emphasis, the Eisenhower program for 1954 represents what a "progressive businessman" might think is indicated in a period when business is falling off—and when elections are in the offing. If the recession begins to cut deeper than present estimates seem to indicate, there can be little doubt that some direct pump-priming measures will be sought by the administration. They may even try to get Congress to put up the legislative framework for such measures in advance—just in case.

But the line-up in Congress is not favorable to the enactment of such a program; except under the most extreme kind of economic pressure. It is safe to predict that in the early months, even this "Fair Deal" by and for businessmen will find rough sledding among the dinosaurs who rule the congressional committee. They cheered loudest for two things: the proposals to attack civil liberties and to back Chiang Kai-shek. That is the measure of the men, the political parties they represent, and their ideas of what the country and the world need most.

# Ike's Strikebreaking Plan —

(Continued from page 1)

beginning, they undertook this drive merely for bargaining purposes, that is, in order to keep the pro-labor concessions to a minimum. We would guess that their success has gone beyond even their original purposes.

Proposals for modifying the T-H Act, 7 are proposals for modifying the T-H Act are pro-labor, 6 are pro-employer and two are supposed to be "neutral." Of the "pro-labor" amendments, only one or two are of much note, and taken as a whole the changes would be relatively unimportant. But overbalancing this is Eisenhower's new recommendation for a compulsory strike poll which, at least in one application, would give the government an automatic strikebreaking role at the very outset of every strike struggle.

## SKULLDUGGERY

According to this proposal (which had been demanded by Secretary of Commerce Weeks when he was carrying on his guerrilla war against the cabinet's D. P., the late-lamented Durkin), as soon as a strike was declared the government would step in to organize a poll of the strikers, to see whether they were really in favor of the strike.

Eisenhower's message itself was so worded as to leave it unclear whether this poll is to be taken before or after a strike is declared; but the GOP chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, Smith of New Jersey, has already submitted a bill which is supposed to implement the White House proposals and which provides that the government-organized vote is to take place after the strike starts.

Anyone with the slightest knowledge of strike situations can see that such a vote, imposed just at the moment when the union is trying to rally its forces and consolidate morale, can do nothing but introduce uncertainty, doubt and disorganization into the strike struggle.

Even if the proposal is interpreted more "favorably" to mean that this vote is to be taken before the strike can actually be declared, then what it becomes is a sort of automatic "injunction," or temporary hold-up, of a strike until the government gets the poll over with. In cases especially where the aim of the strike is to protest against an immediate and pressing injustice, like speedup, and where it may be as important to act fast as to act at all, even this version of the proposal could be a strong employer weapon.

The provision is an anti-union weapon either way, but obviously the interpretation in the Smith bill is the worse one. In this connection Eisenhower's ambiguity in making clear which he meant seems to have been deliberate—a cowardly sidestepping of responsibility. Two days after the message, the N. Y. Times reported:

"The White House declined to accept or deny responsibility for the procedure in the Smith bill. There had been differences of opinion within the president's official family about the wisdom of a strike poll at all, as well as the timing of a poll. It became known, however, that those who wrote the Smith bill did so under White House instructions."

Since the Times can hardly be accused of wishing to slander Eisenhower, the paragraph has to be taken as a polite way of pointing out the president's hypocritical skullduggery.

## "STATES' RIGHTS"

In addition, another pro-employer proposal, designed to change the law in order "to reinforce its basic objectives" (as Eisenhower said), is also the reverse of what had been previously expected. Instead of amending the law to hamper the burgeoning of the "Little T-H Acts" by the states, some of them worse than the

national law, Eisenhower's modification would go in the direction of widening the states' area of operation in labor disputes. In so-called "emergency" situations—which, as we have learned to know, can mean anything—the states will have the right to move in regardless of the provisions even of the T-H Act.

This by itself can open the door to an unforeseeable list of abuses by reactionary legislatures, which will be positively encouraged to write their own anti-labor ticket with less restraint than ever.

To balance all this, labor is given a couple of the minor changes it has demanded. One is the provision that there shall be no NLRB election held (with certain qualifications) during an economic strike. According to T-H now, an employer can break a union, or keep one out, by provoking a strike and then hiring scabs who will have the exclusive right to vote. Another is a degree of relaxation on the rules against secondary boycotts.

## IMPOTENT GIANT

The new gimmick of government-held polls of strikers is an especially ironic invention coming from the Republican administration, in that (1) it means more government intervention, not less, contrary to speeches that have been made lately by Secretary of Labor Mitchell; and (2) it will take some millions of dollars to pay for the holding of these strike polls—just on the chance that somewhere along the line a majority may vote against the strike—at the same time that GOP yells for economy and budget-cutting fill the air.

The character of the president's message, as contrasted with what was originally expected, underlines a big fact about the situation in the country today: Labor's political influence, even as a pressure group, even for bargaining purposes, has never been so low in decades as it is now.

In the last analysis (and often in the first), the degree to which Eisenhower was expected to make T-H concessions did not stem from any estimate of how pro-labor Eisenhower is, but from estimates of how much he has reason to respect labor's political strength. If, compared with expectations, the T-H message is a slap in the face for labor's demands, this is so after a long period of what the labor leaders have considered to be very clever political actions—in which labor's political strength has been frittered away in order to support timid "friends of labor" in the two old boss parties.

## 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 socialist system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

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

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

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

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

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

## Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

## The Handy Way to Subscribe!

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2.  New
  - 6 months at \$1.  Renewal
  - Payment enclosed.  Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

The standard biography

**KARL MARX**

by

**Franz Mehring**

\$3.50

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Orwell's personal account  
of the Spanish Civil War

**HOMAGE TO CATALONIA**

by

**George Orwell**

\$3.50

Order from:

**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
114 West 14 Street, New York City