

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 22, 1954

FIVE CENTS

**The Fight in the
American Civil Liberties Union**

... page 6

Bread and a Stone at Caracas

... page 7

Squabble Over Einstein's Birthday

... page 4

**SPOT-
LIGHT**

If McCarthy Goes, Will That Be the End of McCarthyism?

By H. W. BENSON

Schwable Points to 'Brain-Washing' Here

There are two special angles to the case of Col. Frank Schwable that deserve highlighting.

One is a point that we also made in connection with the Oatis affair. Oatis was the U. S. correspondent in Czechoslovakia who was imprisoned by the Stalinist regime and made to "confess." Upon his release he described what had happened to him in terms not dissimilar to the more moving recital of Col. Schwable.

In both of these cases, where the story was later learned in detail, 100 per cent red-blooded Americans proved to be sitting ducks for the Stalinist methods of confession-extraction. On the basis of the kind of thing that has passed for thinking on the part of some of our biggest brains in the past, this would tend to prove that the "American soul" or the "American mind" is peculiarly susceptible to character-breakdown, self-abasement and other negative traits.

For when our pundits viewed the Moscow frame-up trials of the '30s, with their plethora of "confessions," wasn't it the profound conclusion of so many that this could happen only (a) because of the "Russian soul," or (b) because the "Bolshevik mind" was already most of the way over to acceptance of Stalinism?

Now the Schwable case, after the Oatis case, makes this type of soulful interpretation look like the mushheaded nonsense that it is. But if the "Russian soul" or "Bolshevik psychology" is no longer available for the deep thinkers, the same cannot be said for one element that has

(Continued on page 2)

When Secretary of the Army Stevens was on his knees, apologetic for having been manhandled by Senator McCarthy, one army officer said: "The only one left in the army with any morale is Private Schine." But his fortunes took a sudden turn for the worse this week as the army issued a long blast at McCarthy, accusing him and his assistant Roy Cohn of seeking special privilege for unpaid committee consultant Schine: a commission, then special assignments, then extraordinary passes and leaves.

McCarthy struck back with charges that the army was blackmailing his committee; that Stevens sought to divert it from investigating "loyalty" in the army to tracking down sex perversion in the air force and navy; that John G. Adams, Department of the Army counselor, was a sorehead who had sought, unsuccessfully, to use McCarthy's influence to get a lucrative law job. But such fascinating counter-accusations are futile; McCarthy could prove only that the army is no better than he.

He is suddenly forced on the defensive by an unexpected, and to him trivial, incident. With utter impunity he could defile democracy, insult the country's allies, degrade his country's reputation all over the world, disorganize the State Department, terrorize statesmen, slander presidents, dishonor the army, to say nothing of lying, falsifying, and criticizing Harvard University. But ask for a favor for a friend in the army? That, never!

TURNING HIS FLANK

In ironic fashion he falls victim to the very mood which he creates. Moral corruption, in the thoughts of millions, is a respected personal virtue when practiced and enjoyed in private. It becomes a vice only when exposed to the light of day. Our great nation may not in reality be unstained, unblemished, a paragon; but it must always be so in appearance. Anything else, true or not, is comfort to our enemies, aid to subversion.

McCarthy's crime was not what he did; not even that he was found out; but

merely that it was made public. Such is the mentality of that stone pillar of society: the great Republican voter, the fake patriotism of witchhunt and white-wash.

Favoritism, nepotism, five-percentism for friends, sons, and associates of senators may not be the subject of daily newscasts but they are not unheard of or unknown. If the army began an all-out investigation, it would be a busy-bee army indeed with at least 95 other original suspects.

While on the trail, it would have to explain why it waited for eight months

before making its grand exposé; and why, during this period, Private Schine did in fact enjoy many privileges, not as exalted as he and his powerful friends would have liked but enough to make his life more comfortable and enjoyable.

The army report of its carefully recorded facts was a deliberately timed counter-attack designed to coincide with a growing revulsion among people and politicians against McCarthy. But his critics remain stolidly on the common ground of witch-hunt, "loyalty" purges, and anti-democracy. The new turn of events could become

(Turn to last page)

Another Big 'Anti-Communist' Victory — Dulles Got His Vote and Latin America Got Nothing

By GORDON HASKELL

"We contributed our approval without enthusiasm, without optimism, without joy, and without the feeling that we were contributing to the adoption of a constructive measure."—Uruguayan delegate De Arechaga at the Caracas conference, explaining his vote for Dulles' "anti-Communist" resolution.

The United States got 17 votes for its "anti-Communist" resolution at Caracas. Only Guatemala voted against, while the representatives of Argentina and Mexico abstained.

As we reported last week, the resolution was made as palatable as possible to the Latin American governments. Guatemala, against whose government it is most immediately directed, was not mentioned by name, and in the speeches supporting the resolution Dulles went out of his way to deny that it would increase U. S. power to intervene in the affairs of the smaller or weaker countries.

Yet as soon as the resolution had been passed, Dulles made pointed references to Guatemala's failure to vote for it. "The fact that one American nation voted against that resolution shows how necessary it was that the conference should have acted as it did," he said.

The speeches and explanations which got the majority of the Latin American countries to put their signatures to the resolution can now be forgotten. The groundwork is being laid for the real push against Guatemala, whenever that becomes tactically feasible. To make this perfectly plain, Dulles continued: "Now, of course, we shall have the task of assuring that the enemies of freedom do not move into the breach which has been disclosed within our ranks."

While the Latin American govern-

ments wait to see just what is proposed as a method of "assuring" the above, they will have ample time to reflect on the essential emptiness (for them) of this conference. They had hoped that it would give them an opportunity to make a plea for economic concessions from the United States, and even, perhaps, to put some joint pressure on the American delegation along these lines.

CONSCIENCE-STRICKEN

From the first day, however, it was made quite plain to them that the political as well as the economic situation in the United States does not permit the granting of any concessions of a major kind at this time. The most they were able to extract from the Americans was the promise to hold an economic conference about six months from now, with absolutely no assurances that anything will come of it even then.

After Dulles left the scene, delegate after delegate arose to explain why he had supported the "anti-Communist" resolution. As the New York Times correspondent put it on March 16, "Many of the delegates spoke almost as if their consciences had begun to pain them for having voted for the resolution."

In order to relieve the pain, 19 of the governments hastened to follow up the passage of the "anti-Communist" resolution with one condemning racial dis-

(Continued on page 4)

Don't Tell FBI, Says Senator

In an interview with the N. Y. Post, the only Democratic senator who voted against funds for the McCarthy committee, Fulbright of Arkansas, told the paper that "he would not cooperate in furnishing information to the FBI as long as its confidential files were made available to Sen. McCarthy and other politicians." (March 15.)

Nowadays such a statement is a bold kick in the rump for the sacred cow of the government.

Last September, he said, he had refused to give an FBI agent his evaluation of a man's loyalty. In substantiation of his grounds, he listed the public evidence proving that such information was open to McCarthy's snoopers, as well as citing Brownell's notorious use of the FBI files in the White case.

Fulbright was worried not only about the effect of this state of affairs on the man being investigated, but also its danger for the man giving the evaluation:

"Now Brownell says it is a civic duty to cooperate, but I don't see how I am performing any civic duty by telling them whether I think this or that man is loyal.

"I might have secret suspicions of him that I couldn't prove and wouldn't want made public. Or I might think he was a loyal American and say so, and then years from now they would dig up something about him and I would be in the position of endorsing him when I really didn't know enough about him to have a firm opinion one way or the other.

"In this atmosphere that McCarthy has created, you can go back and crucify a man for something he did 20 years ago. I am not going to be a party to that."

Fulbright may also have heard about the country where, when a man falls into disgrace, every man who ever gave him a recommendation winds up in Siberia.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

been mentioned in the Schwable trial.

If anyone wishes to build up a theory about the "propensity to confess" on the part of Americans in the face of Stalinist pressure, the raw material for a theory based on "capitalist psychology" is provided by Schwable:

"The repetition of lies, threats and promises he compared to certain advertising techniques familiar to all Americans.

"Do we drink one type of soft drink in this country because it really is better than another?" he asked. "Or is it because we've been told over and over again, over the radio, on billboards, in magazines, everywhere and every day, that one brand is superior to another?"

"Once the human will has collapsed under such a barrage, Col. Schwable said, lies come easier to the victim. 'The objective of this treatment is to break down your will to resist, to convince you that resistance is futile,' he said." (N. Y. Times, March 12.)

It's All a Communist Plot, See?

We see by the papers that West Berlin officials suspect that there is "a Communist campaign to discredit the West" by planting stories in the Western press which they can then blast.

For example, it seems that West German papers have reported arrests, new laws, etc. from East Germany which the Stalinist regime thereupon proceeded to disprove, thus sowing doubt about the reliability of the Western press.

The only trouble with this suspicion is that it may not go far enough. Why should the Stalinist agents in the West merely limit themselves to planting fake news stories? The scheme works just as well and even better with true stories.

Take the recent action of the West German Adenauer government in appointing an ex-Nazi as its representative (permanent observer) to the UN. The man, Dr. Peter Pfeiffer, was a member of the Nazi party since 1940 and had served as a Hitler diplomat until he was picked up in North Africa shortly after the Allied landing there in 1942.

World public opinion in the West has been rather disconcerted. Aren't there any deserving reactionaries in Germany available to Adenauer who weren't card-holding Nazis? The move appeared to be untactful, considering that the U. S. is needing France to get happy over German rearmament and that there is a big dispute in the British Labor Party over the question. Is it not possible (as McCarthy would say) that a Stalinist agent in Bonn put this indiscreet step into the impressionable mind of German president Heuss, so that the East German press can rejoice?

In any case, Washington's pet German, Adenauer, and his regime have gotten themselves into a peck of trouble over it, not to speak of being in a pickle. It's a Communist plot, based on the well-known Communist time-table: "Peter Pfeiffer picked a peck of pickled Nazis."



ADENAUER

Who Won—Zaibatsu Or Gen. MacArthur?

While West Germany sends ex-Nazis to represent it before the world, it is pushed to re-create its military machine by the U. S., for the laudable purpose of stopping Russian totalitarianism, which (in turn) grew to its present colossal proportions as a planet-sized menace in collaboration with the U. S. in the war against Hitler, and therefore it is entirely logical that Adenauer's ex-Nazis should be our allies in the great crusade against the Russian threat. . . . That may be a little mixed-up, since we're not sure that we can keep it all straight, but if the logic of the case baffles you, let us clear it all up by going on to Japan.

Here too our government—which must know what it's doing because otherwise who does?—is pressing rearmament on the Japanese regime. And fortunately no one can claim that Tokyo is sending ex-Nazis named Pfeiffer to the UN. So everything would be perfectly clear if it weren't for a confusing dispatch in the N. Y. Times last Sunday, about another recent event, the newly signed Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement between the U. S. and Japan.

The correspondent reviews the good guys in Japan who are for rearmament and the bad guys who are against it, the latter consisting largely of the "neutralists" who "feel that Japan should remain disarmed forever . . . [and] be hub of a democratic 'third force' that by moral example could resolve the problems of the bellicose world."

That's clear enough, but who are the good guys? "One main component is the large internationally centered business grouping, which may be able to see more clearly than the island-bound intellectual the real state [misprint for "estate"] of the world today and Japan's plight in it."

This takes one aback. It takes one aback to the days when that internationally centered business grouping was called the "Zaibatsu," meaning the imperialistically-minded finance-capital overlords of the Japanese ruling class in whose interests Pearl Harbor was launched. Along with Hitler and his Peter Pfeiffers, they were the World Menace then, who would have conquered the world if it hadn't been for heroes like General Douglas MacArthur.

Did someone say MacArthur? That reminds us: if the ex-Zaibatsu are the good guys now, who's responsible for those bad "neutralists"?

"The spiritual fathers of this group," writes the Times, "might be said to be Jawaharlal Nehru . . . and the General of the Army Douglas MacArthur of the days before the 'cold war' began." (The "Communists and fellow travelers" had already been trotted out before this sentence occurred.)

And you know there's something to that, for wasn't it U. S. occupation chief MacArthur who insisted that the Japanese put disarmament and renunciation of war-making into their very Constitution?—the same Constitution which is being torn into a shred of paper by the U. S.-Japanese pact.

As good patriotic Americans, our confusion in the face of all this is cleared up only when someone tells us earnestly: "Let's be practical, you've got to fight fire with fire, one nail drives out another, you can't make an omelet without breaking some eggs, when you chop wood the chips fly," and other homely aphorisms which we continent-bound intellectuals tend to forget. It's a good thing we have profound thinkers around.

Descent Into The Maelstrom

As a contribution to the study of the pathology of renegades, we present some of the latest news about one James Burnham, solely in the interests of science.

(1) "PLOT SEEN TO DRAW U. S. INTO RED WORLD EMPIRE" was the headline in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette after the professor got through enlightening the town in January at a Personnel Association conference. Highlight of his speech was a call to Americans to turn, O turn

to those precious values, "belief in home, flag and country."

This embattled defender of the home, whether it be a modest but patriotic hovel or a Sutton Place retreat, also advised liberals that they should "stop believing the nonsense that stern moves against Communists risk endangering the liberties of non-Communists."

In fact, they have to stop being "black-mailed" by cries about "the mythical monster called 'McCarthyism.'" No such thing.

The president of the conference, U. S. Steel Corp. vice-president Whigham, led the applause.

(2) A while back the mythical monster had brought about Burnham's withdrawal, by special request, from the board of Partisan Review, a magazine which is not on the subversive list. Burnham's letter explained that the divorce took place over the issue of McCarthyism, but it's not true he's a McCarthyite. He carefully made clear that he's merely against the anti-McCarthyites (an anti-anti-witchhunter).

This is positively logical since, if McCarthyism is a myth, he couldn't be a McCarthyite.

(3) More lately, as reported by I. F. Stone (Jan. 11), Burnham has been having trouble in his favorite liberal front organization, the American Committee for Cultural Freedom. The cause was a laudatory introduction written by Burnham for the book *The Secret War for the A-Bomb* by Medford Evans. Evans is not just a reactionary but a lunatic-fringe reactionary: one of his theses in the book is that Russian agents were behind the drive to develop the A-bomb in the U. S. so that other agents could steal it. . . .

Anyway, a prominent scientist member of the ACCF, Eugene Rabinowitch, editor of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, circulated a letter to ACCF members saying that he didn't see how he and other scientists "whose defamations" Burnham had praised "can remain members of the committee unless it dissociates itself from Mr. Burnham." One of those supporting Rabinowitch is ACCF Vice-President H. J. Muller, the biologist.

We do not know whether Sidney Hook's defenders of "cultural freedom" have any intention of following the example of Partisan Review. There seems to be doubt about how reactionary you have to get before you can convince some liberals you aren't.

France Hangs On By Its Claws

France has disillusioned us. Up to now we have been told to think that the "dirty war" in Indo-China was being fought by the French in order to save the world and the Indo-Chinese people from the tyranny of Stalinism, and not just for petty national advantage, usually called imperialism. But last week the French National Assembly told the truth:

" . . . in a resolution adopted Tuesday, it warned that France defended Indo-China because of its position within the French Union [Empire] and that France would have no obligations there if the constitutional provisions defining the French Union were repudiated." (N. Y. Times, Mar. 14.)

This declaration that the French would defend Indo-China against Stalinist control only if it were allowed to exploit it itself was forced out of the deputies by the continuing demands of the Vietnamese for some of that freedom they hear about.

At the same time, French imperialist demagoguery in Tunisia—not acknowledged by the National Assembly—was hit by both sides in the colony itself: by the French resident colonialists, who are opposed to any concessions whatsoever (like the British white settlers in Kenya), and by the Tunisian independence movement, which called the recent reforms a very inadequate advance.

The reforms increased the number of Tunisians in the cabinet and provided for two consultative bodies, one Tunisian and one French. But the very moderate Neo-Destour (Independence) Party condemned the setup as maintaining the principle of "co-sovereignty" (which at bottom means French domination) which it rejects. It

Well We've Got One Friend in Europe

No doubt the following appeared in the U. S. press, but as a matter of fact we saw it in the London *Tribune*, which quotes the special European edition of the American air force's *Air Force Daily*, which in turn quotes a UP dispatch. Following this circle around and back to the U. S., what it gets down to is a recent recommendation made by the Armed Services Subcommittee of the House to the Defense Department in Washington.

The subcommittee proposed that U. S. military headquarters abroad be transferred to Spain.

"In Spain we are made welcome," says the subcommittee—not mentioning the nastiness that the Franco regime has been displaying about including Masons and Protestants in U. S. missions to its Catholic haven—"and we need not have the feeling of having imposed ourselves upon the hospitality of a nation . . . where the presence of our headquarters is a disturbing influence in community life"—not mentioning that the Spanish people have shown some inhospitality to Franco himself, let alone to his American friends and fascist-lovers.

The subcommittee also stated in explanation: "Spain is the implacable foe of Communism everywhere . . . it gave over a million of its sons in defense of its homeland against attempted Communist conquest. The Spanish Civil War was nothing else than Communism's first attempt at imperialistic aggression. No amount of disguise nor ideological gyrations can overshadow the fact that Spain did defeat Communism."

noted that the "key executive departments" of public instruction, finance, public works and others were still in French hands.

The French are hanging on in Tunisia by their claws and in Indo-China by their teeth, but Western imperialism is being pushed back all over the world by the subject peoples. But it shows that it has not changed spots by hanging on as desperately as it knows how, and in so doing it feeds the demagoguery of the Stalinist imperialist rivals.

Why Racist Malan Is 'Anti-War'

The latest recruit to the ranks of the anti-militarists is South Africa's premier Malan, whose White Supremacy government is getting more and more doubtful about the best way of suppressing the overwhelming majority of Africans.

Racist Malan's "anti-militarism" has a common-sense ground unrelated to genuine anti-militarism:

" . . . Dr. Malan said: 'We should prevent Africa from becoming militarized. Africa should not follow the road taken by other parts of the world by becoming militarized. It should not be dragged into wars in other parts of the world. . . .'

" . . . The conviction is universal here [Capetown] that to arm the native African and involve him in wars between the great powers can result only in a Pan-African revolution.

"Strong publicity has been given here recently to reports from Kenya that the Mau Mau rebellion there was the work of men who learned about guerrilla warfare and a nationalist movement against colonialism during World War II.

"Dr. Malan stated clearly enough what he feared. . . . He said:

"After the end of the World War, in which France had large numbers of natives of Madagascar in Europe to participate in the struggle, a rebellion broke out in Madagascar. Who took part in that rebellion? Who led it? The natives who had taken part in the war in Europe. Therefore, our interest and their interest is: Do not allow the natives of Africa to become militarized. One does not hand a rifle to a child."

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

LONDON LETTER

Crumbs for Kenya, and Two Cents for British Strikers

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Mar. 11—After spending the last fortnight in Kenya, Colonial Secretary Oliver Lyttleton announced a new constitution for the colony.

The old Executive Council is to be replaced by a new policy body consisting of 16 members, 10 of whom will be civil servants from England. The other six will be "Kenya residents," three Europeans, two Asians and one African.

No election will take place until the end of the emergency, and the new constitution will not be changed before 1960, "to give it time to be tried out."

The State Council—a largely legislative body—is to be enlarged to include two Africans and two Arabs.

The reactions of the different communities could have been forecast before. The European settlers said they needed more time to think about it, but they are clearly relieved that no greater concessions have been made to the Africans.

As for the Africans, they are very annoyed; they feel that they have been given no responsibility at all, and see their single representative as an ineffective sop to their strong views.

Meanwhile the settlers continue to call for the removal of Sir Evelyn Baring, the governor-general, and General Erskine, commander in chief, far being too lenient with Mau Mau. They are not satisfied with the 40 and 50 "Mau Mau" suspects they massacre every day.

They also complain that many Europeans—especially English—view the situation from afar, and do not realize the economic factors involved. They even condemn the findings of the right-wing Parliamentary Commission on the grounds that it only stayed there 18 days.

Whatever the settlers say, the new constitution will be a very slight advance on previous ones in that there will be one African on the Executive Council. This is the beginning of a historical process, which we have pointed out before, must inevitably lead to greater African political and economic power. It is the thin end of the wedge.

TWO CENTS

After a little longer than the pundits calculated, the Electrical Trades Union and the National Federated Electricians Association have come to an agreement, which is virtually a stalemate.

The strike of different centers in different parts of the country has been going on since January. For the last six weeks, however, 2,000 men have been out continually.

The agreement that has been made is for a wage increase of 2 cents an hour, which amounts to about 90 cents a week. This is more than the employers intended to give at the beginning (they would not consider any rise at all), but less than what the union expected from a protracted strike.

Forty-five thousand electricians are affected by the wage raise, and 1300 stewards voted today to accept it.

Meanwhile the Trade Union Council and the Employers Federation have agreed to start unofficial talks on Friday, on how to avert further industrial disputes.

EMBARRASSED BY WOMEN

On Tuesday, the Rt. Hon. Richard Austen Butler, Tory chancellor of the exchequer, had to face 25 questions from MPs and 1,360,000 signatures from women, on the question of equal pay. But-

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers. Send for our free book list.

ler was chivalrous enough to accept the spirit of the idea that women should be paid equally to men, but only "as soon as the economic and financial circumstances of the country permit."

The demand for equal pay came up in Parliament last time in 1950 after the Labor Party had unanimously voted for it at its annual congress. This was the classic occasion when Attlee said that the Parliamentary Labor Party could not feel itself bound by decisions of the Labor Party congress. At that time the Tories who were in opposition decided to incorporate equal pay in their election program.

Now it is amusing to see the Tories too embarrassed to point out that Labor did not bring in equal pay when it was in power, because in opposition they themselves made a similar promise to the electorate.

Douglas Houghton, Labor MP for Sowerby introduced a bill for equal pay within the lifetime of the present government. Although no one opposed its first reading, the government is expected to put its foot down when it comes up for a second reading.

In the evening 2000 chanting women assembled outside the Houses of Parliament, after mass meetings of 6,000 others in the large halls raved about. They made a terrific row, shouting "We want equal pay now," and then proceeded to the lobby of the House of Commons.

Groups of them were allowed in to fill in cards requesting to see their members of Parliament, but most of these gentlemen were too busy or absent, and so ignored them. Most of the lobbyists left after about an hour.

The effect of all this noise will be to commit the Labor Party to a policy of equal pay. If they get back to power they will have to implement it.

FORE!

During the debate on the navy estimates, Commander Pursey, Labor MP from Hull East, criticized the system of officer and cadet entry into the navy. At his interview he was asked what games he played, so he said he played golf with a handicap of nine. "I had never played golf in my life. I had been a caddy. It was caddy's golf that got me my commission."

Former Henchmen Blast Chiang As Worse Than the Stalinists

By L. G. SMITH

Every once in a while the lid is lifted up a bit over the political cesspool which is the Chiang Kai-shek government in Formosa. Within one week two of the highest former officials of that ruling clique have found themselves compelled to make public statements to the American press denouncing the Formosan government.

First came Li Tsung-jen, who was impeached by Chiang's government on March 10, and removed from office as vice president of the country. General Li, who is now in New York, charged a number of flagrant illegalities connected with his impeachment, and went on to say that Generalissimo Chiang "goes one step further than the Communists" in demanding "unconditional obedience and absolute conformity."

"While the Communists demand obedience and conformity to the dogmas of the party, Chiang demands them to suit his whim," he said.

Hot on the heels of General Li's denunciation came a blast by Dr. K. C. Wu, former governor of Formosa, and a holder of other high posts in the Chiang Kai-shek clique. Dr. Wu said that Chiang's regime has abandoned all semblance of democracy, and claimed that it had made an attempt on his own life about a year ago.

WU ACCUSES

Wu charged the Formosan government with the following anti-democratic abuses: institution of one-party rule; intrusion of politics into the armed forces; establishment of a secret police apparatus; lack of guarantees of individual rights; lack of freedom of the press; establishment of thought control.

Among other things, Dr. Wu said that Generalissimo Chiang is attempting to set up a "dynasty," with his elder son Chiang Ching-kuo as his successor. He charged that the younger Chiang had set up a police state in Formosa, and a "Youth Corps" which was a personal terroristic organization directed against critics or opponents of the regime. He charged that the government is holding his own son as a hostage (Dr. Wu is also in this country) and in conclusion stated that if the boy is not released, "then I



will know for sure in my own mind what kind of human being Chiang Kai-shek is."

It is true that both General Li and Dr. Wu seem to have taken a long, long time to learn "what kind of human being Chiang Kai-shek is." Over many years, with one degree or another of criticism, they have served him well. But one thing about the regime cannot be denied.

It is impossible to find another one, outside the countries controlled by Stalinism, in which former high officials are so consistently charged with corruption, and in which those officials who have the good fortune to have reached the safety of a foreign country from which their voices can be heard, so consistently charge their own government with corruption, suppression of democracy, and every imaginable evil.

Yet it is this government which the people of the United States are supporting to the tune of \$400,000,000 per year. It is this gang of bandits who are to be helped to resume their rule over the Chinese people, at the risk of starting World War III, at that! That is one concrete meaning of America's Far Eastern policy.

ISL FUND DRIVE

Only Six Weeks to Put It Over the Top!

By ALBERT GATES Fund Drive Director

The past week saw the Fund Drive take a dip from the pace set in the previous couple of weeks. A total of \$563 was received. This is exactly half of the weekly sum necessary in order to finish the drive successfully at the end of ten weeks.

There are six weeks left to the drive. A glance at the box score will make it clear that to reach the total quota will require a weekly income over more than a thousand dollars a week. Where is that sum to come from? Here

again the box score provides the answer.

First: What happened to Los Angeles, the fastest growing city in the country? Los Angeles has not contributed one cent as yet to the drive, which is certainly grist to the Bay Area's mill. It also leaves pro-California elements like the editor of LA and the Drive Director feeling kind of disappointed. Los Angeles is doing them dirt.

What about Detroit? We haven't heard a peep out of the Motor City. Seattle shows in the score only because a friend made a contribution. The same goes for the National Office, which is still lagging badly. Philadelphia made one contribution and we haven't heard from it again.

We appeal again to those areas who are under 20 per cent or haven't made a payment at all to get into the swim of things. You have had a whole month in

which to get started and time is of the essence now.

In the past week, New York led the scoring with a contribution of \$370. It's the best of the week, but it isn't too much to boast about. New York is still way down in the standings and has a long way to go yet to appear respectable in the listing.

Bay Area came through with \$160 which lifted it up from practically zero to 34 per cent. Streater bypassed Chicago with 80 per cent and Pittsburgh jumped ahead of Buffalo. Outside of these, there were few changes in the standings. The next couple of weeks will tell the tale.

BOX SCORE

	Quota	Paid	%
TOTAL	\$10,200	\$3287.50	32.2
Streator	25	20	80
Chicago	1800	1435	79.7
Reading	50	35	70
Pittsburgh	150	75	50
Buffalo	300	138	46
St. Louis	25	10	40
Newark	400	137.50	34.3
Bay Area	500	170	34
New York	4000	1347	33.6
Cleveland	150	50	33.3
Philadelphia	250	22	8.8
Seattle	150	10	6
Nat'l Office	1500	8	0
Los Angeles	600	0	0
Detroit	300	0	0
Indiana	50	0	0
Akron	50	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

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

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's 1954 Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

The Squabble Over Einstein's Birthday

By BERNARD CRAMER

Albert Einstein's 75th birthday is an occasion for congratulation and celebration for the whole world, in which we join, not only in recognition of his scientific achievements in remaking our conception of the universe but also in homage to the man and his spirit of freedom.

Falstaff, said his creator, was not only a wit but also a cause of wit in others; and Einstein is not only a nonconformist but also a cause of nonconformism in others. Few, if any, topnotch American intellectuals have spoken out as forthrightly against the witchhunt. There are few whose time is more valuable, and fewer who have given as much of that time to further the social causes they believe in.

We honor Einstein the socialist as much as Einstein the scientist. That is not because we always agree with him in that field, for, while Einstein has not been uncritical of Russian totalitarianism, he has tended to collaborate with Stalinoids who are. But Einstein's own socialist ideals have remained undimmed, and that is rare enough in the intellectual world of these United States.

It is unfortunate that his birthday became the occasion for an unsavory attempt by two bisymmetrical groups to "use" it demagogically. We refer to two groups who represent respectively the "heads" and "tails" side of the civil liberties crisis in the country—the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee of the Stalinoids, and the American Committee for Cultural Freedom of the Sidney Hook school of "cold war" liberals.

The ECLC organized a conference at Princeton on academic freedom "in honor of" Einstein's birthday. It would appear that Einstein himself had not agreed to be present, and it is not clear whether he had any connection with the sponsorship of the conference at all—aside from agreeing to answer five questions on civil liberties submitted to him by the ECLC, which the organization released in connection with publicizing the affair.

Now the ECLC had an indubitable right to organize a conference in honor of Einstein; but when Norman Thomas and other liberals refused to participate in it, they acted in accordance with their views about the organization, not necessarily of Einstein. The ECLC's attack upon them was wide open to the suspicion that it sought to use the name of Einstein as a cover for its own sponsorship.

STOP THIEF!

But if this wasn't exactly cricket, a word is also due about the cold-warriors on the other side. The executive director of Sidney Hook's outfit, the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, issued a statement attacking this "exploitation [of academic freedom and civil liberties] by persons who are at this late date still sympathetic to the cause of the Soviet Union." That's all right by us, even though a part of the ECLC personnel, while partly sympathetic with Russia, is even more blinded by the illusion that any open attack on Stalinism is aid and comfort to American reaction. (This is the viewpoint, expressed by Lamont, which is discussed in this issue in the article on page 6.)

But the rest of the ACCF statement

took unmitigated gall and hypocrisy. "The test of any group's sincerity," said the executive director, "is whether it is opposed to threats of freedom anywhere in the world and whether it is concerned about the gross suppression of civil liberties and academic freedom behind the Iron Curtain. The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee has not met that test."

This is a pickpocket yelling "Stop thief!" The ACCF is almost exclusively concerned with condemning violations of democracy behind the Iron Curtain—the chief exceptions being defenses of ACCF members who mistakenly get attacked as "reds" by over enthusiastic McCarthyites. But when it comes to defense of freedom at home, the ACCF gets very diplomatic.

In February of last year, for example, we exposed the refusal of the ACCF to oppose the McCarran immigration act; the explanation of the then executive secretary was that "we are not a civil liberties organization." In point of fact, when it comes to combating "threats to freedom anywhere in the world," and not only in the Stalinist domain, the ACCF is the mirror image of the Stalinoids of the ECLC.

The smug, self-righteous statement by the ACCF secretary has the ring of a statement by Malenkov in praise of peace-loving peoples or of a statement by Dulles condemning intervention in weaker countries.

Dulles — —

(Continued from page 1)

crimination. Just as the resolution directed against Guatemala did not mention that country by name, so this resolution which is directed primarily against the United States did not mention it either. The resolution was presented by the representative of Panama, which is particularly concerned with discriminatory practices against Panamanian citizens in the Canal Zone.

The passage of this resolution may save some consciences, but it is hardly likely to affect the practice of discrimination. As the United States delegate pointed out, it is the position of the Eisenhower administration that racial discrimination can best be combated by "personal example, education and publicity," rather than by legal action. In other words, the resolution will have no effect on the country which discriminates most in the Western Hemisphere.

On leaving for home, Dulles commented that there is something "unique" about an inter-American conference. There certainly is. In no other regional grouping of states is there the same combination of formal freedom of speech and action for all participants combined with such an overwhelming economic and military superiority of one of them. What is unique is this combination of apparent freedom and equality with the very real hegemony of the United States.

Such is the unique character of American imperialism, based as it is on the economic big stick as the front-line weapon.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Published March 24 by New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books:

Franklin Escher Jr.: *A Brief History of the U. S.* (Signet Key) 25¢. Francis Brown, ed.: *Highlights of Modern Literature* (Mentor) 35¢. John Crompton: *The Life of the Spider* (Mentor) 35¢. Matilda Rogers: *Flower Arrangements* (Signet Key) 25¢. Richard Wright: *Uncle Tom's Children* (Signet) 25¢. Wm. Faulkner: *Sanctuary and Requiem for a Nun* (Signet Giant) 35¢. Ernest Buckler: *The Mountain and the Valley* (Signet Giant) 35¢. Adam Knight: *The Sunburned Corpse* (Signet) 25¢. Maritta Wolff: *Night Shift* (Signet Double) 50¢. Chandler Brossard: *Who Walk in Darkness* (Signet) 25¢. Gerald Sykes: *The Center of the Stage* (Signet) 25¢. Alfred Bester: *The Demolished Man* (Signet) 25¢.

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

ISRAEL AND ITS ARAB MINORITY—

One Step Forward, One Back

By AL FINDLEY

The Israeli government has taken two new steps in relation to the Arab minority within the country—one a step in the right direction of liberalizing the restrictions on the Arabs, and the other a backward step in placing further legal restrictions on them.

The government has lifted some of the controls on the movement of Arabs in one district of Galilee where about 75,000 Arabs live. Other parts of the country are not affected, nor is a part of Galilee which lies three miles from the frontier.

As is well known, Israeli Arabs need special passes to leave their villages. This requirement had a very serious effect on the employment of Arabs. Not only did it make them subject to undue red tape, not only did it mean that they had to travel to a military post before going to work, but in most cases very few "passports" were issued.

The General Zionists who have de-

manded the lifting of military rule over Arab areas have not succeeded in this demand, but they do seem to have gained a moderation of the severities of such rule. In addition, the cabinet minister announced that further liberalization would follow.

The step backward was the introduction of a bill by Pinchas Lavon which empowers the government to deport "security risks" from "danger areas." The Israeli army has in the past deported Arabs without the benefit of a special law. The adoption of this law will only legalize the lack of civil rights that features the position of the Arabs in Israel.

The defense minister also introduced a bill extending the military rule over Arab areas for another year. The only opposition to these measures came from the Arab deputies supported by the Mapam and the Communist Party. The other parties supported them as a government bill despite extensive private opposition.

On the Witchhunt Front Campus and Bar: Prof Wins, Lawyer Loses Out

Professor C. Clyde Mitchell, chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics at the University of Nebraska, has been the center of a heated academic freedom controversy growing out of an article he wrote for *Capper's Farmer*, titled "Let's Not Go Back to 1920." In the article, Professor Mitchell expressed the view that "During the '30s, farm leaders and Congress forged the realistic laws that help agriculture maintain its place in our economy—an economy that is both free and not free. Despite all the talk about free enterprise, much of the non-agricultural economy is not free. For that reason, agriculture demands and receives help from government so that it can compete with industry and labor."

The article and Professor Mitchell came under the immediate fire of the Hall County Farm Bureau Federation, which adopted a resolution asking that a committee be named to call upon the University Board of Regents and "take any further action they deem advisable."

At the same time, Regents-member J. Leroy Welsh was quoted as saying: "I have no brief for anyone in a tax-supported institution who favors the destruction of the free enterprise system. No member at the University has any right or authority to advocate the destruction of this system."

In a closed session, the University Regents decided that Mitchell had not violated the propriety of his office and issued a statement of principle to eliminate further misunderstandings. This statement was unanimously approved by the Board and hailed in the local press as "a fine document, and as straight-forward a declaration of the principles of free thought and expression as has come from any campus."

The statement made the following points:

"Rights and responsibilities (of University faculty) include:

"(1) The full right to speak as a citizen.

"(2) The responsibilities of citizenship.

"(3) The right, as a professional person, to freedom in research and to the publication of the results thereof, limited only by the precepts of scholarship and the faithful performance of other academic responsibilities.

"(4) The right, as a professional person, to free and thorough expression in the classroom.

"The right to uphold, to discuss and dissent are the moral fiber of America's greatness. They are likewise the strength of a great University."

BEFORE THE BAR

The Chicago division of American Civil Liberties Union has filed a "friend of the court" brief with the Illinois Supreme Court in the case of George Anastaplo, who was denied a petition for admission to the Illinois Bar by the Illinois Committee on Character and Fitness. The committee must approve all applications to practice law under Illinois law.

Anastaplo, a 28-year-old veteran, who graduated at the head of his class from the University of Chicago Law School, was denied a certificate of fitness by the Com-

mittee although the Committee did not state its reasons for the action. The ACLU's brief protested on the following grounds:

(1) The records of the hearings show no facts as to why Anastaplo lacks "Requisite Character and Fitness to Practice Law."

(2) "Since the applicant made out . . . a prima facie case of character and fitness . . . it appears certain that, except for what the applicant said at the hearings, he would not have encountered difficulty in obtaining certification by the Committee. Therefore: The Character and Fitness Committee refused to certify the applicant solely because of his expressed unorthodox opinions and beliefs on philosophical and political questions." The brief said that Stephen Love, a member of the Committee, said: "there was not the slightest evidence that any Communist or subversive activity, or even interest on the part of the applicant, at any time during the 28 years of his life."

ENFORCING TIMIDITY

(3) "Admission to the practice of law should not be denied on the grounds that an applicant holds unorthodox political or philosophical beliefs. A refusal to admit an applicant which is based on such grounds would violate Article II of the Illinois Constitution, and the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution."

Raising strong objections to the content of the Committee's interrogation of Anastaplo, which strayed into such fields as the naming of all his organizational affiliations and even which newspapers he read, the ACLU affiliate said:

"In view of the close relation of lawyers to the exercise of the rights safeguarded by our state and federal Bill of Rights, inhibition of freedom of thought and action on the spirit of lawyers destroys the free play of the spirit which all lawyers ought to especially cultivate, and makes for caution and timidity in their associations by potential lawyers.

"Ought admission to the bar be refused to an applicant only because he expresses a philosophical belief in the Jeffersonian 'right of revolution,' or the opinion (in which two justices of the U. S. Supreme Court concurred) that the Smith Act ought to be held unconstitutional, or the opinion that it is improper to ask an applicant about membership in the Communist Party and other opinions of a like nature with whose recital we will not burden this court? Should such an applicant be refused permission to practice law simply because he holds and expresses these opinions? To answer in the affirmative would not only be an injustice to the applicant but would seriously impair the intellectual diversity peculiarly needed in the Bar."

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.



LABOR
ACTION

March 22, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 12

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, 1879.—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

Asst. Editors: GORDON HASKELL,

BEN HALL, MARY BELL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Rosen Defense Comm. Appeals For Support

The Burton Rosen case has previously been reported in LABOR ACTION; we are also glad to publish the following circular letter which is being sent out by the Defense Committee in charge of the case, received this week in our office.—Ed.

Dear Friend:

Does the Selective Service Act Violate the First Amendment by setting up an established religion? Can we reconcile the constitutional provision that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion" with section 6-J of the Selective Service Act, which provides for exemption from military service only for those who hold beliefs in a Supreme Being? Are the courts correct in holding that a person who refuses to register for service under this law, because it denies non-religious persons the right to be classified as conscientious objectors, thereby surrender the right to challenge section 6-J? Is the spurious argument of "separability" of these two clauses to stand unchallenged?

These are the questions raised in the case of Burton Rosen. The documents which are enclosed will familiarize you with some of the essential details of the case of Burton Rosen, now under a four year sentence for non-registration. Burton Rosen, 28, of Chicago, is a socialist, political objector to war. While he was formerly active in the Socialist Party and the Young People's Socialist League, as well as the CIO Electrical Workers Union, he has had no organizational affiliations recently. He has received no support in his case from any organizations aside from the original \$5000 bail supplied at the time of his arrest by the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors. The traditional pacifist groups have not chosen to make a legal test of the issues which Rosen desires to test in this case.

TOWARD A TEST

Yet it would be exceedingly unfortunate if these issues are not tested. Very few persons have elected to resist the selective service act on the grounds which Rosen cites as his, namely, that as an atheist he is denied the consideration on grounds of conscience which is accorded to believers under the law. While the climate of opinion is highly unfavorable to war resisters, and especially to those of Rosen's views, we believe that Rosen is correct in asserting that the separation of church and state is involved here and that the courts must be compelled to rule on this question.

To carry this appeal is an expensive task. The cost of printing trial records and briefs, of hiring court stenographers, and paying court fees and necessary expenses of his attorney, is completely beyond the ability of Rosen and his closest friends to meet. This committee, organized after consultation with Rosen and his attorney, is therefore issuing this appeal for your aid. Kindly make the most generous contribution possible, and remember that time is short. Receipts will be issued and a strict accounting made of all funds received. Please respond today, with all that you can afford. Remember that there are very few to whom we can turn for support in a case of this type, despite the importance of the questions raised. May we hear from you by return mail?

Victor HOWARD

For the Burton Rosen Defense Comm.,
6043 S. Peoria St., Chicago 21.

Get The Challenge

every week — by subscribing to Labor Action. A student sub is only \$2 a year.

A 'Liberal' Opposes the 18-Year-Old Vote

By PRISCILLA JACOBS

The latest issue of the Reporter, that informative and sometime-liberal magazine, carries a vicious attack on the current proposal to extend the franchise to 18-year-olds. Unlike the usual opponent of this measure, who is content to say that what was good enough for his father is good enough for him, William Hessler, the author of this piece, really sinks his teeth into the subject and disgorges some of the most anti- and undemocratic arguments to be found outside the pages of the American Mercury.

Not only would he not extend the franchise, but he would limit it to those of the population who read books and newspapers, because only such people can form intelligent opinions! We are allowed to presume from this that Hessler is an omnivorous reader.

The pertinent arguments which he advances against the 18-year-old proposal are: (1) that fighting and voting are two very different types of activity, and (2) that one is not sufficiently experienced or mature (or well-read) at the tender age of 18, to make a wise political decision. Hessler has a third argument, it is true, but he is too bashful to put it forward on his own; he merely suggests its use to others.

It is, namely, to wit, and in effect, that the only country in the world where 18-year-olds vote is—hide your head—Soviet Russia! Now aren't we sorry we brought the matter up! Since this point is worthy of discussion only by idiots, we

shall leave it alone, with only the passing observation that it is factually incorrect.

The proponents of the measure say, over and over again, "If he's old enough to fight, he's old enough to vote." And our author has looked piercingly into the matter; pondered deeply, and, with the simple and irrefutable logic of a child, come up with the response, "fighting and voting are different things." That Hessler, and those who go along with him, miss the point here (either deliberately or through honest thickheadedness) is actually the fault of those who support this basically democratic measure simply as a partisan-political maneuver, and therefore cannot marshal the proper arguments in its favor.

The Republicans received large support from the younger voters in the last election. The Democrats can hardly oppose the measure once it has been proposed—in the first place, that's a lot of votes to reckon with; and secondly, liberal thought has long considered that the younger the voter the more radical. And the argument they all put forward has the additional advantage of being a sop to those young men who might otherwise cavil at being forced to serve in the army—a rifle for a vote.

WIDER CRITERION

Still and all, the argument that those who have the onus of carrying out the decisions of the nation by fighting should have the right to participate, however inadequately, in the making of these decisions, is sound—as far as it goes. Is it only when waging war that these young

men should vote? Are only young males to vote?

The fact is that fighting is only one arena in which the 18-year-old participates in the adult life of the nation. This is the usual age for leaving school and hence childhood, for going to work and, frequently, for starting a new family unit. The "sufficiently mature" argument is meaningless, since the impossibility of determining this maturity makes an objective standard necessary. At this age most of our young people are contributing in an adult manner to their society and living under adult standards with adult responsibilities; they are therefore entitled to adult rights. And those who defer the time of their full participation by further educational preparation are no less entitled to these rights than their contemporaries.

The passage of this measure would not only be a good thing in itself. It would probably have the highly desirable effect of increasing political interest and activity not only generally, among the youth of the nation, but more specifically on the campus.

It has for some time now been a deplorable phenomenon that students on the whole are apathetic about political issues, although some encouraging signs of awakening interest have lately been discernible. If these students were to be extended the responsibility of making political judgments in the form of voting, it could very possibly help to stimulate an intellectual renaissance in the colleges. It is the responsibility of socialists, therefore, to support this measure wherever possible, and to put it forward independently on the campus.

Lively Meetings Launch YSL Tour

By TED BARRY

Three meetings in the Philadelphia area marked the beginning of the first tour launched by the Young Socialist League. These meetings were all arranged through the good offices of pacifist friends of the Third Camp socialist youth organization, and marked the first appearance of the YSL on campuses around Philadelphia.

Bogdan Denitch, editor of the Challenge, and Scott Arden, YSL secretary, who are touring on behalf of the YSL, spoke at Haverford College, at Swarthmore College, and at a town meeting arranged by the Peacemakers.

Haverford College, the first place where the Young Socialists spoke, is a wealthy Quaker school with a long liberal tradition. It is, however, a small college with almost no student political activity and with no academic freedom problems. Bogdan Denitch spoke before a small meeting on "Radical Socialist Youth and conformity." The topic was chosen by the club before which he spoke, apparently as a part of a series of meetings on conformity. Peter Viereck, one of the would-be philosophers of a "new conservatism," had spoken before the same group a week before.

POLITICALLY ALIVE

The YSL speaker discussed "conformity" from the socialist point of view—tying it in with the cultural alienation of the American intellectuals in the face of a society where the mass media of communication have created a "mass culture," and the political temper of the times which has resulted from the intellectual collapse of the bourgeoisie in the face of the assaults on political democracy by the rising garrison-state in America.

He pointed out that the emergence of the "mass society" which terrifies the "neo-conservatives" calls for a political solution—the extension of democracy to the economic life of the country, and that withdrawal from politics by American intellectuals results in reactionary social ideologies, which many of them have now embraced. The talk, and the subse-

quent discussion of the need for a major political realignment on the American scene in the form of a labor party, was well-received, as was the YSL opposition to the policies of both imperialist camps.

Swarthmore College is a much more politically alive school and has continued student participation in political activities and civil-liberties work. The campus has a Pacifist Fellowship and an SDA chapter, and ACLU group, and a number of other social-issues groups. These, however, involve, as usual, only a minority of students, although the general atmosphere on the campus is favorable to liberal and socialist ideas.

An excellent meeting was arranged at Swarthmore through the Pacifist Fellowship, at which Denitch spoke on "Socialism and World Peace." The meeting was preceded by a small dinner meeting at which the officers of the Fellowship discussed a number of problems of anti-war policy with the two YSL speakers. (Amusingly enough, Denitch and Arden were introduced as "Trotskyists," and it was only after rather strenuous objections raised by Denitch that the point was cleared up.)

The meeting itself, with around 50 students attending, lasted unusually late since a vigorous discussion followed Denitch's exposition of the Third Camp socialist approach to war, capitalism and democracy. The YSL speaker particularly emphasized the tie-in between the witch-hunt and the drive toward war, and the inability of American capitalism to have a democratic foreign policy.

INTEREST WAKENED

The audience raised a number of very interesting questions: why pacifists like A. J. Muste cooperate with Third Camp revolutionary Marxists; whether continued government spending coupled with a lowering of the trade barriers could stave off a recession indefinitely; on the similarities between the YSL speaker's conception of workers' democracy and guild-socialism; on the role of the trade-union bureaucracy in the formation of a labor party in America, etc. Both YSL speakers seemed impressed

with the unusually high level of interest and political maturity of the audience, and excellent contact was made with a number of students on the campus.

An interesting two-hour discussion was followed by another two hours over coffee. There is every hope that on the basis of the contacts made, and the politically friendly atmosphere, a YSL unit will soon be organized on this campus. The proximity of Swarthmore to the YSL national center makes it possible for that campus to be visited by socialist speakers very often.

The last meeting at which the Young Socialists spoke was in Philadelphia, under the sponsorship of the Peacemakers. The meeting itself was small but it consisted mainly of an interesting discussion of campus work and the areas of socialist and pacifist cooperation between the two Young Socialists and the local Fellowship of Reconciliation, Friends Committee and Peacemakers. The agreement of both pacifists and socialists on the necessity of opposing the war drive at home and all aspects of militarization and bureaucratization of America, as well as Stalinist totalitarianism, makes this cooperation both possible and practical on political grounds.

This good beginning of the tour—which is to cover many campuses in the Midwest during the coming month, is a hopeful start for the Young Socialist League in its attempt to build an anti-war socialist youth movement. But the success of the YSL in this field is a success for the whole anti-war movement, since increasingly cooperation between various anti-war tendencies makes itself felt in ever-wider areas.

Help Anvil!

The Young Socialist League is raising a fund of \$250 for the student anti-war magazine. We ask all members, friends and sympathizers to please help. Send all contributions, noting the purpose, to the YSL National Offices at 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Three Lines on the Resistance to the Witchhunt

THE FIGHT IN THE CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

By PHILIP COBEN

The dispute that has been taking place within the American Civil Liberties Union must be of the greatest concern to all well-wishers of the civil-liberties struggle; but the only connected story of what has been taking place in the ACLU is that which has been appearing in *I. F. Stone's Newsletter*. Its March 1 issue presents an account of the last developments by Corliss Lamont.

Both Stone and Lamont are semi-Stalinist or pro-Stalinist in their political ideas, though unconnected with the Communist Party, and naturally their narration is colored by their approach. However, what they have to say is informative, even though we may keep in mind that there may be another side to the story.

Before summarizing the facts given by Lamont, it should be pointed out that the "coloration" given by his account is quite frankly set forth and is well worth discussing: he believes that the basic trouble with the ACLU's National Board of Directors majority derives from (a) their view that the ACLU as a civil-liberties organization also has the right and duty of attacking the totalitarian Stalinists; and (b) their 1940 declaration barring as officers of the Union or members of its staff any person "who is a member of any political organization which supports totalitarian dictatorship in any country or who by his public declarations indicates his support of such a principle."

On this issue, we must say, we agree entirely with the ACLU line, and disagree vigorously with that expounded by Lamont as well as by such liberals as Professor Alexander Meiklejohn. A civil-liberties line cannot be kept straight unless it makes the following distinction clearly and forthrightly: It is one thing to defend the RIGHT of Stalinists (and for that matter, fascists) to express their views and to enjoy full civil liberties, detestable as we may believe their views are. It is quite a different thing to conceal the fact that the people whose rights we are defending are themselves no defenders of civil liberties at all, but rather supporters of or apologists for totalitarian systems.

Lamont's Complaint

The formulation which has disoriented so many liberals is: no democratic rights for those who themselves are anti-democratic. We have argued against this view in *LABOR ACTION* on other occasions and will not do so here; it is a question of pointing up the issue at stake.

In any case, when the ACLU expresses its opposition to Stalinism as a totalitarian movement, it is not going outside its province, as Lamont claims. Long before the Stalinist issue arose in its present form, in the train of the cold war, the ACLU's traditional position was in favor of defending the democratic rights even of fascists (or of people whom the ACLU and other liberals regarded as fascists) to express their opinions. But while maintaining this position, the ACLU was not reluctant to dissociate itself from the opinions of the fascists whose legal rights it was defending. The ACLU was ready to defend the legal democratic rights even of Nazi Bundists in America, people who were led by pro-fascist agents of a foreign fascist power; but surely Lamont would not have insisted that it refrain from expressing its own civil-libertarian opinions about fascists and pro-fascists.

Yet, when it comes to the Stalinists, Lamont, and even some misguided liberals who are not pro-Stalinist at all, bitterly condemn the ACLU for taking the same tack.

For example, in the aforementioned article, Lamont peppers his factual narrative with complaints that, in attacking Stalinist totalitarianism, the ACLU "compromised the defense of the Bill of Rights by a long, violent and irrelevant attack on the Communist Party. . . . Another fundamental objection to the statement on the Communist Party is that it takes the Civil Liberties Union into a realm of sweeping judgments on domestic politics and international affairs where it has no business. . . ."

The Whitewash Line

Now it is clear that Lamont is not *only* objecting to specific statements in the ACLU's attack on the CP. True, he says that the statement implies "that most Communists are guilty of conspiracy and illegal acts," and if this is true it is a grievous fault. Likewise, he claims that "they [the ACLU leadership] attempt to make the struggle against communism that organization's chief aim instead of the struggle for civil liberties" (italics added); and if he could prove this, he would have a case.

But Lamont is objecting to the fact that the ACLU takes a position against Stalinist totalitarianism at all, and this is what he ties up with "McCarthyism and McCarthyism" in the first place. This is one thing he shares with the CP's line of self-whitewash.

Lamont writes: "The Directors and other officials of the ACLU are not supposed to be experts on international relations and political systems. They are united in the Civil Liberties Union for the defense of American civil liberties." (Again the italics are added but undoubtedly the added emphasis is basic to Lamont's thought.) Here he really falls into a provincial and reactionary approach, one which he does not agree with in other cases. He might as well denounce the National Association for the Advancement of Colored Peoples for concerning itself (as it does) with the Negro peo-

ple of Africa. He might as well denounce the CIO for expressing an opinion about Franco tyranny.

He comes close to presenting an argument when he writes that "it is not the function of the ACLU to describe, analyze and judge the inner nature of the organizations whose civil liberties it defends, any more than it is its function to determine whether some individual deprived of free speech has really been telling the full truth or is faithful to his wife."

But the ACLU is properly concerned with "the inner nature of the organizations it defends" when that nature bears on *civil liberties*. The ACLU may not be properly concerned with the position of the CP on dialectical materialism, but it could not *effectively* defend the civil liberties of pro-totalitarians if it pretended that it didn't know exactly what it was doing.

The Three Lines

If a speaker or writer fails to tell the "full truth," he must surely be attacked, and the truth must be brought out by democratic polemic and discussion; that's what democracy is for. But if the government were to step in and jail him on such a charge, that act would be an abridgment of free speech. There is no proper *civil-liberties* issue involved in the question of marital fidelity or a factual argument over truth-telling. There is a civil liberties concern which is properly raised when the ACLU makes clear to the public that it has nothing in common with the anti-civil-liberties position of people it defends.

The coloration of Lamont's argument is evident in such language as this: Norman Thomas, he says, who has been most energetic in the Board majority, "obviously has a political bone to pick with the Communists and burns with righteousness and Gospel fervor when he gets going on the Communist menace." This kind of sneer is very unfortunate, for Lamont. He strengthens the suspicion that he is bridling at any anti-Stalinist opposition ("picking a political bone with the Communists") and *not merely* at a disposition in the ACLU to compromise its principled position of defending civil liberties when Stalinists are involved.

Lamont is at one end of a destructive polarization: (1) if you are for defending a Stalinist's civil liberties, then you must not attack Stalinist totalitarian views; or (2) on the other hand, if you are keenly aware of and sensitive to the totalitarian nature of Stalinism, you cannot defend civil liberties for Stalinists.

Our view, on the contrary, is: (3) You defend the civil liberties of Stalinists, as we have done; but you carry on this defense as an *opponent* of Stalinism, in the name of defending the right to express views which you believe in fighting tooth and nail. And you carry this defense on in collaboration with pro-civil liberties fighters, not in collaboration with totalitarians.

Revolt in the ACLU

Now if the issue in the recent fight inside the American Civil Liberties Union had simply been the problem we have outlined above, then it would be easy, to our mind anyway. But that does not seem to be so.

The ruction in the ACLU was raised when the Board of Directors proposed three new policy statements which bore precisely on the willingness of the ACLU to defend the civil liberties of Stalinists, and not merely on its attitude toward Stalinist totalitarianism or collaboration with Stalinists. Lamont's own discussion winds both questions in to a single package, but it has to be considered separately.

A real rank-and-file revolt took place within the organization because of the fear that these new statements were so written as to open the door to whittling down and compromising the principled civil-liberties stand of the ACLU. The issue was not properly pro-Stalinism or anti-Stalinism, and there can be no doubt that the strength of the opposition was not due to the influence within the Union of Stalinoids like Lamont.

Among the key passages which the opposition objected to were the following:

"But (1) It is not a violation of civil liberties to take into account a person's voluntary choice of association when that choice is relevant to a particular judgment—providing that such a judgment is not indiscriminate or automatic, but specific and comprehensive in weighing all relevant factors. . . . This is not to condone 'guilt by association' in the reprehensible sense of holding a person guilty of believing or doing what someone else with whom he is (often remotely) connected believes or does.

"On the other hand, the Union will continue, for example: (1) to recognize the indispensability of police measures to prevent and punish actual subversive acts at the earliest moment they can be identified as acts, and the necessity in drawing the line of 'clear and present danger' of taking more factors into account with respect to the free speech of a secret conspiratorial group aiming at sabotage than with respect to the open-air preaching of a single anarchist."

It may be possible, by suitable exegesis, to make every carefully formulated word in this passage square with the ACLU's traditional position, and therefore to argue that nothing is being changed. The only trouble with this effort would be that no one would believe it—on either side of the dispute. The statements are full of phrases wide open at both ends. To this must be added the background fact that among the most vigorous proponents of the new policy statements were directors who had at-

ready publicly expressed views that went substantially beyond the careful wording of the statements—in the direction of limiting the civil liberties of Stalinists.

The Referendum Fight

The Board of Directors, relates Lamont, debated and reformulated the policy statements from December 1952 to June 1953, and finally adopted them. Ten members of the board initiated a national referendum on them, in accordance with the by-laws. The referendum went out in the first week of last September.

"Some six weeks later," Lamont recounts, "the referendum was concluded and Mr. Malin sent out an official report, referring to October 16 as 'the deadline.' Much to everyone's surprise the negative had won by a small margin. The vote of the Affiliates was decisive, 13 of them having voted in the negative and only three of the smaller ones in the affirmative. Instead of accepting this democratic decision, the Board group which had originally forced through the three statements immediately started maneuvering to set aside the referendum."

"Two weeks later a report came through from the ACLU office that the Chicago affiliate had switched its vote from negative to affirmative and that therefore the statements had been adopted. I objected to this procedure on the ground that it was improper to change the ballot totals after the referendum had been officially concluded. I also discovered that the Chicago switch had taken place as the result of a hasty and incomplete poll of its Board members by telephone. Accordingly I phoned the Chicago affiliate and protested. My protest went before the next meeting of its Board, which declared that the whole business of a 'second vote' was unacceptable, withdrew the results of its telephone poll and reported its referendum vote again in the negative. Hence on November 13 Mr. Malin had to return to his original report that the negative had won the national referendum."

"But the Cold War group [Lamont's term for the Board majority] on the National Board was determined to have its way; and shortly afterwards put through a Board decision (the first of its kind in the 34-year history of the organization) to override the referendum under cover of a special veto provision slipped into the new By-Laws of 1951. The three policy statements stood adopted officially by the American Civil Liberties Union."

Who Won?

But then, at the recent biennial conference of the ACLU in New York over the February 12 weekend, the opposition of the ACLU Affiliates (reports Stone) led to the Board's withdrawal of the statements and presentation of "a substitute reaffirming the organization's traditional position." They also "recommended the elimination of the monstrous provision in the ACLU By-Laws permitting the Board of Directors to set aside the results of national referendums and to veto all amendments to the by-laws."

The substitute statement of policy was drafted by former Senator Frank P. Graham, Professor Robert Lynd and Morris Rubin and was unanimously accepted at the conference.

However, we must add that Stone registers a note of skepticism about the future line of the National Board, in spite of this outcome:

"Lamont's retirement and the new members chosen by the self-perpetuation Board of Directors do not promise a militancy to match the policy statement forced on it by the Affiliates. The new members are New York City Councilman Earl Brown, a Republican; Lewis Galantieri, program director of Radio Free Europe; John Jessup, chief editorial writer of *Life* magazine; and C. Dickerman Williams, once assistant to Samuel Seabury and a former solicitor of the U. S. Department of Commerce. In the February 22 issue of the ultra-rightist *The Freeman*, Mr. Williams has an article supporting 'immunity' legislation to compel testimony before congressional investigating committees."

On the Defensive

So, apart from their views, the above is Lamont's and Stone's side of the factual story of what happened. It is sufficient to justify an anxious eye on the ACLU's future course.

The ACLU is under heavy public pressure from the extreme right. Most recently, for example, there was the way it figured in the interchange between McCarthy and TV commentator Murrow. One of the lies on which Murrow had challenged the senator was the latter's statement that the ACLU was on the "subversive list." Of course, it is not, and Murrow exposed the falsification. McCarthy replied by pointing, not to the attorney general's list, but to one drawn up by the California Tenney committee, a body which out-McCarthyed McCarthy before McCarthy discovered the Communist issue.

But in any case, in addition to the cold-war pressure in present-day liberal ideology, the ACLU leadership is pushed on to the defensive in the present climate of fear insofar as it dares to take a forthright stand on civil liberties for Stalinists.

Furthermore the kind of line which is taken by some Lamont-type liberals in the ACLU—as discussed in the first part of this article—puts the issue in exactly the way which brings out the worst in the compromising tendencies within the organization. Insofar as the former insist that the crux is attitude toward Stalinist totalitarianism, and not merely attitude toward civil liberties for Stalinists, the compromisers are reinforced in their trend.

Bread and a Stone at Caracas:

Latin America Can't Eat That 'Anti-Communist' Resolution

By SAM TAYLOR

The end of the Tenth Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, will bring a long-sigh of relief from the United States State Department. From Secretary of State Dulles' point of view, the conference might better have been postponed. Sandwiched in between the Big Four meeting in Berlin and the Big Five meeting in Geneva late in April, the paucity of results hardly seemed to have justified the effort.

The first thing about the conference to be noted is that the United States would have preferred to postpone or delay it for an indefinite time. It was not that the pressure of the coming Big Five meeting in Geneva made it difficult for Dulles adequately to prepare the United States program. The simple fact is, as all correspondents have stated, the United States had no program to contribute to the parley.

Nor is it the case that there are no real problems that the Latin Americans want to discuss. Most Latin American delegations came ready to discuss the economic problems facing their country and the Americas, and looked forward to a discussion of plans to bolster their weak economic position. To them this was the only meaningful purpose to the conference.

The United States' determination to center the entire conference around its "anti-Communist" resolution set the entire tone. One Latin American speaker after another got up to announce formal agreement with the resolution, but pointed out that there were other and more pressing problems facing their countries.

This difference also demonstrated the reactionary approach of United States foreign policy toward Stalinism, the policy which the U. S. was intent upon jamming down the throats of the Latin Americans. Dulles states the United States idea of Stalinism when he told the delegates:

"The total [of Stalinism] constitutes not a theory, not a doctrine, but an aggressive, tough political force, backed by great resources and serving the most ruthless empire of modern times."

From this it follows that the most "effective means" of combating Stalinism is through a series of police measures. The United States resolution "Intervention of International Communism in the American Republics" is the opening wedge for United States intervention in Latin American countries if it is to mean anything; otherwise it is just a statement of the United States' attitude and it scarcely would have justified the tremendous effort to have it passed.

Waiting for a Lead

The steady insistence of the Latin American delegations on discussing the economic problems of the hemisphere came about because of the present economic situation in the United States. They see the United States slipping further and further into a deeper recession, with hardly any steps being taken even to attempt to check it. Whether or not the present recession gets worse, they know that the level of post-war prosperity that has obtained up to now is a thing of the past. Their economic developments on the basis of present policies certainly cannot get any better and is far more likely to get worse—even without a serious recession or depression in the United States.

The Latin American countries still have colonial-type economies dependent on a small number of raw-material and agricultural exports to the more industrialized areas. Coffee, bananas, meat, iron ore, tin, copper, and oil are the basis around which most of their economies are built. They are, in this sense, the economic vassals of the industrialized states to whom they export, and they were demanding at Caracas that something be done to assure their stability. This is why even some of the most reactionary regimes, such as those of Peru and Colombia, criticized the United States' effort to have the anti-Communist resolution set the tone of the conference.

In the discussion on economic policy, the Latin American delegations called for a statement of United States policy, and for themselves offered a series of plans for meeting specific problems. The United States has such a preponderant role in the capitalist economies of the world, that many Latin American delegations felt that they could not even offer ideas of their own until the United States first declared a policy. The Panamanian delegate pointed out that "until that great country [U. S.] announces clearly the direction its foreign economic policy is to take and applies that policy and guarantees its continuance for a relatively long period of time" then no Latin American country could chart its way confidently.

Stalling on the Economic Front

But Secretary of State Dulles was firm on this point, as on the anti-Communist resolution, and refused to say what the United States policy would be. The reason is that the Eisenhower administration has not formulated any specific policy, and is drifting along, more or less, with the same old Acheson policies to which the Latin Americans are objecting.

President Eisenhower's brother Milton made a "good will" tour through Latin America giving "assurances" that the United States had a greater economic stake in Latin America than in Europe or perhaps the rest of the world combined. But no demonstration of this "good will" has been forthcoming.

Of more importance is the fact that the Randell Commission Re-

port on Foreign Economic Policy was made only a few weeks ago. This report met with the opposition of leading congressional Republicans and was by and large a moderate restatement of the foreign economic policy followed under the Truman administration. And on various proposals the Eisenhower administration is uncertain about what Congress will decide. Therefore Dulles engaged in a stalling maneuver on the economic discussion.

Apart from "listening sympathetically" to what the Latin Americans had to say, the United States idea was to let the entire discussion end with the conference. However, so great was the pressure for a conference dealing with their economic problem that another conference has been called for later this year, at the insistence of the delegations. In effect this is saying that the Caracas meeting was a failure, and that the real issues are still to be dealt with.

However, in the meetings that did take up economic problems there was a concerted attack on United States policies on the ground that they contributed to the economic instability of Latin America. Most Latin Americans were concerned about the falling prices of their raw materials. A series of proposals by the Colombian delegation called for raw-materials-exporting nations to enforce production levels in keeping with world demand; that raw-material-importing nations fix the prices of these materials; and that the Inter-American Economic Council study means for fixing price levels.

The Mexican delegation called for the stockpiling a number of materials. This would involve price-fixing and the curtailing of production as well as stockpiling a number of raw materials.

Although the United States did not voice active opposition to any of these ideas, it seems certain that they will be rejected. Not only is the congressional attitude hostile to these ideas even in the United States, but all of the proposals call for the Inter-American Conference to work out the plans rather than for Washington unilaterally to dictate the plan.

The Inter-American Approach

Another series of Latin American proposals centered around the easing of trade barriers against Latin American imports into the United States. But here again Dulles has little to offer, and the latest press reports have the United States opposing a Latin American resolution calling for all countries to the conference to "eliminate restrictions on trade of all kinds."

The most grandiose plans that the Latin Americans have proposed, although informally, is for the creation of some kind of permanent council to review the economic problems of the Americas. This has been described as a proposal for a Marshall Plan for the Americas, or as an economic counterpart to the North Atlantic Pact Council. The purpose of this body would go beyond the kind of limited technical body for conducting study such as is represented by the Inter-American Economic and Social Council. The idea is for this body to draw up economic plans for all the Americas and to deal with specific intranational problems.

The interest of this proposal is that it demonstrates that the problems of economic development have to be viewed from an inter-American approach. But its chances for even serious discussion are nil, for it involves more than the momentary foreign economic policy that the Eisenhower administration is going to adopt in the next few months. This proposal barely mentioned in the press, does not indicate the extent of the planning that most Latin countries envisage, or else a formal setup to discuss trade policy, stabilizing the price of raw materials and the extent of capital investment.

To expect the United States to participate in any scheme for planning the economic development of these underdeveloped countries is clearly out of the question. For the United States to offer to stabilize prices for Latin America means that the United States has first to stabilize its own economy and plan for prosperity. If capitalist United States cannot guarantee prosperity for itself, how can it sit down and talk about it with its neighbors?

Sitting on a Powderkeg

This fact hangs as a cloud over all the Latin American proposals and their criticism of United States policies. The ruling classes in Latin America feel the direct pressure of the masses of underfed and poorly clothed and housed people under them; they know they are sitting on a powderkeg of social upheaval. The steady pressure of an increasing population demands an increase in production at a time when the world capitalist economy begins to falter as the post-war boom comes grinding to a halt and a downturn begins.

Almost all of the Latin American countries have ambitious plans for the expansion of agriculture. But the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations states that even if the most ambitious of these plans succeeds, living standards will just about reach the pre-war depression levels.

Sitting on this powder keg, the Latin Americans put pressure on the United States for a program to aid them, even in their status as raw-material-producing economies. Instead they were treated to a resolution on "international communism" and the fleshless promise that the United States would show up at a future conference on economic policy.

If McCarthy Goes — —

(Continued from page 1)

the starting point for a swing away from the mood of intimidation; but for that we would need what we do not have: a movement of fighting, consistent, democrats determined to defend and expand civil liberties in every sphere.

McCarthy as a man may win or lose in the fight which has begun; but the demeanor of his opponents, their own arguments and mood, show how far he has succeeded in placing the stamp of McCarthyism upon American life.

'RESPONSIBLE' WITCHHUNTERS

Responsible organs of bourgeois opinion like the New York Times and the Herald Tribune, supporters of the Eisenhower administration, have long hoped, in polite fashion, for curbs on McCarthy. Having no private, narrow political axe to grind they seek conservative and responsible government; the Tribune did not hesitate to repudiate Attorney-General Brownell's assault on Truman or to denounce as irresponsible and shameful the falsification of "loyalty" firing figures by administration spokesmen.

But where democracy is under attack they see only an infringement on "the rights of the independent executive." Since McCarthy's attacks on the army, they have become almost strident in their demands that Eisenhower call a halt; and they reject all compromise and urge a fight to the finish.

But, the Times editorializes, "The overwhelming mass of the American people decided long ago that they wanted no Communists teaching in the public schools, no Communists functioning in public office, no Communists spying on the secrets of our government."

Only spies are for "spying" and only Stalinists are for the election of their co-thinkers to public office. But here the Times repeats its endorsement of purges of government workers and teachers, just as it has supported jail sentences under the Smith Act, for the advocacy of political views.

HOW TO SHOOT

The Eisenhower Republicans, with a simple, crude and short-ranged goal, were (and are) eager to utilize McCarthy against the Democrats. As he thundered against "twenty years of treason" and equated New-Dealism with communism, they nudged one another: *Great stuff, eh? the man's good, a born politician. But—what's this? Now he's calling US the defenders and protectors of communism! That's going too far. The man's irresponsible and must be curbed.*

C. E. Wilson publicly said "tommyrot" when McCarthy accused the army of shielding communists; but he was careful to remind reporters that the drive to get rid of "disloyal" people must continue.

Senator Flanders of Vermont startled a silent, uncheering Senate with a denunciation of McCarthy; but he was hysterical in his fears of "infiltration and subversion."

Vice-President Nixon in his radio address repudiated McCarthy without mentioning him; but he made his own views only too clear: that "it's a privilege, not a right, to work for the government, and that we should remove from the payroll those of doubtful loyalty. . . ." And lest this appear too mildly formulated, he summarized his outlook in the following gentle language, "I've heard people say, 'After all they're a bunch of rats. What we ought to do is to go out and shoot 'em.' Well, I'll agree they're a bunch of rats, but just remember this. When you go out to shoot rats, you have to shoot straight. . . ."

This is an authentic vice-president lecturing the people on the philosophy of American democracy. "This administration under President Eisenhower will never tolerate disloyalty any place we find it."

It was not so long ago that Eisenhower, in the name of Wild Bill Hickok, spoke against shooting people in the back—that is, condemning them with evidence behind their back. Now Nixon, who also thinks of shooting when the idea "subversive" occurs to him, demands only that the shooting be well-aimed and at the proper victims.

These gentlemen, who put forward conformity and ideological straightjacketing in the guise of "loyalty," may "curb" McCarthy, but their curbs on democracy continue.

IMAGINARY VISION

While the nation is agitated by McCarthyism, pro and con, the Democrats have not yet decided whether it is politic to join in; a majority of the party's congressmen are still convinced that it is wise to be silent. In a radio broadcast on March 6, Stevenson characterized the



McCarthy

Republican Party as "half McCarthy and half Eisenhower." Democratic members of the McCarthy committee actually intervened to prevent the "browbeating" of a witness and commanded Roy Cohn, interrogator, to cease making wild unsupported charges during a hearing. With the air of a man who is screwing up his last reserve of courage, one Democrat told a witness who denied Communist affiliations, "I believe you."

Upon such incidents, hopeful liberals create imaginary visions of a new crusading Democratic Party. CIO-PAC runs away with itself, reporting that Stevenson "blew the lid off" with his speech.

But the Democrats initiated nothing, merely contributing a timid piece of change to the mounting collection of protests.

CONSOLATION

For years, the passions of liberals have been kept in check while their New Deal-Fair Deal prepared the way for today's witchhunt; they restrained themselves while Democrats acted in silent collusion on McCarthy's committee and voted for his appropriations. If now they burst into cheers at trifles, who will deny them this consolation?

Stevenson, however, proving that he is a true man of his times, said, "Everyone hopes the administration will find and remove all the real subversives and keep

them out of our government. A single disloyal employee is one too many." Here no ringing call for democracy; only a complaint that the McCarthy witchhunt drags Democrats into its net.

The current McCarthy fight has hardly touched upon the vital questions of democracy versus authoritarianism, of witchhunt versus free-thinking, that face the United States. So far, against the frenzied, irresponsible, wild witchhunt of McCarthy is pitted the sane, unemotional, "responsible" witchhunt of the cold war.

What arouses whole sections of bourgeois opinion against the demagogue from Wisconsin is not the spirit of democracy, the rights of dissenters, but a fear that their own rights are being undermined. The drive for conformity which they began in the name of democracy against Communism is now turned against their democracy. It is this, not any concern for democratic rights in general, which disturbs them.

COMMON GROUND

McCarthy, in the very vanguard of the witchhunt, threatens to undermine and disorganize what is defended and supported by Democrats and Republicans alike. In an atmosphere of terror and intimidation it becomes impossible for responsible, even conservative, ideologists and strategists to weigh the needs of national policy, objectively and calmly. The friendly rivalry between two loyal opponent parties threatens at all times to be transformed, figuratively, into a civil war of words.

He threatens, in sum, to deprive the statesmen of capitalist America of an opportunity to grapple with the vital questions of domestic and international policy, substituting wild harangues for sober action.

In meeting this danger, the varied factions, tendencies and parties lean together in mutual sympathy. But basically, they are all infected with the mood of the witchhunt against any ideas which disturb "cold war" capitalism, their joint concern. They agree on defending their own rights; they agree, likewise, on undermining the democratic rights of others, "communists," "subversives" et al.

The most liberal of the liberals decries the march away from democracy; but Stalinism appears to him so hateful, so reactionary, so totalitarian in its program (as it is) that its rights cannot be defended. Thus the demoralization of liberals is also a product of the totalitarian nature of Stalinism and the demands of the cold war.

WHO WILL STAND UP?

If Stalinism is a movement so rotten that we must cut away its democratic rights, rights which we have always considered fundamental, then argues McCarthy, can we permit those who cooperate with it to enjoy unrestricted freedom? And what of those who defend those who cooperate with it? And those who defend those who defend . . . and so on ad infinitum. The McCarthy fight reminds us that restrictions on democracy cannot be custom-tailored to fit only a small hated minority. The witchhunt spills over.

When McCarthy announced the withdrawal of his libel suit against Benton, he reported that he could find no one who believed the charges against him. Letters poured in from a growing "I believe Benton" club. When Edward R. Murrow, CBS commentator, staged a documentary television criticism of McCarthy, a flood of phone calls and telegrams rolled in running as high as 15-1 against McCarthy. The people of this country can be and are aroused against him, even by the diluted, gingerly half-measures of half-protest.

The stage is now set for a fundamental attack not only on McCarthy but on the whole system of McCarthyism, against "loyalty" purges, political trials, convictions and jail sentences, "subversive" lists, oaths, hounding of teachers for their politics, firing of government workers for "disloyalty." Where are the political leaders to take the floor?

There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$ a year—
Subscribe now!

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Labor Action FORUM • New York City

THURSDAY, MARCH 25, at 9 p.m.

Albert Gates

reviews

"The Prophet Armed"

The new book on Trotsky by Isaac Deutscher

Labor Action Hall

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.