

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 29, 1954

FIVE CENTS

The ISL Passport Case

... page 6

Socialist Policy on Puerto Rico

... page 3

Racism, Rackets, Rough-Riding Charged Against Curran Machine

... page 2

Passports and the 'Subversive List'

ISL to Start Its First Court Case Against Gov't

The Independent Socialist League has moved, through its counsel, to institute the first court case which will bring the government before the bench on a question involving the inclusion of the ISL on the attorney general's notorious "subversive list."

This first court test will not itself be a direct attack on the Department of Justice's list but will deal with the "subversive list" criterion for the refusal of the State Department to grant a passport to Max Shachtman, national chairman of the League.

These two issues—the ISL "subversive" listing by the Justice Department and the Shachtman passport case in the State Department—have been going on side by side, as described in the case histories on page 7. They have now been formally and legally linked together by the latest action of the State Department in the passport case.

INTO COURT

On January 2 Shachtman had appealed, to the department's Passport Appeals Board, the refusal to grant him a passport. It was expected that the appeal would at least be heard, regardless of what could be expected from it in the nature of justice. Now, in a letter dated March 8, the director of the Passport Office, Mrs. R. B. Shipley has informed

him on a legal pretext that he does not have the right to appeal!

She wrote that "there does not appear to be any further procedure which you can follow in connection with the passport application at this time." But she is quite wrong, since the "further procedure" will take place in the courts.

The connection between the passport case and the "subversive list" is established in the official reason given by the State Department agency for refusing the passport. That reason is solely and simply the fact of the ISL's listing. Shipley's letter stated: "further consideration will be given to the issue of a passport to you if there should be a change in the findings of the attorney general respecting your organization."

This action testifies to the direct and substantial damage done to the ISL (as to all other organizations bureaucratically listed) by the attorney general's list, which, at least originally, pretended to be merely a guide to government departments for the hiring of employees.

The launching of this court case around the passport side of the issue in no way substitutes for a direct challenge to the Department of Justice itself. Such a challenge is being stalled by the attorney general's office, which is continuing to ignore its plain duty to hold the required hearing on the ISL case.

Full details on the latest development, and a summary of the two cases, will be found in the documents on page 6 and 7 of this issue.

SPOT- LIGHT

Thought for the Week

President Eisenhower has solemnly pledged himself to ask Congress about it before throwing the country into war, and that's downright decent of him, even though it's only the Constitution that gives the power to declare war to Congress. That is, Eisenhower promised to let Congress act provided he's got a minute to spare and isn't too rushed at the moment. But if we are "attacked" such a luxury may have to go by the board, especially since few of the United States' wars have been "declared" anyway.

In the emergency of "aggression," however, Eisenhower said, any president who delayed acting immediately ought to be shot. Just the other day Vice-President Nixon was also talking about shooting—shooting "rats," i.e., subversives, metaphorically speaking—and it is interesting how the metaphor keeps shooting up all the time, ever since Ike strapped on his six-guns and made that speech about Wild Bill Hickok.

The president left it a little vague whether the type of emergency he had in mind included not only any attack on continental United States, or its insular possessions, but also on any of its military basis, or on any of its allies or any possessions of theirs. Under Truman the Korean war broke out and raged on with-

(Continued on page 2)

Forgotten Men

McCarthy may or may not be on the run, but McCarthy's victims are still flat on their backs. One of the attorneys for the suspended Fort Monmouth personnel, Harry Green, called attention on Monday to the fact that, of the 21 employees suspended not a single case has yet been decided. Apparently they are "the forgotten men," he said.

A radar engineer at the fort who was reinstated after army suspension last fall, has again been suspended by the army. And "Employees still are losing clearances for work with classified material, with two new cases reported last month," reports the N. Y. Times.

The radar engineer had been chairman of a local chapter of the American Veterans Committee. He says he was suspended because of one "hypothetical" answer he gave McCarthy, as to how he would have voted on expelling CPers from the AVC. He had said that, according to his thinking of that time, although wholly opposed to Communism, he "might have voted" not to expel them because a democratic AVC would have had nothing to fear from them. The question was hypothetical because as a matter of fact he had not voted on the question.

So the army, which is "fighting" McCarthysm (they say), suspended him.

Is U.S. Moving to Enter The War in Indo-China?

By GORDON HASKELL

The danger of American armed intervention in Indo-China is far from past. This was re-emphasized by the recent visit of the French chief of staff in Washington, and the conferences in which he has met with the highest military and civilian officials of the American government.

The immediate problem with which these conferences concerned themselves was no doubt reinforcing the French, who have been taking a beating in the biggest battle of the war around the jungle fortress of Dienbienphu. But the conferees must also have considered at least two farther-reaching problems: (a) What will the United States do if Dienbienphu should fall and the whole French military position in Indo-China be threatened? (b) What can the United States do in a military way right now to prevent the development of the war in Indo-China from exerting a strong influence against U. S. interests on the conference with the Stalinists at Geneva next month?

The two questions are really part of the same problem. It is recognized by everyone that the present Vietminh offensive in Indo-China is part of the Stalinist preparation for the Geneva Conference. The Stalinists are putting forth a supreme effort in a military campaign which differs markedly from the kind of fighting the Vietminh forces have done in the past.

A victory at Dienbienphu is calculated to make the French government desire some kind of settlement at Geneva with a fervor born of desperation. This would permit the Russian and Chinese negotiators there to put a tremendous squeeze on France, and hence on American policy both in Europe and Asia.

It is already clear that there is a deep gap between the Western Allies over the proper policy to use with regard to Stalinist China. The disagreements have been openly expressed on freedom of trade with China and on the admission of its Stalinist government to the United

(Turn to last page)

'Big Brother' and the Step-Children

Since the United States put over its "anti-Communist" resolution at Caracas, the Inter-American Conference has retreated from the front pages of U. S. newspapers to the deep recesses of their innards.

But as we go to press, the talking is still going on at Caracas, and a good deal of voting too. Having achieved its prime goal at the conference, the U. S. has been willing to permit the sovereign and "equal" governments of Latin America to pass resolutions with which it disagreed.

Most important of these has been a resolution condemning continued European colonialism in Latin America, and urging a rapid turning over of the remaining colonies to Latin American rule. As the imperialist powers involved are all allies of the United States, the U. S. delegation voted against the resolution on the ground that this is a matter for the UN to take up, rather than for the governments of the Americas.

The Guatemalan government has remained the thorn in the side of the State Department. It introduced two resolutions, both of which have a strong appeal for all Latin American governments, but both of which were also clearly directed against the United States. One resolution called for the prohibition of economic boycotts by one or a group of American states against another one, and the other for laws to prevent the creation of monopolies for mining, industrial and agricultural exploitation.

The first resolution lost by a vote of

4 to 1, with eleven governments abstaining. This despite the fact that every underdeveloped country in Latin America fears economic boycott, especially one applied by the United States. But who is going to kick Big Brother in the shins, even when he appears to be friendly? The second one was defeated by 9 to 1, with six governments abstaining.

BUT SOME ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS

Thus the U. S. rolls from victory to victory, while the "equal" governments to the south permit themselves to take a token fall out of the Colossus of the North on some question which has only theoretical interest. But no one on either side of the fence really has any illusions about the real sentiments of the governments involved, or of the peoples, in those cases where the governments permit them some degree of political expression.

The most serious and pressing problems which confront the Latin American states are not even being debated at this meeting. They have been relegated to the economic conference which the U. S. reluctantly agreed to hold some time in the near future. These problems are so vital to the Latin American countries that it can be expected that it will be much more difficult for the United States to hold them in line at that time. Even though, without U. S. agreement, nothing serious can be accomplished at such a conference, the "equal" sovereign partners will have their say in no uncertain terms.

NMU Opposition Charges Racism, Racketeering and Rough-Riding

By BEN HALL

The faction fight in the National Maritime Union (CIO) erupted with full virulence at a National Council meeting on February 15-17.

Of the twenty members of the council, highest ruling body between conventions, five support the opposition to the Curran administration. Of the six top officers, two are in opposition. Thus the Curran regime, apparently united up to a few months ago, is split down the middle.

The opposition, headed by Neal Hanley, national secretary, H. B. Warner, vice-president, and John Moriarty, Galveston port agent, is contesting every important post except president in elections which open on April 1 and conclude on June 15. Only Curran himself will be unopposed. He threatens to resign if the opposition candidates are elected.

Utter irreconcilability was the tone of the meeting: If the struggle continues in the direction already indicated, without investigation or intervention from the CIO, splits or expulsions are virtually inevitable.

The issues raised by the opposition are now out in the open and can be summarized as follows: (1) Race prejudice and Negro-baiting; (2) racketeering in the union; (3) internal democracy.

Not all the opposition leaders emphasize all three points. Warner levels the accusation of prejudice; Moriarty hits at union inaction against racketeers; all join in denouncing the anti-democratic actions of the pro-administration group. All charges, taken together, add up to an accusation that leading officials are mixed up in a campaign against Negroes and in the sale of union books, and that Curran is using bureaucratic measures to cover up for them. These are no trivial claims.

"SICK INSIDE"

The charges are sweeping and startling; if they were fostered by isolated or unknown individuals they could be brushed aside. But the men who make them were tried and true Curran supporters in every past struggle; they are leaders of the union with standing and prestige. Either they have suddenly and simultaneously gone berserk or they have finally been forced, by a long accumulation of issues and grievances, to begin a struggle to the end against the internal corruption of the union.

Warner voices his feelings toward the majority group in the most uncompromising language: "This is the sort of thing which makes you sick inside and makes you feel you are up to your knees in filth and you can't live with it because these are not trade-union people when

they do things like that. They are not even demagogues; they are corrupt, diseased characters. They have no character, they have no morals. This thing has reached a stage over a period of time where you are forced to reject it."

Warner, himself a Negro, centers his indictment of racism against the person of M. Hedley Stone, treasurer, referring to "the slanderous, malicious, and race bigotry coming from M. Hedley Stone." In signed affidavits, several union members affirm that Stone in private talks warned that Negroes might take over the union and called upon them to be alert to ward off such a danger. Stone denounces these statements as frauds and produces at least one man, presumably present at these conversations, who denies that any such Jim Crow comments ever were made.

Warner had asked Curran to act on these charges, and when he refused reprinted the affidavits and distributed them to the rank and file. Stone, Curran and their supporters demand that Warner either bring Stone up on charges or stop circulating the charges.

STRANGE VISIT

Warner replies: (1) It would be impossible for him to get a fair trial committee in New York. "I have seen the membership's votes stolen in the port of New York at membership meetings. It is not the membership I am afraid of. I am afraid of the businessman's machine."

(2) He is not morally compelled to bring charges because it is not he but several patrolmen and port agents who have produced the affidavits against Stone.

(3) If Stone is slandered, then he is bound to prefer charges against those who are spreading the slanders.

At the council meeting Curran introduced a motion instructing Warner to cease circulating his charges against Stone or prefer charges. The opposition split; two voted against and two for Curran's motion.

But in the welter of accusations and counteraccusations, one report remained unchallenged.

Warner had received a strange visit, he announced, from Hoyt Haddock, head of the CIO Maritime Committee. Haddock told Warner that all government secret services had been informed (source anonymous as is usual in such cases) of an alleged conspiracy in the NMU to turn it over to Negroes and Puerto Ricans. With uniform regularity such rumors emanated from the FBI, Army Intelligence, Navy Intelligence, and Coast Guard Intelligence.

The finger of accusation pointed to Warner as inspirer of this ring. Haddock was seeking facts and figures to demon-

strate that the rumor was a wild fantasy. It would seem incontestable that someone or some group, with enough authority to turn the attention of government agencies to the NMU, was beginning an undercover, rumor-mongering campaign against Warner in particular and Negroes in general.

If any single incident produced the current fight, it was the uncovering of a membership-book selling racket. A former patrolman, Andrew Mele, is under indictment for raking off lush profits from selling membership books to men anxious to go to sea. He, in turn, implicated several Curran supporters in the racket, including New York Port Agent Hunt and Vice-President Duffy. They vigorously deny his charge as a frame-up. The question arises: What shall the union do?

Curran's answer is simple: everyone is innocent until proven guilty; this is a matter not for the union but for the police; the union's only obligation, at this time, is to provide whatever facts the police want. But the opposition demands action by the union. In Galveston, where Moriarty and the opposition are in complete control, resolutions demanded the election of a rank-and-file investigating committee to track down racketeers.

TO CLEAN HOUSE

At the council meeting, Warner outlined the opposition's case for union action: "We see the fix that the ILA is in. Why? . . . because the union has refused to clean up and wipe out corruption within its ranks. This is not a problem which should be allocated to a law-enforcement agency. . . . Everybody has been screaming why doesn't the longshoremen's union clean itself up, clean up their own house. Now, are we going to permit the National Maritime Union to come to that? . . . What we want to know, based upon trade-union standards, are our officials' hands clean or whether they have been engaging in these practices?"

Curran replies that the election of a rank-and-file committee would be an expression of a lack of confidence in the top leadership's good faith; the opposition does not deny such a lack of confidence; it proclaims it. Are such suspicions justified? Adrian Duffy, pro-Curran vice-president, cleared the air remarking, "Now you and I know that this Mele could not sell books to anyone unless Mele had contact with some officials or officials in this organization."

If Duffy is right, then someone in the top leadership of the NMU is tied in with the racket. If so, can such a person be expected to participate in exposing it? That is what is undoubtedly in the mind of the opposition.

SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

out any vote by Congress at all, and Eisenhower, critical of this disregard for the sovereign representatives of the people, opined that it would have been just as easy to have let Congress in on it, even if only after the shooting had started. So to speak, he was in favor of unlocking the door after the horses had been stolen.

But this criticism of Truman puts Eisenhower on The Left, and if it had been the other way round, if a Fair Deal president had been able to take a fall out of a Republican in the same way, that would have constituted new proof of the fundamental difference between Fair-Dealism and the GOP dinosaurs.

Meanwhile, considering this comedy, we present a Thought for the Week. Just before the Second World War broke out, there was an important issue being debated in the country which also dealt with the manner of getting into wars. This was around the Ludlow amendment for a popular referendum on war.

In 1938 it was a mooted question whether the people should have the right to put the country into a war. In 1954 the president has to assure Congress that it still will have something to say, if, when and provided that. . . . A whole era of capitalist militarization and bureaucratization is lit up.

Cum Grano Salis

On the McCarthy front, the valiant fighters against McCarthyism of the Republican Party have not yet made up their minds whether to let McCarthy act as one of the investigators of McCarthy, with the right to cross-examine, or whether that should only be done by McCarthyites who are not named Joe. As for Republicans who may take a dimmer view of the subject of the inquiry, they do not seem anxious to rush into the fray.

The same Senator Flanders who made the headlines by his outburst against McCarthyism has now slunk back to Vermont with a good word for the gentleman from Wisconsin—because, it is reported, his mail ran only 4-3 in his favor. The president of the American Bar Association has refused to become counsel for the investigating committee, and we should guess that he figures he can't win either way.

The Democratic Party leaders are still pretending that McCarthy is just an internal problem of the GOP, somewhat in the way that France maintains that its oppression in Tunisia and Morocco is strictly its own affair.

But the best-known Democratic rank-and-filer in the country, Adlai Stevenson, has made some more speeches about freedom, telling the students of Harvard and Princeton to express their thoughts fearlessly. As everybody knows, they need the urging.

But Stevenson did not tell them what he would do if they expressed their thoughts fearlessly, and if the said thoughts turned out to be objectionable in the eyes of attorney generals like Truman's or Eisenhower's, who put socialist organizations on the "subversive list," or even if their misguided but sincere thoughts turned out to be pro-Stalinist. He forgot to mention that, in such case, he would not raise a peep if the "subversive list" is used to refuse them academic posts, scholarships, jobs, etc.

In the course of his speech at Harvard, Stevenson told the students that *Via ovum cranium difficilis est*, which he kindly translated as "The way of the eggheads is hard" for the benefit of the non-eggheads. But it is not very hard to make a speech in which you express your thoughts fearlessly about expressing your thoughts fearlessly. *Vox et praeterea nihil*, as we classicists like to say, which Shakespeare roughly translated at one time as "Words, words, words" and at another as "Blow, blow, thou winter wind."

A Basic Pamphlet—

SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY

by
Max Shachtman

Read it!

10 cents

Independent Socialist Press

114 West 14 Street, New York City

LONDON LETTER

Labor MPs Pressing for a Wage-Rise

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Mar. 18—A committee of Parliament last week recommended that the salaries of members of Parliament be raised from the present 1000 pounds a year to the figure of 1500 pounds. This was recommended on the grounds that of the present pay the MP is left with only 250 pounds a year, after expenses.

Therefore, unless he has an alternative source of income, it is impossible to support himself as a full-time MP. It is for this reason that there is a very large number of lawyers, company directors and trade-union officials in Parliament.

Until 1945, the government, a Tory one, had a clear majority in Parliament, so that no political advantage could be gained by either side from a snap vote. From that date there was a strong Labor vote, which pushed a lot of business through Parliament. In 1950, the small Labor majority was kept on its toes by the threat of snap votes and Labor has retaliated by votes at awkward times since their Opposition starting in 1952.

The effect of these narrow majorities is to require the constant presence of most MPs, which makes it very difficult for them to earn a living.

There would thus seem to be a clear case for raising the pay of members of Parliament. However, while the Tories

are strongly resisting the demands of organized labor for higher wages, it would be most indiscreet of them to agree to raising their own wages.

The fact is, furthermore, that the Tories don't necessarily want the raise, as they are quite well off on the whole. It is the unfortunate Labor MPs who suffer. And the Tories are damned if they are going to support legislation which is aimed primarily to relieve the financial embarrassment of the Opposition.

Talking about wages, negotiations between the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions and the employers have broken down today. The Confederation, representing 3,000,000 workers of 39 unions, has been claiming a 15 per cent rise in wages, which would cost the employers \$350,000,000 a year. The employers have offered a 5 per cent rise as a basis for discussion.

At the same time the 45,000 workers of the Electrical Trades Union have submitted their claim to arbitration for an increase above the 80 cents rise which they were awarded last week, after their 3-month guerrilla strike.

QUESTION OF RACISM

A fortnight ago 5,000 Birmingham busmen were asked by their local branch of the Transport and General Workers

Union to vote on whether they should allow Negroes to be employed side-by-side with the other workers.

Naturally, progressive forces called on the busmen to boycott the vote, as they felt that the colored people had an inalienable right to any of the 900 vacancies for which they were suitable. A ballot would imply that the other busmen had a right to decide if a colored worker should be entitled to a living or not.

After a 2½-hour meeting of the City Transport Committee, the following statement was issued: "The committee resolved that the general manager be authorized to recruit any suitable personnel for service with the transport department as platform staff."

Harry Green, of the Transport and General Workers Union, issued a statement that "Any colored men employed on Birmingham buses will be accepted as members of the union. It is now up to the transport staff to make them happy and work with them."

I should think so too!

FRANCO PROTESTS PROTEST

Going a little farther afield, 13 Labor MPs sent a protest to the Duke of Primo de Rivera, the Spanish ambassador in London, about the rearrest of 14 Basques on

(Continued on page 3)

A SOCIALIST POLICY ON PUERTO RICO: Self-Determination and 'Independence-Plus'

From Prof. Alexander

To the Editor:

Your article on Puerto Rico in the March 8 issue of LABOR ACTION was wrong on various points. Two are worthy of particular mention, however.

First, Muñoz Marin was not elected in 1940 on an independence platform. He very specifically did not take any position on the independence issue. He said that the issue of the island's status was of secondary importance at that moment, that the important issues were economic and social. He promised a program which included agrarian reform, unification and government ownership of the island's public utilities, public housing, industrialization, social security, labor legislation. These promises his party has kept, and abundantly. In addition, his party has evolved a new approach to the problem of status. You may prefer independence but apparently the people of Puerto Rico do not—and this brings up the second error in your article.

There has never been a plebiscite on independence, as such; in that you are right. But the people have various times expressed their preference for the Popular Democratic Party, which has sponsored the Commonwealth program, over the Independence Party, which obviously advocates independence. In the election in 1952 the Popular Party got about 60 per cent of the vote, if my memory serves correctly, while the Independentistas got about 19 per cent of the vote. The third party is the Partido Estadista, which advocates statehood for the island. It got 10-15 per cent, I believe.

The Nacionalistas are virtually without popular backing and I seriously doubt if their assassination attempts have made them any more popular. They are extreme nationalists, and it would be a real disaster for Puerto Rico if they were to gain control of the island. Their fanatical rule would make most of the Latin American dictatorships seem full-fledged democracies by comparison.

Robert ALEXANDER
Rutgers University, March 12.

Labor MPs — —

(Continued from page 2)

a charge of leading illegal strikes. They had been in jail for a year, and released under an amnesty last year.

The representative of Franco's regime refused to forward the protest organized by ex-Foreign Undersecretary Ernest Davies to the dictator. He wrote, "Since the matter is the internal concern of a sovereign state, I would ask you to refrain in future from interfering in the internal affairs of my country, as we refrain from interfering in yours."

My comment on the situation is to blame the last Labor Government for recognizing the sovereignty of Franco's fascist regime in the first place. In cooperation with other United Nations Governments it could probably have brought about its downfall in 1945, much to the advantage of the Spanish people.

MOSES AND WINSTON

In a recent debate in Parliament, Emrys Hughes got up and said that Moses was a much greater strategist than Churchill. He did the sensible thing. He led his forces out of Egypt in time. The speaker intervened to point out that Sir Winston's distinguished predecessor was not in Parliament, and it was improper to make remarks about people not present.

Despite the humor of the situation the 80,000 troops from the Suez Canal will have to move out by 1956 according to the original agreement made by Disraeli. The General Staff is already in the process of moving to Cyprus.

Meanwhile there have been considerable exchanges in newspapers here over the future of this island. Is it (1) to remain a British colony, (2) to become a self-governing dominion, (3) have "enosis" with Greece (most of the people are Greek), or (4) join Turkey (a third of the population is Turkish)?

Why not leave it up to the Cypriots?

By HAL DRAPER

Professor Alexander's letter (see column to the left) came in as we were planning a discussion article to deal with a large number of questions that have been raised in discussion that we have heard, dealing with the situation in Puerto Rico, the political problems of the island, and socialist policy with respect to the whole question. His letter raises some of these, and in any case I hope he doesn't mind if this article comments on his letter while it also proceeds to range a good deal further.

As an appreciative reader of the highly informative articles on Latin America which Professor Alexander publishes in the press, I must say that this time his memory has played him false, on the factual point which he raises about Muñoz Marin. In 1940, when Muñoz's Popular Democratic Party first entered the elections and swept into a majority, the party platform included the advocacy of independence, and Muñoz still presented himself as an advocate of independence, as I wrote. It was not until five-six years later that he openly repudiated this objective.

To cite sources checkable here, the N. Y. Times dispatch reported on July 22, 1940 on the Popular party convention: "The party platform proclaims for democracy as against dictatorship and advocates independence as an objective to be won at a special plebiscite. . . . The new party summarizes its purposes with the slogan 'bread, land, liberty.'" In a dispatch from San Juan on July 24, a Times (UP) account reporting an election speech by Muñoz said that he spoke as a "steadfast advocate of Puerto Rican independence." An article by Louis S. Blanco in the Nation of January 25, 1941 likewise reported that the party platform favored independence.

Outside of the Times and Nation, I have not been able to find any report on the fact, one way or the other, in the U. S. press. (Americans have not been very interested in Puerto Rico.)

Behind this factual matter is a different point about Muñoz's approach in 1940, one which I took up in LA in a longer study of the situation (after the Blair House shooting). Although in 1940 Muñoz still presented himself before the people as an advocate of independence, he was already laying the groundwork for a de-emphasis of the independence question, which in turn became the road through which he traveled toward explicit repudiation of the independence aim. Professor Alexander would have been quite correct if he had limited himself to pointing out that, though pro-independence in 1940, Muñoz already sought to emphasize his economic program above that question—also, incidentally, mentioning in his speeches that "we must not hamper the leadership of the U. S. in the fight for democracy against totalitarianism" (there was a war on). But all this does not bear on the context in which I referred to Muñoz's advocacy of independence in 1940.*

Munoz's "New Approach"

Secondly, Muñoz worked out no "new approach to the problem of [Puerto Rico's political] status." Instead of independence as an objective, Muñoz first gave Washington to understand that he would be willing to settle for various concessions for increased island rights, such as had been kicked around for quite a while. Even Gov. Rex Tugwell had advocated Puerto Rico's right to elect its own governor. Talk about independence as an "ultimate" objective became only a bargaining point and a means of pressure. When Puerto Rico got its present degree of home rule in 1950, even that talk stopped in the governor's palace. Such was the evolution of Muñoz's program on status.

Reference to something new called a "Commonwealth" status, such as Professor Alexander makes in his letter and as has been common in the press, is misleading, to put it mildly. The term is used as if it implies a status like that of the dominions in the British commonwealth, and indeed the press has used it as if Puerto Rico's present status is like that of Canada's. I do not think socialists should use this disingenuous terminology that is so common in the press.

The only "Commonwealth" status that is known, namely that in the British setup, is today one of effectual independence, control over one's own foreign relations, foreign economic relations, army, courts, etc. Moreover it is an entirely voluntary relationship, capable of being withdrawn by the action of the self-governing partner in the Commonwealth. Puerto Rico's status does not resemble this, and all of the disputed rights are included in the differences.

What Muñoz worked out was a new approach to the solution of the island's economic problems, and this is very truly one of the most important sources of his popular support. The program itself (so-called Operation Bootstrap) I have criticized

*After this article was written, we received from Ruth Reynolds the text of the party's 1940 platform on status, which confirms the Times dispatches. It sets forth two ways only by which Puerto Rico could become a "free people": (1) statehood in the U. S., or (2) independence, looking forward to a "confederation of all free peoples of America." It then clearly affirms that it favors the latter, since then "our destiny would be more useful . . . and better for the cause of Puerto Rican justice." The beginnings of de-emphasis can also be seen in this platform in the statement that it favors a special vote on the question of status and that the present election should not itself be considered a vote on that question. This statement was also an attempt to corral votes for the party from people who differed with its advocacy of independence by favoring statehood (which was a much more widespread view then than now).

The one point of view to which the 1940 platform made NO concession was that of colonial "autonomy," which is Muñoz's present idea. A few years before that, Muñoz had said the following in a speech about the "autonomy" advocates: "I believe I know why some of my compatriots think of autonomy. Deeply disgusted with the colonial status and much afraid of independence, they sincerely seek in autonomy a decorous mantle that will cover the rags of colonialism and resemble the toga of independence."

in previous articles; but what can stand re-emphasis is the fact that Muñoz was the first island politico to work out a modern-type economic program which made an attempt to grapple basically with Puerto Rico's economic blind-alley. Now, one can have the opinion, as I do, that this is an attempt to solve the problem of industrialization in a reactionary way, but we all have to recognize the attractive power in backward countries even of an industrialization and modernization program with reactionary features. (Compare, on a quite different level, the attractive power of Stalinist and Peronist industrialization.)

The Nationalist Party is a futile and primitive outfit not only because of its self-defeating individual-terrorist methods, and it cannot be supported by socialists not only for reasons such as Professor Alexander gives, but in addition it has nothing to offer the Puerto Rican people toward a programmatic solution of the economic problems which independence would pose.

Nor did the Independence Party arise with any such program; perhaps some things I have read about it recently indicate that it is moving in this direction.

Skepticism and Apathy

In addition, the Independence Party has a handicap which has to be understood in the light of the history of Puerto Rican independentista politics: for decades, parties have presented themselves before the people as fighters for independence, gained the votes of the people and then in office betrayed and abandoned the independence fight, under the pressure of U. S. domination and, corruption from within. (In fact, it was in this connection that I mentioned that Muñoz himself was among those who swept in as an advocate of independence.)

This process has been especially crude in Puerto Rico because of the weakness of any social counterpoise to the pressure of the colossus on the mainland—what with a very small working class and a very thin stratum even of a native bourgeoisie. In any case (without here pursuing this question further into a discussion of the "theory of permanent revolution" as applied to Puerto Rico), it is indubitable that, especially today, the mass of jibaros and of the urban population look with a skeptical eye on more politicians who merely come forward with orations about independence.

They will sell out like all the others (say the jibaros) and so we might as well go back to the island custom of selling our votes for a couple of dollars—the same sentiment which Muñoz had to fight in 1940. And the urban middle class and workers say doubtfully: But isn't Muñoz right when he argues that if we just cut ourselves adrift from the U. S. in our present dependent and unviable state, our economy will just go smash?

And so, even at the best, the Independence Party has to build up its "credit" with the people's independence sentiment. It is not an old party. According to an article in the last New Leader (no friend of Puerto Rican nationalism), the Independence Party is the fastest-growing party on the island. Whether this is a very good thing or not is something I personally can't answer without knowing a good deal more about the Independence Party than I do.

Do They Want Independence?

But one indicated conclusion is that it is a very rash thing to try to prove that "the people of Puerto Rico do not prefer independence" by citing the vote for the Popular Democratic Party. The first question that Professor Alexander overlooks, I think, is one that has often been raised by observers: What proportion of the voters who cast their ballots for Muñoz would also cast their ballots for independence in a plebiscite, if one were held?

There should be no difficulty at all in understanding the political frame of mind of Puerto Ricans who would do this. Winning independence against the opposition of the world-shadowing power of the U. S., the giant of the mainland, is so difficult a task to many Puerto Ricans, without even any competent leadership in that direction; the prospect seems suspended for the present, practically speaking; and meanwhile Muñoz is trying to do something. . . . A vote for Muñoz in 1952 was not necessarily a vote against independence.

Secondly, in addition to those who would prefer independence but who remain inside the ranks of Popular Party supporters at present, there are the non-voters who stay away from the polls altogether, in apathy and disillusionment, and who would not be brought out except by an opportunity to vote their aspirations. This is a varying figure from 40 to 50 per cent of the population! (It was also in this connection that I cited the Muñoz election of 1940 when 90 per cent of the voters turned out, their hopes having been aroused by the Populares.) In the 1950 vote on the new constitution, a majority of the voters stayed away.

Incidentally, just as rash as Professor Alexander's claim is that of Nationalist Party sympathizers who chalk up the total of non-voters to the Nationalist Party, which called for a boycott of both votes; but no matter how small or large a fraction of the non-voters may be principled followers of the Nationalist boycott slogan, there is excellent ground to believe that in a genuine plebiscite, with a militant independence party to spark it, at least another 90 per cent turnout could be expected. In such a situation, which could provide a real test of the islanders' preferences, the argument from the Muñoz vote of 1952 can be seen as far from decisive.

Thirdly, in addition to the above two forces there is also, of course, the near-20 per cent vote (of those who voted) already garnered by the growing Independence Party.

A Challenge

Stopping at this point for the moment, there is an inescapable challenge before those who speak so confidently of the Puerto Rican people's preference for the present status, as virtually all of the U. S. press does.

(Continued on page 4)

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Dave McDonald Discovers Unemployment

By PETE JARMS

David McDonald, president of the Steelworkers (CIO), has finally found that there is unemployment in the United States that affects his members. After making the fantastic statement on March 3 that "I refuse to become hysterical about our current economic situation," he added, "I do not think that the current socialist line for great big federal projects is the answer."

But the realities of life catch up even with this prima-donna. A special union executive board meeting has been called for Pittsburgh, April 5 and 6, to draft proposals to help solve the problem.

The fact that steel is functioning at 67 per cent of capacity and that unemployment is widespread in the industry has forced the steel union to act. As one representative of the union states: "about 40 per cent of the 90,000 in the Gary-Smith Chicago area work only a part-time week—three or four days instead of five."

He also stated that close to 15,000 have been laid off in steel-fabricating plants in this area; and in the zinc, lead and copper industries the situation is worse. Out of 26,000 persons employed in that segment of industry 18,000 have already been laid off.

Dave McDonald keeps on his right-wing road of appeasing big business. He has ordered all Steelworker officials in the U. S. to drop out of Americans for Demo-

cratic Action. It will be interesting to see if he will follow this up with an order to force the Canadian Steelworkers out of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, which is the accepted political wing of the Canadian labor movement and socialist to boot. He probably is wise enough not to dare tell the Canadians what he really believes about their political action.

The Lake County Steelworkers Council (Indiana Harbor, Hammond, Ind.) passed a resolution, to be introduced at the current Indiana state convention of the CIO, to the effect that they do not care what any individual wants to do with regard to national affiliation but that they are sticking with the CIO. This was the local's reaction to the widespread gossip that McDonald is ready to split from the CIO.

AGAINST WITCHHUNT

The Agricultural Implement Council of the United Auto Workers (CIO), which was the council that led the fight at the last UAW convention to allow industry councils to meet as often as they wanted to, passed a strong resolution calling for labor unity and a national conference of all locals of the labor movement to meet the terror of unemployment and the boss offensive.

The council also reaffirmed the UAW resolution on civil liberties and called upon the labor movement to give no aid and comfort to the various witchhunt

committees. The resolution pointed out how important it was to fight the loyalty oaths, blacklists, etc., in spite of the possibility that the unions would be slanderously linked with the Communist Party. The meetings were held in Milwaukee, Wisconsin on March 6 and 7.

UAW CONFERENCE

The third UAW-CIO International Education Conference will be held in Chicago, April 8 through 11.

The first two conferences have been huge successes and each affair has produced one session that delegates will remember for years to come. At the first conference in 1949 in Milwaukee, Professor Robert S. Lynd's speech attacking the Democratic and Republican Parties and his call for a labor party was the high point.

At the second conference held in Cleveland in 1952, the great civil-libertarian Zachariah Chafee made a tremendous speech calling upon the workers to fight the encroachment on civil liberties then gaining momentum in the U. S. "If we can't be the land of the free, let's be the home of the brave," he said.

The third conference does not seem to have the high level of the other two conferences. The times are tougher; reaction has gained ground. Paul Hoffman, president of Studebaker, is invited to show the unions' respectability.

But the invitation to David Croll, a

Liberal Party member of the Canadian parliament is mystifying. Granted that he is a maverick, yet the fact is that labor has its own party in Canada. It is the Canadian Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, and it has some speakers that would make a terrific impression on the rank-and-file delegates of the U. S. Besides that, there is one province in Canada where the CCF is the governing party, and has introduced advanced legislation on medicine, insurance, hospitalization, etc.

The fear of being smeared as "socialist" apparently makes the UAW hesitate to call on speakers from the CCF. At the same time as this conference, Jenny Lee, wife of Aneurin Bevan and herself a great speaker, will be in Toronto. If the UAW had the guts which built its organization it would introduce a Bevanite to the United States just to show their political position to the U. S. workers.

But its fear of socialist-baiting is too much for it. This fear will not stop Dave McDonald from baiting the UAW; the reactionary press and the employers will continue their sly innuendoes against the UAW. The art of running away never won a battle.

Other speakers will be James Wechsler, Senators Douglas and Humphrey, and the great cartoonist Herblock. With all its shortcomings it will still be an important even in the U. S. labor movement.

A Socialist Policy on Puerto Rico — —

(Continued from page 3)

If, as has so often been said, the Nationalist Party followers are only a handful, if the Independence Party's not-quite-20 per cent vote represents truly the total sentiment for independence, if Muñoz's "60 per cent (or so) of the vote" (of those who voted) shows the preference of the people for the present dependent status, then there is an easy and sure way of showing up the agitation in Puerto Rico for independence, and of isolating the "demagogues" (not to speak of the terrorists) who claim to speak in the name of their suppressed people. This is: to grant the plebiscite which has been demanded.

WHY ARE THEY AFRAID?

In 1946, as we have explained in LABOR ACTION, the Puerto Rican legislative assembly, dominated by Muñoz, unanimously passed a law for such a plebiscite. It was vetoed by Governor Tugwell. Thereupon Muñoz himself personally urged the assembly to override the veto, even though he had already retreated from the advocacy of independence. And the veto was overridden by the unanimous vote of the Popular Democratic deputies, only the four votes of the non-Popular deputies being cast against it; so that Truman had to dishonor himself openly in the eyes of history by putting the proposition to death with his own veto, giving the lie to his public pledges.

Eisenhower has never even spoken of a plebiscite.

Well, why not? Professor Alexander, for example, should be the first to support the demand for a plebiscite, precisely from his own point of view, and we trust that he is in favor of it.

What is the U. S. government afraid of? Or is it not quite so certain as it pretends to be about how the Puerto Rican people would vote? As long as it holds on to the island without allowing the people to vote on their own fate, without giving them at least the same right of withdrawal that a member of the British Commonwealth has, then it is imperialist demagoguery on its part when it pretends to be nothing but the benevolent uncle.

SOCIALIST POLICY

Such a demand for a free plebiscite is not yet a demand for independence. It is simply the demand for the right to self-determination. And this is quite separate from any speculative discussion about what the Puerto Rican people prefer.

The fundamental demand on behalf of the Puerto Rican people which cannot be argued away by any genuine democrat or liberal (not to speak of socialist) is the continuing right to self-determination. A U. S. socialist organization cannot put independence for Puerto Rico in its own platform. As socialists in the country which is the imperialist master in the case, our platform must include pledging independence to Puerto Rico on the demand of its people freely expressed. This is no slight distinction, as should be evident to anyone who claims that the Puerto Ricans would be positively resentful if the U. S. onesidedly cut them off and cast them into the limbo of independence. An American socialist government's duty would be to make it possible for the Puerto Rican people to express their desires in a free and unfettered vote on their relationship to the mainland.

But this phrase "free and unfettered" vote brings us to the last programmatic

point about a democratic policy with regard to Puerto Rico. It is not as unambiguous as it sounds.

Let us go back to the claim that the Puerto Rican people have shown they prefer the present status. That claim is ill-advised. Does it follow from that argument that one can reverse the claim and try to prove that the majority of Puerto Ricans would vote for independence in a plebiscite if it were held tomorrow?

Perhaps; a good case can be made out. But in point of fact, no article in LABOR ACTION has made that particular statement, even speculatively. In previous articles, this writer has chosen to go out on a somewhat different and safer limb, in expressing the opinion that what the Puerto Ricans want and would embrace in a plebiscite is a more concrete proposition which I have called "independence-plus." More important is the fact that an American government, I believe, has to offer this more concrete proposal before a Puerto Rican plebiscite can be considered genuine, "free and unfettered."

INDEPENDENCE-PLUS

Any account of what has happened economically to Puerto Rico during the more than half century of U. S. rule would show, as LABOR ACTION did in an article after the Blair House shooting, that the greatest crime of American imperialism in the island has been the cruel distortion of the island's whole economy as a result of squeezing it into the U. S. economic framework.

It has been made into a one-crop (sugar) country, with U. S. capital dominating the land; it has ceased to be self-supporting even as far as its own miserable level of food is concerned; it has been remade into its present image of a country which cannot live economically under the U. S.'s foreign rule, and which has also been made incapable of a viable existence on its own.

Independence, many Puerto Ricans fear not without justice, would deprive it immediately of the benefits, which are now necessary to its distorted economy, of its present inclusion in the U. S. economic structure, and of benefits such as the return to its own treasury of the revenue from its excise taxes. They fear that economic chaos would engulf the island if independence, however gained, broke these crutches away suddenly, without the sovereign government being able to make a new economic life for the people anywhere near as quickly. It would be difficult to find another colony which has been so thoroughly crippled for independent existence by foreign economic domination.

It would be only slight compensation for the consequences of U. S. rule if an American government pledged itself to grant independence on demand, while still maintaining the economic benefits to Puerto Rico which the island now possesses.

Today, even given a plebiscite, the U. S. is holding a club over the heads of the Puerto Rican people. The club is not a threat to send in the Marines, at least not yet; and since it is not, our liberals may feel free to overlook it. The Puerto Rican people cannot. It is an economic club: if you go it alone, then we close our economic gates and coffers to you and you can go starve by yourselves in glorious sovereignty.

TAKE AWAY THE CLUB

Especially today, when the U. S. is handing out billions of dollars in what it claims is humanitarian aid to less privileged countries, it would be a horrible mockery of human decency and a real imperialist crime if the U. S. were to react to a pro-independence vote of Puerto Rico (assuming a plebiscite is put through) by pinching off one drop of the economic lifeblood which the island needs at least for a whole period ahead.

This is independence-plus—the right to self-determination up to and including independence, with the pledge of continuing present forms of economic aid to the island for a whole period.

A Puerto Rican party that is fighting for the political and economic freedom of its people would have many more programmatic questions to take up—the question of Caribbean federation, a program of beginning with the nationalization of the foreign-owned monopolistic corporations that dominate the island, and many more that are not in the province of this article. But a socialist movement in our side of the imperialist line, or any genuine democrat in the U. S., must establish the right to independence-plus as the minimum.

Los Angeles YSL

Spring Education Series

March 30: Fascism. April 13: Lenin on Party Organization. Dates and subjects of following meetings to be announced. The Los Angeles YSL will meet every Thursday at 8 p.m. at 1508 N. Beverly Glen Blvd. (1 mile north of Sunset Blvd. between Beverly Hills & UCLA) until permanent headquarters are obtained. Temporary mailing addresses: P. O. Box 2571, Terminal Annex, Los Angeles 54.



LABOR ACTION

March 29, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 13

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Asst. Editors: GORDON HASKELL,

BEN HALL, MARY BELL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Peccadillo

Who's subversive? Ku-Klux Klansmen, maybe?

No, says the man in charge of enforcing Georgia's loyalty oath for state employees. That's Lamar Sizemore, assistant attorney general.

"He said the Klan, when it was in existence, appeared to be aimed at destroying individual rights rather than overthrowing the government of the state or nation."—Atlanta Constitution, Feb. 4. Oh, well, if that's all. . . .

NYU Newspaper Smears Young Socialists

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

The case of the amateur cloak-and-dagger boys who attacked the Young Socialist League in the *Commerce Bulletin*, student paper at New York University, involves far more than misstatements of fact and libelous charges. It occurs in the midst of a national atmosphere in which the stoolpigeon is a hero, and even if every last word of the article were true (which is not the case), such an attack would still be symptomatic of the noxious values of the garrison state.

But the charges are not true and this compounds the ugliness of the incident.

The NYU *Commerce Bulletin* wrote that the Young Socialist League was "labeled as a communistic organization by the government." There is no foundation in fact for such a statement; yet the very making of it does irreparable harm to the League.

In times such as we live in, one could wonder if even a retraction can undo the harm already done. It is not hard to see such an article taking its proud place in House Un-American Committee files, Tenney Committee reports and various security folders, along with all the other irresponsible charges which are used to blast careers and reputations.

The fact is that the Young Socialist League was formed out of a merger of the Socialist Youth League (formerly youth section of the Independent Socialist League and listed by the attorney general), and the Young People's Socialist League (formerly youth section of the Socialist Party, USA, and not listed). What our ambitious young sleuths did was to equate the YSL with the Socialist Youth League. They did not bother to check on the fact (which we have been proclaiming with all our might) that a new, merged organization (not listed) has come into existence. Yet within the atmosphere of today, checking for the facts is somewhat passé, at least for professional patriots, junior and senior.

POISON-PEN STUFF

This same poisoned atmosphere exists in imaginative statements like "Forced to go underground, the League continues to recruit members from the campus." In a leaflet distributed this week to NYU students, the "underground" League invited all students to one of its regular, open meetings.

Then there is the statement that LABOR ACTION is one of "their" (the YSL's) publications. This should be read along with the box in the first issue of *Challenge* which states that "Young Socialist Challenge, organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of LABOR ACTION but is under the sole editorship of the YSL." Or there are the various YSL convention documents defining the relationship between the League and LABOR ACTION, all of which could be had for the asking. However, procedural niceties such as researching charges are rarely observed in Junior G-Man circles.

The YSL is also described as the "youth section of the Independent Socialist League," which is later described as "likewise listed on government loyalty forms as 'subversive.'" This is stated in the face of the fact that every League document which has treated the point has stated clearly and plainly that we are not affiliated to any adult organization.

SOME FACTS

So that the subversive-hunters at NYU cannot be said to have pushed us into the disingenuous of the cowed, let's be plain about our relation to LABOR ACTION and the Independent Socialist League.

Get The Challenge

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

LABOR ACTION is not "our" paper, i.e., we have no voice in its content or policy. *Challenge* is not LABOR ACTION's paper, i.e., LABOR ACTION has no voice in the content or policy of *Challenge*. But we are happy to affirm the very obvious fact that we are in deep political sympathy since *Challenge* and LABOR ACTION are the only two Third Camp anti-war socialist papers in the United States. It is clear that the working agreement between *Challenge* and LABOR ACTION is the result of common politics independently arrived at.

The same is true of the Independent Socialist League. The YSL is not affiliated to that organization. We are, however, bound to it by the closest ties of solidarity and cooperation. We have made these distinctions with regard to LABOR ACTION and the ISL on practically every occasion on which we have described our organization. But then it would be too much to ask the *Commerce Bulletin* reporters to check facts.

There are many other misstatements of fact, with a misquotation thrown in for good measure, and there is the over-all tone of an article titled "Red Group Active Here Undercover." Yet rather than rebut every point, I would return to my initial statement: that the presuppositions of such an attack are symptoms of an evil at least equal to the attack itself.

DISEASE SYMPTOM

Supposing that the YSL had been listed by the attorney general in the usual fashion—without hearings, accusers, etc. Supposing that the YSL were affiliated to the ISL which is, indeed, "listed" in the vicious manner described above. Supposing that the entire story were true down to every last fantastic statement. What then?

Would it then follow that the Young Socialist League should be the target for all the apprentice patriots on campus? would it reflect the atmosphere in our colleges and universities in a better light simply because these charges were true?

The answer is obvious. Only if you ratify all of the anti-civil-libertarian measures of the garrison state, Smith Act, attorney general's list, the two McCarran Acts, the loyalty and security program—only then would such an article, even a true article, make sense. We don't think that the American student has made such a ratification. But it is a sign of the sickness of our political life that an untrue article based on these premises could be paraded in a student paper at New York University.

To take a very specific case. The Independent Socialist League has been placed on the subversive list. This was done by bureaucratic fiat, without even the semblance of democratic procedure. We state, without qualifications, that we are in solidarity with the fight of the ISL to get off the list. But then, as we said, the ISL is a Third Camp socialist organization and so is the YSL, and so perhaps the point is not clear. We also back the fight for Stalinists and fascists against the list. We are in violent disagreement with their politics, yet we realize that the list-system itself is such an evil that one must be against it on principle.

WHERE WE STAND

If there is any need to document the nature of the attorney general's list, we have it in this incident at NYU. Not only is a listed organization—or one suspected of being on the list—subject to harassment by the FBI, the loss of jobs for its members, etc., but it must also face irresponsible libels by young students who imitate the very grown-up

How the Junior Witchhunters Mobilized To Save NYU from the Socialist Menace

By JO CAMP

It has often been noted that political life on most American college campuses is not what it was five years ago or even fifteen years ago. The result has not been one to increase the average student's understanding of politics or political movements, and it provides a wide field for the political charlatan to operate with relative impunity.

However, it would appear that the Young Socialist League is not the only one interested in developing political interest among students. Help in this effort sometimes comes from unexpected sources with motives that are not beyond suspicion.

In past years the concern with politics was to increase student interest in order to participate in the political movement closest to his sympathies. Today the tendency seems to be to make the student aware of politics only to convince them that political organizations are a thing to be avoided with their careers at stake.

In this latter category must be considered an effort which appeared in New York University School of Commerce newspaper *Commerce Bulletin* on March 17. No college education is considered complete these days until the student body has been treated to a real spine-tingling episode of underground "subversive" activities. This is the day of the spy chillers and thrillers, and all must be made to feel that they are actively involved in at least one lurid episode.

On this score we must confer a Junior G-Man badge on the *Commerce Bulletin* and the administration of the NYU School of Commerce.

ALL ABOUT THE PLOT

In the midst of their studies in accounting, taxes, real estate and business administration, on March 17 School of Commerce students must have been shocked to read the headline in their school paper "Red Group Active Here Undercover." Nervously eying their classmates and wondering who the "undercover" agents might be, they went on to read about the plot:

"The Young Socialist League, labeled as a communistic organization by the government, and supposedly inactive at NYU, is not as dormant as the administration would like it to be.

"Forced to go underground, the League continues to recruit members from the campus. A Commerce student, working in conjunction with this paper, was asked if he would like to join the NYU chapter of the YSL."

"The invitation was extended following a meeting he attended of the Young People's Socialist League."

wave of fear and anonymous accusation which exists within the garrison state.

In conclusion, let me be quite positive about what the Young Socialist League IS. We are an organization of democratic socialist youth, not listed by the government and opposing all such listings. We have no adult affiliation but we are bound by political and personal ties to all Third Camp anti-war organizations. In the United States this of course means the Independent Socialist League. We oppose Stalinism and capitalism, both of which are driving the world toward a catastrophic war. We stand for the Third Camp, with the exploited workers and colonials who suffer under and fight against these two systems of exploitation.

We are an open organization. We would welcome a unit on the NYU campus and any place else.

We have asked the *Commerce Bulletin* for a retraction and for equal space for our reply. What they will do will not only be the outcome of one incident: it will be an index of how far the rot of anti-civil liberties has penetrated. For if the campus is now intimidated and afraid...

The article then presents a forged quotation with perfect aplomb:

"According to one of their publications, LABOR ACTION, 'The YSL is at present the youth section of the Independent Socialist League, and by and large defends the revolutionary traditions of Bolshevism and revolutionary Marxism.'"

"The Independent Socialist League is likewise listed on government loyalty forms as 'subversive.'"

"In its heyday, during the forties, the League was active at Washington Square College [of NYU]."

There is a widespread feeling on the part of many people that in college a person acquires the ability to attain a certain level of comprehension of facts when brought into contact with them. Notwithstanding this assumption, it is difficult to see how it would have been possible to cram more errors of fact into so few sentences.

DEMAND RETRACTION

It is easy to see how a person could make errors when attempting to write about a subject from a distance and relying on second-hand information. But one of the authors had made it a point to come down to a meeting of either the former YPSL or the present YSL (it is hard to tell which from the garblings in his article) in order to get the "facts." And even if he were the least intelligent student at Commerce—and there is no proof that he is not—he should have been able to note, between making hurriedly scrawled notes on SYL-YPSL unity convention documents, that the Young Socialist League was just being formed; and that at the time the articles appeared the YSL had been in existence for only one month. Perhaps it is a good thing that the reporter is a student at a school of commerce and not at a school of journalism, or perhaps a rare journalistic talent is being unfolded.

Continuing their straightforward journalistic practice of double-checking their information, the two candidates for the Hearst papers went to Dean Robert Jenkins for an interview.

"Dean Robert Jenkins said, according to his knowledge, at least in the last three or four years, they certainly have not been recognized at Commerce."

"He said he did not know of any such organization being rejected recognition here, but hesitated to comment on what would result if they did apply."

The rest of this article contains a series of quotations and paraphrases from unity convention documents which "prove" that the YSL is active on various college campuses. And this is about the only statement of fact in their "revelations."

The YSL, upon receiving a copy of the *Commerce Bulletin* article, immediately sent a letter to the paper requesting an official retraction of the article and "space for a reply of equal space and prominence as that accorded the unfounded and libelous charges made against us." This attack on the YSL cannot be viewed as merely the prank of two junior G-men, but one in which the administration of the School of Commerce participated.

N. Y. YSL Forum

Friday Evenings at 8:15

Apr. 2—Irving Berg on

A SOCIALIST VIEW OF THE KINSEY REPORT

Apr. 9—Abe Stein on

THE CRISIS IN FRANCE

at Labor Action Hall

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

The ISL Case Against the State Dep't

By ALBERT GATES

In a letter dated March 8, 1954, R. B. Shipley, director of the Passport Office of the State Department, denied to Max Shachtman the right of an appeal against the administrative decision to refuse a passport to him. The case will now be taken to the courts where an effort will be made to reverse the bureaucratic action of the State Department.

That a decision was made at all is due entirely to the persistent efforts of the ISL, the Workers Defense League, and attorney Joseph L. Rauh of Washington. The record shows that without these efforts, it is doubtful that Shachtman would ever have received a reply to his application for a passport.

The grounds for the refusal of a passport and the decision to deny Shachtman a right to appeal are quite disingenuous. It appears that the State Department has provided only two grounds for appeal from the denial of passports, and that there is at least one additional ground for the denial of a passport which cannot even be appealed!

After playing around with the case for months, without acknowledging the receipt of the application or answering communications, and without making any decision, Mrs. Shipley finally chose that ground for a denial which would preclude an administrative appeal to the State Department Appeals Board (a Section 71.25 of Title 22 of the Code of Federal Regulations). It says in part: "The Secretary of State is authorized in his discretion to refuse to issue a passport...."

This section, according to the director of the Passport Office, is not subject to appeal.

For the reader to understand fully the meaning of this decision, it will be necessary to tell briefly the whole story from the beginning (see the synopsis of the case).

The Case Starts

On February 10, 1952, Max Shachtman made application for a passport to travel to Europe where he intended to gather materials and information for writing and lecturing in the United States. The application was made on the stationery of the Independent Socialist League and Shachtman signed his letter as chairman of the ISL. It was therefore made clear who he was and why he was going.

From February 10 until October 9, not one word was ever received from the State Department in reply to the application or to any communication sent requesting information or decision upon the application. In mid-July, Attorney Rauh telephoned the State Department to protest the manner in which it had ignored the application and all communications about it.

Rauh made reference to two sections of the Code, 51.135 and 51.136 which bar passports to certain individuals, and he pointed out that these could not be the basis for any action in the Shachtman case. The two sections read respectively: "Limitation on Issuance of Passports to Persons Supporting Communist Movement," and "Limitations on Issuance of Passports to Persons Likely to Violate Laws of the United States."

Runaround

Readers of LABOR ACTION will recall that Rauh spoke to one Ashley J. Nichols and was advised that while there was some doubt about Shachtman's position while Stalin was alive, the death of Stalin had changed that. Rauh had to point out to Nicholas that the life or death of Stalin had nothing to do with Shachtman's views, that they were political and not personal, and that he was opposed not only to Stalin, but above all to the system of Stalinism, the Stalinist State in Russia and the world Stalinist movement. Nicholas then asked that Shachtman submit an affidavit to that effect.

This was six months after the application for a passport had been made! On July 17, Shachtman sent the affidavit requested, with an accompanying letter protesting the failure of the State Department to act on his case and demanding that a decision be made immediately so that an appeal could be taken should that decision be negative. No answer was received

to this letter. On October 8, therefore, a telegram was sent protesting the failure of the State Department to acknowledge or reply to the letter of July 17. The request for a hearing was made simultaneously.

The reader should bear in mind that up to this point Shachtman still did not know whether a passport was actually denied to him. The dilatory tactics of the State Department merely enforced the well-founded belief that his application was rejected. Obviously, too, he could only suspect the grounds upon which the State Department was acting, the suspicion being based upon the telephone conversation which Rauh had with Nicholas.

On October 9, the State Department wired Shachtman granting an "informal" hearing. This was the very first communication of any kind received since February 10, and all it said was that he could have an "informal" hearing. For what purpose would the hearing be held? Was the application for a passport actually denied? And if it was, what were the grounds for the denial? Or was the granting of the "informal" hearing a way of communicating a "hint" that the State Department had made a decision in the case?

The "Informal Hearing"

In any case, on October 15, another wire was sent to the State Department asking whether or not the application had been denied, and if so, what the grounds were so that Shachtman might know just what it was he had to do in any prospective hearing. It was this wire that produced the first letter from the Passport Office, in ten months from the date of the application. In the letter from Mrs. Shipley, Shachtman finally learned that he was denied a passport because he was associated with an organization on the attorney general's list of "subversive organizations." Yet, no section of the code was cited.

On November 3, the "informal" hearing was held in the Passport Office with Nicholas. Shachtman and Gates appeared there accompanied by Attorney Rauh. A stenographic record revealed the farcical character of that hearing. When Nicholas stated that he had information that Shachtman was associated with the ISL and wanted to verify the fact, he was stopped instantly by Rauh. Rauh pointed out that the State Department had all the factual information it needed to act in the case; that the application had been made on the stationery of the ISL and that Shachtman had stated in his application that he was the national chairman of the organization. Rauh told Nicholas that there could be only one purpose to such a hearing: to obtain information that the State Department did not know and for it, in turn, to present reasons for its silence and failure to act in the case for over ten months.

Very Clever, Mrs. Shipley

The meeting went on for over two hours in which the political views of Shachtman and the ISL were fully explored. What remained was for the State Department to come to a decision. Had it come to one already? We had no doubt about it. But how can one be certain when after the hearing we were again faced with the complete silence of the department? Did it review the record of the hearing? Did it make a definitive decision to adhere to the position communicated on October 22 or had it revised that position on the basis of the hearing?

After two months of waiting (almost a year had now passed since the application was made), a communication was addressed on January 15, 1954 to the newly established State Department Appeals Board, headed by Thurston B. Morton, placing Shachtman's appeal before it under Sections 51.135 and 51.136.

On January 22, 1954, Mr. Sipes of the Appeals Board replied saying that the board had no notice of any Shachtman case under these sections and since there was no case before him, an appeal was denied.

On January 21, however, Mrs. Shipley wrote to Rauh denying a passport to Shachtman on the ground of membership in an organization on

the attorney general's list. Here again, no specific sections were cited as the basis.

Apparently, we were witnessing a very "clever" strategy on the part of the State Department. On January 22, the Appeals Board knew nothing of any denial of a passport to Shachtman under the sections of the code under which appeals are made before it. A day previous, however, on the 21st, Mrs. Shipley denied the passport without citing any paragraph of the code!

No Right to Appeal!

Several days later Shachtman appealed the ruling of Mrs. Shipley and requested a hearing before the Appeals Board. And that has now been denied. Sections 51.135 and 51.136, says Mrs. Shipley, "merely prescribe certain categories of persons to whom passports must be denied. No regulations have been promulgated providing appeal procedures for persons who are refused passports for reasons other than those set forth in Sections 51.135 and 51.136 of the Passport Regulations since normally these refusals, in effect, are temporary and conditional and further consideration will be given to the application upon removal of the conditions which caused the refusal."

Simple, isn't it? Shachtman was not the type of person to whom a passport "must be refused." No, the refusal in his case is really a temporary one, and "further consideration will be given to the issue of a passport to you [Shachtman] if there should be a change in the findings of the attorney general respecting your organization." Nevertheless, "... there does not appear to be any further procedure which you can follow in connection with the passport application at this time." In a word: Go see the attorney general!

We have seen the attorney general, in a manner of speaking. Our readers are familiar with the efforts that were made over a period of almost six years to get a hearing from the Department of Justice, over which in our experience, two administrations and four successive attorneys general have presided. And still we have not had our first hearing!

Under the Truman administration, hearings were excluded. One suffered the bureaucratic, administrative acts of attorney general with no recourse but court action. A commitment made to the ISL that its case would be reviewed was never honored. A change in administration halted our efforts to proceed further.

The "List" Link

But the promised reforms under the Eisenhower administration, too, have not yet been realized. It was hoped in the beginning, when Presidential Order No. 10450 was issued granting hearings, that the ISL would at last be able to come to grips with its case. It went through the elaborate procedures contained in the above order. The attorney general presented a state of grounds and interrogatories to the ISL. The monstrous character of the grounds and the even more monstrous interrogatories were dealt with and replied to fully by the ISL as far back as September 3, 1953. They were published in full in LABOR ACTION. There remained only the actual hearing itself which was provided for in the procedures drawn of the attorney general.

Seven months have passed since the reply was made and a hearing has not yet been set. Nor is there any sign whatever that Brownell, the politician attorney general, who is quite ready to publicly "convict" organizations, is even going to grant a hearing provided for in his own procedures.

This is what Mrs. Shipley has referred to as a "temporary and conditional" situation.

One thing at a time: We are preparing our court case now against the State Department; tomorrow we will go on with our case against the attorney general. The Workers Defense League which is handling our case is ready to make the test to the end. With the assistance of the WDL and its tireless secretary, Rowland Watts, who has been a source of strength for us, and with our excellent counsel, we are confident of the outcome.

For the Record: THE ISL PASSPORT CASE

A Synopsis

(1) February 10, 1953.
Max Shachtman made application for a passport on the letterhead stationery of the Independent Socialist League, as its national chairman. He stated his intention to travel to Europe for the purpose of collecting information and material for lectures and articles to be written in the United States.
No reply from the State Department.
(2) April 30, 1953.
Shachtman addressed a communication to R. B. Shipley, director of Passport Office, requesting information on his case and inquiring for the reasons why the State Department had not acted on his passport application.
No reply from the State Department.
(3) Mid-July, 1953.
Joseph L. Rauh Jr. of Washington, Shachtman's counsel, telephoned the State Department and in conversation with Ashley J. Nicholas protested the

failure of the State Department to acknowledge Shachtman's application and communications sent to it. Rauh pointed out that the rules of the State Department barring passports to certain individuals did not apply to Shachtman.
In reply, Nicholas stated that while Rauh's point may have been correct before Stalin's death, the situation had changed with his death. Rauh pointed out that Stalin's death had nothing to do with Shachtman's anti-Stalinist views which were political, not personal.
Nicholas requested an affidavit to that effect.
(4) July 17, 1953.
The affidavit referred to was sent. Shachtman also sent a letter requesting that the State Department render an immediate decision on his application so that, if it is in the negative, an appeal might be made to the proper body.
No reply from the State Department.
(5) October 8, 1953.

Telegram sent to the State Department protesting its failure to answer the letter and affidavit of July 17. Once more, a request was made for a hearing.
(6) October 9, 1953.
Reply telegram received from the State Department. An informal hearing was granted for November 3, although the telegram did not state whether the application was accepted or rejected, and if rejected, what were its grounds.
(7) October 15, 1953.
Another telegram sent to the State Department requesting information, if the passport application had been denied, that it state the grounds so that Shachtman might know exactly what material he would have to discuss, or what charges to refute, in a hearing.
(8) October 22, 1953.
The first communication received from the State Department since February 10 was signed by R. B. Shipley, and stated that a passport was denied because

Shachtman belonged to an organization on the attorney general's list of "subversive organizations."
(9) November 3, 1953.
An informal hearing was held with Ashley B. Nicholas. Max Shachtman and Albert Gates were presented on behalf of the ISL with their counsel, Joseph L. Rauh, and a stenographer. A Mr. Dalies was also presented for the State Department. Views of Shachtman and ISL were presented.
Nothing was heard from the State Department thereafter.
(10) January 15, 1954.
Shachtman appealed to the newly established Appeals Board of the State Department headed by Thurston B. Morton. Appeal was made on the assumption that passport denial remained in effect following the hearing of November 3.
(11) January 22, 1954.
Mr. Sipes, on behalf of the Appeals Board, denied a hearing to Shachtman, on the ground that the board had no information of the case of the denial of a passport to him under Sections 51.135 and 51.136, the basis upon which appeals could be made.
(12) January 21, 1954.
On this date, one day earlier than the letter from Mr. Sipes, Mrs. Shipley wrote to Attorney Rauh, reaffirming the decision to deny a passport on the ground of Shachtman's membership in an organization on the attorney general's list. No regulations, however, were cited by Mrs. Shipley.
(13) End of January 1954.
Shachtman filed an appeal from the ruling of Mrs. Shipley and requested a hearing before the Appeals Board.
(15) March 8, 1954.
One year and one month after Shachtman's application for a passport, Mrs. Shipley wrote stating that since the denial referred to was not based on Sections 51.135 and 51.136, no appeal was possible.

For the Record: The Subversive List Case

A Synopsis

(1) Summer of 1948.
Workers Party learned from newspaper reports that the attorney general had issued a list of "subversive organizations" which included the WP, though WP never was informed that it was being considered for such listing, nor was it ever advised that it had been placed on the list.
(2) July 20, 1948.
Workers Party communicated with attorney general requesting a hearing. This was sent on the advice of Arthur Garfield Hays, then general counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union, which had been informed of the above.
Reply received from Mr. Quinn, for the attorney general, expressed a willingness to meet with representatives of the WP.
(3) August 3, 1948.
WP acknowledged letter from Quinn but requested that the charges against it be stated so that at a hearing the WP would know just what the charges and evidence were that would have to be met.
This exchange proved fruitless because the attorney general stated he would not grant a "hearing" but only a meeting; furthermore, he would not and could not present the charges against the Workers Party, nor the grounds and the evidence which produced the listing, because the issuance of such information was barred by President Truman's Executive Order No. 9835.
(4) April 19, 1949.
The Workers Party renewed its request for a hearing and information on the grounds for the listing, at the same time demanding removal from the list.
(5) April 28, 1949.
Alex Campbell replying for the attorney general stated:
"Executive Order No. 9835 contains no warrant or authority for disclosing the bases upon which the designations

made pursuant thereto were formulated. The designations were made after careful consideration of the available information, and in the circumstances your request for removal of Workers Party... must be denied."
(6) April 1949.
Workers Party dissolved, and Independent Socialist League formed. The attorney general was informed of this as well as that the basic views of the ISL corresponded with those of the WP.
Sometime thereafter, the ISL was placed on the list. It was never informed of this fact and learned of it only accidentally.
(7) September 25, 1950.
The ISL, after learning that it had been put on the attorney general's list, wrote to Attorney General McGrath referring to the offer of Mr. Quinn and stating that, although desiring a hearing, it would accept a "meeting" in lieu thereof.
In the meantime the Workers Defense League agreed to handle the case of the ISL and to aid it in seeking an attorney to handle the case.
(8) January 25, 1951.
The ISL presented a written petition to the attorney general and met with Raymond P. Whearty and a Mr. Foley, representing the attorney general. Present for the ISL were Max Shachtman and Albert Gates, and, as counsel, Rowland Watts of the WDL.
Not knowing the charges or evidence against it, the ISL made a request for this material. This was denied it by Whearty who declared that he could not divulge this information under Executive Order 9835. Thereupon Shachtman presented the views of the ISL orally and in writing. As a result of the further material presented by Shachtman and Gates and the views of its counsel, Whearty made a solemn commitment to review the case of the ISL.
(9) 1951-1952.

Repeated and unsuccessful efforts were made to obtain from the attorney general the results of the review of the ISL case to which he had committed himself.
Most of the correspondence of the ISL was unanswered. On two occasions the attorney general did reply, once stating that the ISL would be informed when the review was completed; and the other that the review was completed but no decision would be communicated to us until a court case then pending in the Columbia district was first decided.
(10) End of 1952.
The ISL determined that it would get neither satisfaction nor justice from the attorney general and was successful in obtaining the services of Joseph L. Rauh to handle the case under direction of the WDL and ISL.
(11) March, 1953.
A new administration took office and new Executive Order No. 10450 was issued granting hearings before organizations were listed by attorney general. New order published in April. Despite this, all organizations on previous list were retained without a hearing.
(12) May, 1953.
The ISL protested its retention on list and requested an immediate hearing.
(13) July 9, 1953.
For the first time since 1948, the ISL received from the attorney general a statement of grounds and interrogatories precedent to a hearing.
(14) September 3, 1953.
The ISL filed its reply to the attorney general's statement of grounds and interrogatories. No reply was received, nor was a date for a hearing set.
(15) October 8, 1953.
The ISL wired the attorney general inquiring when the hearing of the ISL would be held.
(16) October 21, 1953.
Received a reply from Mr. Olney III, acknowledging wire and asking advice "as to the date of a possible hearing..." He wrote: "Please be assured that it is the policy of this department to give ample advance notice to the designee of any hearing which may take place in connection with this program."
(17) October 29, 1953.
The ISL replied reiterating its request for a hearing date in accordance with the attorney general's own procedures, pointing out that Mr. Olney's communication placed a hearing in the category of a possibility that "may take place," when the granting of a hearing was mandatory.
No reply has ever been received to this communication.

From the Passport Regulations

Following is the text of the provisions of the passport regulations under sections 51.135 and 51.136, limiting the issuance of passports, referred to in the accompanying articles:

Sec. 51.135—Limitation on Issuance of Passports to Persons Supporting Communist Movement. In order to promote the national interest by assuring that persons who support the world communist movement of which the Communist Party is an integral unit may not, through use of United States passports, further the purposes of that movement, no passport, except one limited for direct and immediate return to the United States, shall be issued to:

(a) Persons who are members of the Communist Party or who have recently terminated such membership under such circumstances as to warrant the conclusion—not otherwise rebutted by the evidence—that they continue to act in furtherance of the interests and under the discipline of the Communist Party;

(b) Persons, regardless of the formal state of their affiliation with the Communist Party, who engage in activities which support the Communist movement under such circumstances as to warrant the conclusion—not otherwise rebutted by the evidence—that they have engaged in such activities as a result of direction, domination, or control exercised over them by the Communist movement.

(c) Persons, regardless of the formal state of their affiliation with the Communist Party, as to whom there is reason to believe, on the balance of all the evidence, that they are going abroad to engage in activities which will advance the Communist movement for the purpose, knowingly and willfully of advancing that movement.

Sec. 51.136—Limitations on Issuance of Passports to Persons Likely to Violate Laws of the United States. In order to promote the national interest by assuring that the conduct of foreign relations shall be free from unlawful interference, no passport, except one limited for direct and immediate return to the United States, shall be issued to persons as to whom there is reason to believe, on the balance of all the evidence, that they are going abroad to engage in activities while abroad which would violate the laws of the United States, or which if carried on in the United States would violate such laws designed to protect the security of the United States.

Text of Passport Office Decision

Following is the text of the last communication received from the Passport Office of the State Department, dated March 8, denying Shachtman the right to appeal to the Passport Appeals Board:

My dear Mr. Shachtman:
The Department has received your petition for appeal, dated January 2, 1954, of the decision of the Department refusing you passport facilities.
You are informed that the Department's refusal of a passport to you was not based on the findings that such issue was precluded under the provisions of Section 51.135 or 51.136 of the Passport Regulations. The authority for the refusal is set forth in Section 51.75 of Title 22 of the Code of Federal Regulations which reads as follows: "The Secretary of State is authorized in this discretion to refuse to issue a passport..."
In this connection it may be stated that Sections 51.135 and 51.136 do not limit the authority contained in Section 51.75 but merely prescribe certain categories of persons to whom passports must be refused. No regulations have been promulgated providing appeal procedures for persons who are refused passports for reasons other than those set forth in Sections 51.135 and 51.136 of the Passport Regulations since normally these refusals, in effect, are temporary and conditional and further consideration will be given to the application upon removal of the conditions which caused the refusal. As stated in my letter of January 21, further consideration will be given to the issue of a passport to you if there should be a change in the findings of the attorney general respecting your organization. You were granted an informal hearing in the Passport Office similar to that provided in Section 51.137 and your case thereafter carefully considered by the Department. In the circumstances there does not appear to be any further procedure which you can follow in connection with the passport application at this time.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) R. B. Shipley
Director, Passport Office

Orwell's personal account of the Spanish Civil War
HOMAGE TO CATALONIA
by
George Orwell
\$3.50 Order from:
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

U.S. and Indo-China War — —

(Continued from page 1)

Nations. Most recently this took the form of a threat by the U. S. delegate to the UN, Lodge, to veto the admission of China to the Security Council of the UN on the one hand, while the British delegate (just retired) said that Stalinist China should be admitted once it had "purged itself of aggression," on the other. On freedom of trade, the argument has been raging back and forth across the Atlantic for months.

As far as admission to the UN is concerned, there is good reason to believe that not all policy-makers in the American government are of a single mind. But one thing is certain: there are extremely powerful elements in the Republican Party, led by Majority Leader Knowland and supported by many others, who have made the China issue one of the chief pillars of their political careers.

This group is convinced that the Democrats can be licked time and time again on the claim that they connived at turning China over to the Stalinists. But this issue can remain a burning one in politics only as long as the Republicans keep Chiang Kai-shek's government in Formosa alive as the symbol of their policy for China as opposed to that of their opponents.

Moscow's Handle

As long as the Eisenhower administration fails to break with the "Formosa lobby," its hands are tied on the recognition of Stalinist China or its admission to the UN. And there is no reason to think that any consideration now on the political horizon would induce Eisenhower to break with them.

But the State Department must maintain its alliance with France as well as with Formosa. And here is where the Stalinists hope to put

on their maximum pressure.

The French government has been bled into a dangerous state of anemia by the war in Indo-China. Manpower, military equipment and cash have disappeared in the jungles and rice paddies of that far-off land without bringing any benefit whatever. The war appears to be no closer to a victorious conclusion today than it was four years ago. During the last government crisis, it became clear that political elements who a year or so ago stood firm for a continuation of the war have now softened or gone over to the "peace party."

Wider and wider sections of the nation now hope for some kind of deal with the Vietminh as the only way to end the hopeless situation. And the shock of realization that France cannot hope to win this war

has led to an increase in the strength of neutralist sentiment in the country, which expresses itself also in opposition to the rearmament of Germany and the creation of the European Defense Community.

Terms for a Deal

The tendency in France is increasingly to look forward to the Geneva conference as the diplomatic means by which to end the war in Indo-China. In the meantime, the feeling grows that nothing should be done (such as ratification of the EDC treaties) which might throw a monkey-wrench into the forthcoming negotiations.

The Stalinists are very well aware of this development, and they can be expected to exploit it to the maximum.

The absolute minimum the Stalinists can be expected to demand in exchange for some kind of settlement to the war in Korea and Indo-China is admission of the government of China to the United Nations. If the terms they offer are attractive enough, it is probable that they will be able to move France away from the United States on this issue.

But the Russian Stalinists, especially, may try to play for even higher stakes. It is not at all out of the question that they may demand the abandonment of EDC as their price for an end to the war in the Far East. If, between now and the convening of the conference at the end of April in Geneva, they should really have the French on the run in Indo-China, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that this could deliver the death-blow to the chief American policy in Europe.

Hands Tied

It is quite likely that the American government understands this as well as the most intelligent foreign correspondents who have been writing about it in the press. And that is the reason why the danger of American intervention in Indo-China becomes particularly acute at this moment.

The American government's hands are tied with regard to even so simple and obvious a gesture as admitting the actual government of China to the United Nations. It has shown no ability to devise a political and social program which could undermine the Stalinists either in Korea or Indo-China. The danger of intervention stems from the possibility that it might now seek to make up for this chronic political incapacity by seeking to achieve a quick military victory in Indo-China which will offer it the chance of "negotiating from strength" at Geneva.

It is quite clear that if such a policy should be adopted now, it would be fraught with the gravest danger of exploding World War III. The Stalinists have the enormous political advantage of being able to operate with native political and military forces in Indo-China, as they did in Korea in the initial phase of the war there.

The Americans can hope to quickly turn the military tide only by sending American troops into the country in considerable numbers. The Chinese could be expected to do the same. And there is no guarantee that a second Korea

could be stopped in the same way that the first one was.

France Holds On

Whatever the American government might be inclined to do in this situation, the French can be counted on to resist any attempt by the United States to take over the struggle from them. Unless they were confronted with the ultimate disaster of being driven from their major strongholds in the country in utter rout, they would have absolutely nothing to gain by the repetition of the Korean experience on Indo-Chinese soil. As the French have said, they are fighting in Indo-China only in order to keep that land tied to their empire.

As the French do not seem to be on the verge of complete military disaster in Indo-China, the danger of American military intervention will most likely remain nothing more than a danger, no matter which way the fighting goes at Dienbienphu. But this in no way changes the fact that unless the Vietminh should receive a crushing defeat, the Stalinists will hold the strongest cards at the Geneva conference. Their success in bringing about a major conflict in the American camp may well be hindered by their tendency to overreach themselves more than by anything the State Department can offer in opposition.

Paying the Price

In the politics of nations as well as in the individual lives of men, the chickens have a tendency to come home to roost, sooner or later. The price the American government may have to pay (and the American people will have to pay it in the long run) for supporting reactionary French colonialism ever since World War II may well be the loss of Indo-China to the Stalinists. And as long as Americans continue to choose and support this kind of a government, we will continue to pay the price for its conservative and even reactionary foreign policy down through the years.

What is the alternative? It is a democratic foreign policy which supports the desire of the colonial peoples for freedom and aids them to achieve it. It is a policy which has democratic solutions to offer for Germany as well as for Indo-China, for Morocco as well as for Czechoslovakia.

But such a policy cannot be achieved by liberals when they strive for "bi-partnership" with the Eisenhowers, Knowlands, or even with their Democratic predecessors. It can only be achieved by a political realignment in which the labor movement and the liberal forces of the country work out a foreign policy which corresponds to their own needs and interests rather than to those of American imperialism and its imperialist allies.

Poetry Corner

The UAW's magazine *Ammunition* comments on the statement by GOP National Chairman in which Hall denounced those who are warning of depression as "the left wing in the country," as "horsemen" who are spreading "gloom and doom":
A weather forecaster named Toomey
Was fired; said a senator, "Sue me;
The facts show, t'sk, t'sk,
He's a loyalty risk,
He predicted the day would be gloomy."

ISL FUND DRIVE

One Month to Do the Job!

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

Although there was a sharp rise in income in the Fund Drive this past week, the pace is still far behind what is necessary to complete the quota on schedule. A total of \$1041 came into the National Office during the week, with the National Office quota making its first substantial donation of \$500.

No real change, however, took place in

the standings. Streator still is in first place leading Chicago by a nose. Pittsburgh and Cleveland moved up. The standings reveal that most of the areas assigned quotas are still below the 50 per cent mark and that is where the difficulty lies.

New York, with the largest quota, while it has been doing quite well in recent weeks, still has a long way to go to reach a respectable place in the standings. At 42.5 per cent New York is only in 8th place. Behind it, however, we find the Bay Area, National Office, Philadelphia and Detroit, each one of them capable of doing much better than they have.

The reverse surprise of the campaign has been the failure of Los Angeles to make even a squeak. Six weeks since the drive started, Los Angeles has yet to send in the first contribution. Seattle too hasn't made a response yet. We like to think that these two Coast cities are waiting to send in large contributions at one time. Well, we're waiting patiently. When this review of the drive appears there will be one month left to the campaign. That is the crucial period, as it is in all fund drives. We are counting on the branches putting on their greatest efforts so that by the time May 1 rolls around we shall be able to report that once again we made it.

We are counting on the larger quotas to do the job. That means, of course, New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Bay Area, etc., not to speak of the National Office. We are waiting for strong replies from them.

BOX SCORE

	Quota	Paid	%
TOTAL	\$10,200	\$4328.50	42.4
Streator	25	20	80
Chicago	1800	1435	79.7
Reading	50	35	70
Pittsburgh	150	81	54
Cleveland	150	75	50
Buffalo	300	138	46
Newark	400	178.50	44.6
New York	4000	1702	42.5
Bay Area	500	210	42
St. Louis	25	10	40
Nat'l Office	1500	508	33.8
Philadelphia	250	46	18.4
Detroit	300	0	0
Seattle	150	10	6
Los Angeles	600	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)