

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 26, 1954

FIVE CENTS

**MALAYA — —**  
**New Bastion of "Democracy"**

... page 4

**Freedom vs. American Party Line**

... page 6

**Police-State Bills Flood Congress**

... page 2

**Young People Face Unemployment**

... page 5

## Brownell's Anti-'Red' Bill Shotguns Labor Movement

By SAM ADAMS

Under the guise of the fight against the Communist Party, and "espionage" and "sabotage," Attorney General Brownell introduced a bill which could, if passed, only have laid the groundwork for the destruction of the union movement in the United States. The bill itself was never made public, since the public hearings planned by the Senate Committee on Judiciary were never held. Two days before the public hearings were to be held, Brownell personally appeared before the committee in executive session, at a time when most of the opponents of the bill were not present.

**The Committee voted to call off the public hearings and to report Brownell's bill in amended form. Even then the bill was not made public, but it did appear in part in the Committee report which indicated the kind of standards Mr. Brownell had in mind in his request that he be given the right to name a receiver for or to liquidate any business, trade union or other organization believed to be "Communist infiltrated."**

In a box elsewhere on this page the text of these provisions appears as reported out by the Committee and they indicate how serious is the threat against the essence of the Bill of Rights, of democracy,

and the union movement, as conceived in the mind of Brownell and his like-minded fellows on the Senate Committee. For while they rejected some of Brownell's demands, the essence or spirit of the proposal was retained.

### REED BILL

The House Judiciary Committee also considered the Reed Bill, similarly conceived and presented in behalf of the administration. After a long period of soft and virtually unheard opposition to the utterly reactionary atmosphere and campaign by the administration and its congressional supporters, both CIO President Walter Reuther and AFL President George Meany finally intervened, and at the House Committee meeting successfully urged the setting up of a commission to study the question of "security in the industrial field." Reuther and Meany opposed the Senate and House administration bills.

**Although the Reuther-Meany strategy may have been effective in staving off Brownell's attack on the labor movement, its long-run implications do not bode well for it. After years of claiming that the labor movement is amply capable of handling the Stalinists in its own way, without any government intervention and, in fact, after years of claiming that they have success-**

(Turn to last page)

## U.S. Policy in Shambles At Geneva Conference

By SAM TAYLOR

A cease fire agreement has finally been reached in the eight-year old "dirty war" in Indochina. After three months of negotiations at Geneva, the agreement was reached which enabled the French to salvage, at least for the present, part of their crumbling colonial empire.

This marks one of the great defeats for Western imperialism in Asia and one which is bound to have repercussions in France's North African colonies. But this defeat of Western imperialism is no victory for the cause of democracy, for at the same time it is a victory for Stalinism. It means the expansion of Stalinist influence and power among the peoples of Southeast Asia.

Indochina had become a pawn in the diplomatic struggle going on at Geneva between China and Russia on the one side and Britain, France and the United States on the other. An agreement has been reached over the body of the Indochinese people in which they were not the participants.

The main terms of the agreement as they are known at this time call for:

- The division of Viet Nam in two at the 17th Parallel with the French retaining control in the south and the Stalinists in the north.
- The French are to evacuate the north Viet Nam capital of Hanoi in two months and its port of Haiphong in ten months.
- Vietminh areas of control in south Viet Nam will be gradually withdrawn.
- Fighting to cease in Cambodia and Vietminh is to withdraw its forces.
- Two northern provinces of Laos are to be controlled by Vietminh and Vietminh is to cease fighting and withdraw from the rest of Laos.
- Elections are to be held simultaneously in north and south Viet Nam before July 1956.
- A three power commission of India, Canada and Poland is to supervise the terms of the cease fire arrangement.

This was a typically cynical negotiation over the fate of a small country by the big powers in the cold war, in which the interests of the Indochinese people were sacrificed in the name of jockeying for advantage in other places. The Viet Nam and Vietminh foreign ministers were present at Geneva, but no one took them seriously as having a voice in deciding the fate of their country.

The drafts which formed the basis of the cease fire agreement were drawn up by a committee consisting of Russian Foreign Minister Molotov, British Foreign Minister Eden and French Premier Mendes-France.

Whatever myths may have persisted to this late date of the independence of the Vietminh from Russian and Chinese domination should have been destroyed by their demonstration of subservience at Geneva. It is inconceivable that Stalinist-controlled Vietminh would have agreed to the partition if it had not been forced on them by Moscow and/or Peiping. Even the out and out puppet Bao Dai Viet Nam regime had to make a formal protest against this travesty. Nevertheless the Vietminh played some kind of a role at Geneva, if only because the French had to confer with them over the arrangements for the cease fire.

Just prior to the signing of the agreement the Bao Dai regime circulated a series of proposals for a cease fire without a partition of the country. It also called for the simultaneous disarming of Vietminh troops and the withdrawal of all foreign troops, and for the United Nations to control the country until elections are held at some undetermined time.

**But no one took the Viet Nam objections to the partition seriously, since it was reported in the press that Dr. Tran Van Do, the Viet Nam foreign minister, had told Anthony Eden, British foreign secretary, that his government was prepared to accept any solution reached at the conference. More than likely the proposals and the protests against partition were meant for home consumption primarily. However, they do go to the heart of the relationship between France and Viet Nam and that is that Viet Nam is a French colony and Bao Dai heads a puppet government which is viewed as expendable from French interests. . . . The Bao Dai regime exists only by fiat of the French colonial office which saw little reason to even inform the Viet Nam delegation of what was going on.**

Nevertheless the protests raised about the partition of the country are legitimate. The examples of partitioned Germany and Korea, where it is unlikely that free and democratic elections for unification will be held in the foreseeable future, are fresh in everyones mind. Once again we see where the imperialist

(Turn to last page)

## How "Communist-Infiltration" Would Be Determined

"In making such determination with respect to any organization, the Board would be required to take into account—

"(1) the extent to which the effective management of the affairs of such organization is conducted by one or more individuals who are, or within five years have been, (A) members, agents, or representatives of any Communist organization, any Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title, with knowledge of the nature and purpose thereof, or (B) engaged in giving aid or support to any such organization, government, or movement with knowledge of the nature and purpose thereof;

"(2) the extent to which the policies of such organization are, or within five years have been, formulated and carried out pursuant to the direction or advice of any member, agent or representative of any such organization, government or movement.

"(3) the extent to which the personnel and resources of such organization are, or within five years have been, used to further or promote the objectives of any such Communist organization, government or movement;

"(4) the extent to which such organization within 5 years has received from, or furnished to or for the use of, any such Communist organization, government or movement any funds or other material assistance;

"(5) the extent to which such organization is, or within five years has been, affiliated in any other way with any such Communist organization, government or movement;

"(6) the extent to which the affiliation of such organization, or of any individual or individuals who are members or who manage its affairs, with any such Communist organization, government or movement is concealed from or is not disclosed to the membership of such organization; and

"(7) the extent to which such organization or any of its members or managers are, or within five years have been knowingly engaged—

"(A) in any conduct punishable under Section 4 or 15 of this act or under chapter 37, 105, or 115 of title 18 of the U. S. Code; or

"(B) with intent to impair the military strength of the United States or its industrial capacity to furnish logistical or other support required by its Armed Forces, in any activity resulting in or contributing to such impairment.

"Sections 4 and 15 of the act, referred to in subparagraph (7) (A) of the foregoing standards, prescribe criminal penalties for the violation of substantive provisions contained in the [Internal Security] Act. Chapters 37, 105, and 115 of title 18 of the U. S. Code . . . are penal in nature and are entitled respectively 'Espionage and Censorship,' 'Sabotage,' and 'Treason, Seditious and Subversive Activities.'"

—Mr. Butler, from the Senate Committee on the Judiciary (Report No. 1709) to accompany S 8706, to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide for the determination of the identity of Communist-infiltrated organizations.

# Police-State Measures Deluge Congress

By GORDON HASKELL

This session of Congress has seen the government press forward with a number of police-state measures.

Discussed elsewhere in this issue of LABOR ACTION is Brownell's proposal to make any organization branded as "communist infiltrated" subject to dissolution or government seizure. In addition, however, there has been a whole series of other measures which have met varying fates in Congress, and on some of which final action has not yet been taken.

As we go to press, the New York Times states that the House of Representatives has just passed and sent to the White House a bill to force "subversive" organizations to provide the government with a list of their printing machinery, down to and including mimeograph machines. From the article it appears that this measure would apply to organizations which had been cited by the Subversive Activities Control Board, set up under the McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950. The Board has so far declared only the Communist Party to be subversive, and its findings are now in process of appeal to the courts.

It is interesting to note how that defender of civil liberties, the New York Times, describes the reason for this bill in a way which is intended to make it appear other than a direct violation of freedom of the press.

"The material issuing from these machines," says the Times for July 20, "makes it more difficult for government agencies to determine what passes by printed word between Communist party leaders and their operatives."

The Communist Party hardly needs printing presses, or even mimeograph machines for communication between the leaders and "their operatives." The prime function of printing presses is to publish materials for the purpose of spreading their political views.

## DEATH PENALTY

On July 8, the House passed a bill which widens the definition of espionage and sabotage, eliminates any statute of limitations in their prosecution, and makes the death penalty applicable even in peacetime.

On July 7, the House passed a bill imposing savage penalties for those who harbor fugitives. From the argument it is clear that this was done not because the police seek to stamp out criminal activity, but as a measure against people who might want to hide political fugitives.

So far, the Brownell-sponsored bills to force people to testify before congressional committees by granting them immunity from prosecution for any illegal activity which might be disclosed by their testimony has hit the snag of congressional resistance, as has the bill which would permit the use of evidence obtained by wiretapping in federal courts. In both cases the chief reason for the resistance seems to be some congressional squeamishness over giving the attorney general too much power, a squeamishness which is reinforced by observation of the way Brownell has been using the power he already has.

According to the press, the Sen-

ate Judiciary Committee has just voted out a bill to "bar from defense plants any individual against whom there was 'reasonable' belief that he might become subversive."

## ANYTHING POSSIBLE

This wording (New York Times, July 20) is so loose that it is difficult to believe that even in these times Congress would pass legislation to penalize persons on the "reasonable belief" that they might commit future acts. Yet, when it is borne in mind that Congress has already passed legislation which, in an emergency, would permit the authorities to imprison or "detain" people against whom there might be reasonable suspicion that they might commit sabotage or espionage, it appears that anything is possible.

As Congress stampedes through the passages of this type of legislation, one is led to wonder what threat to the present government and its social system can possibly justify, even in the minds of government leaders, this attack on the

legal safeguards and civil liberties of the people.

In view of the current impotence and isolation of the American Stalinist movement, it would appear that Washington has been gripped in some kind of an insane frenzy. The "justification" which preys at the back of the minds of government officials was recently given by an FBI agent to a person he was questioning about the radical movement in this country.

## NO GUARANTEE

When asked why the government should spend so much money and show concern to pry into the affairs of small socialist propaganda and educational organizations, the FBI man replied: "They may not always be so small. After all, what guarantee is there that present economic conditions will last forever? If we have another depression, these organizations may find a lot of people to listen to them."

That, it would appear, is as good a reason as any to lay the groundwork now for the suppression of

## AS WE GO TO PRESS

According to the New York Times on July 21 the House of Representatives passed a bill stripping United States citizenship from any person who advocates violent overthrow of the government. The measure was passed unanimously, by voice vote, without debate or demand for explanation of the measure. At the same time, a House Judiciary subcommittee approved a bill that would outlaw the Communist Party "or organizations following its line." Conviction for membership in such organizations would draw penalties of up to ten years in prison and \$10,000 fines.

More comment on these bills next week.

the freedom of press and association, so that when the day comes when this government's rule by the consent of the governed is endangered, no voice may be raised in the land around which the people could rally to re-organize the government in such a form as would seem to them most likely to ensure their future security and happiness.

## PENNSYLVANIA

# COAL MINERS ON THE DEFENSIVE

By GERALD McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, July 20 — Coal miners are everywhere on the defensive today.

Twenty large mines in western Pennsylvania are currently on strike in a wildcat dispute aimed at defending their contract. The mines, employing a total of fifteen thousand, include the largest local in the UMW at the largest mine in the world, the U. S. Steel Robena mine at Masontown, Pa.

The strike, now in its second week, began when the Nemacolin mine, a captive mine of Youngstown Sheet and Tube, laid off 235 men without observing seniority. The Nemacolin diggers struck when UMW district officials were unable to adjudicate the grievance. They then established picket lines at other mines in the area. These picket lines have so far been observed by the other locals, despite efforts of UMW District Four president William Hynes to get the men back to work.

The mines involved are large, modern, mechanized mines which in recent years have shown increasing independence from UMW headquarters. The large locals at the newer mechanized mines resist domination by the international more successfully than the older type of small mine where the locals were small in size and had little chance to develop leadership of their own.

## DEFENSIVE ACTION

The District Four wildcat is the second defensive action forced on miners in western Pennsylvania this year. Recently near Johnstown, Pa., a small mine tried to repudiate its union contract and remain open without contributing to the Health and Welfare Fund. Mass picketing prevented the mine from operating.

Nevertheless, throughout the nation, the amount of non-union coal being dug is increasing. The coal deposits in the United States are so extensive that small marginal mines—"gopher hole" or "wagon mines," as they are called—are easily exploited. Operated by a few men—often union miners driven to such work by long unemployment—they can undersell union-mined coal because they do not pay a per-ton royalty to the Health and Welfare Fund. The Tennessee Valley Authority, for example, which buys a good deal of coal,

has been buying non-union coal recently because it is required by law to buy from the lowest bidder.

Even harder hit are the anthracite fields of eastern Pennsylvania. Miners in the Panther Valley recently struck in protest against a plan authorized by the international union whereby the contract would be altered in the company's favor. The international said that the plan was necessary in order to keep the company in business. The company went out of business anyway.

Because of the desperate situation in the anthracite fields, pensions for anthracite miners were cut in half early this year. The anthracite industry has a fund of its own, separate from the bituminous industry. The 50 per cent cut was forced by a drop in anthracite production and a consequent drop in royalty payments. Pensioners have had to go on relief.

## NO PROGRAM

In the face of this situation, John L. Lewis has no real program. He can only call for tinkering with the tariff to keep out foreign petroleum products, or for government subsidies to force U. S. coal on foreign markets where it is normally not competitive. Both of these measures are unacceptable to the government and to powerful export industries like auto and steel. Eisenhower has finally acknowledged the existence of a bad situation in coal—by appointing a commission to study it. He was asked to do this by congressmen from coal producing areas over a year ago. A report can be confidently expected by 1960.

The truth of the matter is that the coal miners' problems, more than those of almost any other section of the labor movement, require a social solution as part of a planned economy. That is exactly what the present leadership of the UMW will not fight for. When coal is in short supply, as it has been only during the two world wars, Lewis can bargain sharply. But this is not possible today, and there appears to be no prospect, short of another war, that coal will be again in short supply for at least a decade.

The welfare fund exhibited the greatest social vision attained by Lewis in his career as a leader of the miners, and there is no denying its achievements or the gratefulness that Lewis has earned with the rank and file as a result of it. However, like the escalator clause, or the guaranteed annual wage, or unemployment compensation, or the thirty-hour week or other useful but piecemeal attempts at solving labor's problems short of the reorganization of society on a socialist basis, the welfare fund is not de-

pression-proof. In the anthracite fields, as already pointed out, it is not even recession proof. And even aside from that, how can a miner afford to qualify for a pension if he is to be on a two-day work week (or less) for year after year?

There is certainly a lesson in this for steelworkers and truck drivers. They must resist any attempt by their leaders to put their unions under the backward leadership of John L. Lewis. And coal miners must press for a more progressive policy within their union as well as for real labor unity, and not a fake unity which has as its basis the disruption of the AFL and CIO.

## READ ABOUT SOCIALISM

The Fight for Socialism ..... cloth \$2  
paper \$1  
by Max Shachtman

Socialism: the Hope of Humanity ..... .10  
by Max Shachtman

Marxism in the U. S. .... .35  
by Leon Trotsky

Plenty for All: The Meaning of Socialism ..... .25  
by Ernest Erber

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

Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

## There's No Angel Around

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

A sub is only \$2 a year—  
Subscribe now!



## A Partial Victory in Fight on Army McCarthyism

# Army Grants Miller General Discharge

As a result of the intervention of the Workers Defense League and Norman Thomas, Barry Miller, whose case was reported in LABOR ACTION of July 6, has had his discharge changed from "Undesirable Discharge" to a General Discharge, a discharge under honorable conditions.

The undesirable discharge was issued on June 8 without a hearing, even though one was requested by Miller and his counsel, Rowland Watts, Secretary of the WDL. It was granted at a time when Miller awaited a call to a hearing where he was prepared to present a strong case against the army's action.

Both the WDL and Norman Thomas had protested the action and requested an immediate review by the Army Discharge Review Board. Thomas wrote additionally to Hugh H. Milton II, assistant secretary of the army and sent copies of this letter in addition to other correspondence to President Eisenhower, Senator H. Alexander Smith of New Jersey (Miller's resident state) and Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, where Miller lived while attending the University of Chicago.

## GENERAL DISCHARGE

On the 19th of July, Thomas made public a reply from Milton in which it was stated that the army would recover the undesirable discharge and issue the new one cited above. Although no official communication has as yet been received of this new action, Thomas asserted that it was only a matter of time when it would be forthcoming. Upon receipt of the new official "General Discharge," the WDL will consider its next steps in the case, since it feels that the change of the army's position in the Miller case signifies that he should have received nothing less than an "Honorable Discharge."

Commenting on the case, Watts said: "The action concerning Barry Miller does not go far enough. For five weeks he has been unemployed, and the discharge has stood in the way of his getting a job.

"In June, it cost him a position as a microwave technical teacher with a large New York corporation. The army's admission that an 'undesirable discharge' should not have been issued to Miller implies that the army recognizes he is not a security risk. If that is so, then he is clearly entitled to an honorable discharge on the basis of his excellent service."

We print below excerpts from Norman Thomas' statement on the case as it well summarizes the events of the past two weeks:

## LETTER OF PROTEST

"The Miller case had been brought to my attention through the Workers De-

fense League and other agencies. I wrote a strong letter of protest to Army Secretary Stevens, not only in behalf of Miller but of all members of our citizen army who are subject to such drastic and unfair procedure. (Secretary Wilson has just testified that there have been 80 discharges as security risks and over 300 cases are pending under investigation.) In due course, and after considerable correspondence with various persons, including President Eisenhower and Senator H. Alexander Smith, I received from Hugh H. Milton, II, assistant secretary of the army, under date of July 8, 1954, the following statement:

"Following the receipt of your most recent letter to me, I took the liberty personally of referring this case, and other similar cases, to the Army Discharge Review Board. After careful consideration of all of the facts in the case, the board determined that Mr. Miller should have been awarded a General Discharge, a discharge under honorable conditions. This decision was furnished to me only yesterday. The Adjutant General will now, in accordance with established procedure, take immediate action to recover the Undesirable Discharge from Mr. Miller. Upon its receipt it will be destroyed and a General Discharge will be issued. By this procedure, no stigma of the original discharge will remain with Mr. Miller."

## NEED FOR A CHANGE

"Mr. Milton also enclosed the directive of the Defense Department, dated April 7th, under which action had been taken for the summary dismissal of Mr. Miller, and the more elaborate directive of the army, issued under date of June 18th, implementing the earlier directive. Mr. Miller's attorney, Rowland Watts of the Workers Defense League, a man with experience in these cases, has made an analysis of the army order in its latest form and finds it improved over the procedures used in the original discharge of Mr. Miller. There is, as his careful analysis shows, still need for further changes to protect the legitimate rights of free born Americans who may be drafted into the army. It should be recorded that neither Mr. Miller nor Mr. Watts has yet been officially informed of the action of which Assistant Secretary Milton wrote me. But that is doubtless merely a question of time.

"Mr. Miller is still looking for a job. The employment which he had regarded as certain after his army service has been denied him because of the undesirable discharge which for a great many men comes close to a sentence of permanent unemployment.

"That is why the Miller case is important. I rejoice both that the army finally corrected, in part, the injustice to Mr. Miller and I welcome the improvements in procedure indicated by the directives of June 18th. But by no means has the army yet reached a security procedure which is in accord with American doctrines of individual right and fair play..."

# Chiang Buries Opponents Alive

Since the end of World War II, hundreds of thousands of people have escaped from Stalinist "democracy" by fleeing across the iron-curtain frontiers.

In addition to the Stalinist lands, there is another "democracy" which keeps throwing off its own quota of political refugees. This is none other than America's bastion of freedom in the Far East, Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa.

Most recent refugee from Chiang's "democracy" to come to our attention is a 26-year-old captain in Chiang's marines, Hsuan Wei.

Hsuan was sent to this country in 1952 for further training. He does not want to return to his country, and is now being held for deportation by American authorities on the claim of the Chiang government that he is a "deserter."

"I wouldn't have a chance if I were sent to Formosa," Hsuan told reporters in San Francisco when he is being held for deportation. "There is no such thing there

as a fair court martial, and I would be tortured and put to death.

"In September 1950," he continued, "Chiang Kai-shek's secret police rounded up 150 of my friends who had expressed dissatisfaction with the dictator state. Each of the 150 had a black hood put over his face. They were then trucked to a trench in a field, struck on the head and knocked unconscious, and were buried alive.

"I am still faithful to the anti-communist intent of the nationalist government, but I don't want to be under the present police state policies of that government. If the regime changes to a more democratic one, I will be glad to return to Formosa. If not, I would like to remain permanently in this country and, if possible, become an American citizen."

Hsuan is said to be in close touch with Dr. K. C. Wu, former governor of Formosa, who is also a fugitive from Chiang's democracy living in this country.

## LONDON LETTER

# Britain-Egypt Deal on Suez Leaves Middle East in Flux

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, July 14—Last week negotiations between the British and Egyptian governments over the evacuation of the Suez Canal were resumed. It is now clear that they have reached the stage where success seems imminent.

The main points of agreement so far reached are as follows:

(1) Britain would evacuate her 80,000 troops within two years.

(2) She would keep 1000 technicians to maintain the base. These men would wear civilian clothes and be present in the status of civilians.

(3) In the event of an attack on any Arab-bloc country, or on Turkey, or (it is implied) a world war, Britain would have the right to re-enter the zone without further negotiation.

One may recall that this 103 mile long canal, completed with forced labor in 1869, was put under British military control as a result of the bribing by Disraeli of the then bankrupt Khedive of Egypt with four million pounds. Today it is worth about forty million pounds economically to Britain, and she has about ten times that figure of military installations there.

The economic and strategic importance of the base to British trade cannot be exaggerated. The establishment of troops will be transferred to Cyprus, Libya and Jordan. This move, previously reported in LABOR ACTION, has already begun.

## "SCUTTLE"

It is not at all surprising that when Churchill announced the likelihood of forthcoming agreement at the Conservative Members Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday, there was general consternation. Some Tories shouted "scuttle." The prime minister was at pains to point out how useless the base was to Britain if the local population was hostile. An agreement with Egypt would contribute greatly to the peace and stability of the Middle East.

Churchill enlisted Eden's help to try to pacify ultra-reactionary dissenters who wanted the British government to fight it out with Egypt if necessary. Mr. Butler, the chancellor of the exchequer, was called in to prove what a financial boon it would be to Britain not to have to run the Canal Zone. Perhaps this argument might persuade the rebels?

But no. Three hours after this meeting a group of thirty to forty ultra-reactionary Tories under a Captain Waterhouse announced that they will be forced to vote against the agreement when it is brought up in Parliament. About twenty of them said they will defy the government whips. This revolt within the Tory Party of a marginal number of members of Parliament will mean that the government will have to rely on the Labor Party's support for the agreement when it is put to the vote. Although it will not be reticent to support the Tories on an important forward move, the Labor Party may well recall some of the Tories' remarks in 1947

when an agreement on similar lines between Bevin and Farouk seemed impending.

The threat of guerrilla activity in Egypt and the uselessness of Suez without Egyptian cooperation seem to be the important factors forcing the Churchill government to take this historic move. The configuration of Middle Eastern powers will naturally be greatly changed, and their reactions have already been reported to London.

## LYBIA AND JORDAN

Both Libya and Jordan which already receive large British subsidies for their armies favor the increase of British establishments because it brings more money into the country. In Jordan it forms a substantial fraction of the whole budget. On the other hand, both being members of the Arab League and desiring national independence their hearts have been contradicting their pockets. Statements from different organizations in these countries have so far been equivocal.

We have previously reported the Cypriot views on the enlargement of the British base. The Greek 60 per cent of the population feels that now is the time to increase its agitation for unity with Greece to prevent Britain from keeping too many troops in their island. The governor-general and executive are trading warily as the Greek Orthodox Patriarchy favor union with Greece.

It is hardly necessary to say that Israel is greatly interested in the future of the Canal Zone. Once the British evacuate, will Colonel Nasser, Colonel Salem and General Neguib turn the evil eye on Israel? Or, as Nasser is reliably reported to have given private assurances as far back as 1948, will the elimination of Britain from the Egyptian scene make the political climate more suitable for peace in the Middle East.

## DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD

Again, the proposed treaty contains a double-edged sword. The British are to reoccupy the Canal Zone in the event of an attack on the Arab states. If a second round between the Arabs and Israel does come and the British do re-occupy the Canal Zone, will they act to help the Arab states against Israel, or to restore peace? Israel radio seems to have painfully little doubt about which of these alternatives the British will embrace.

Although Turkey is not in the Arab bloc, but has joined NATO and the Balkan Pact, the Turks have welcomed the forthcoming agreement. Relations between Turkey and Egypt have recently been temporarily poisoned by an incident which involved Turkish-held land in Egypt belonging to ex-Egyptian monarchists. But the similarity in appeal, in method, and in inspiration between the present Egyptian junta and the late Kemal Ataturk makes it very unlikely that their two countries can long remain far apart.

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### HYSTERICAL DEVERALL

To the Editor:

On June 21st, LABOR ACTION reprinted a story by Richard Deverall, the AFL's representative in Japan. The editor's statement in introducing the article made it plain that LABOR ACTION dissociates itself from the American chauvinism of the *New Leader* where the article first appeared. In order to prevent any possible misunderstanding by Asian readers, I think it should be made plain that LABOR ACTION also dissociates itself from the activities and writings of Deverall, whose hysterical red-baiting in Japan has earned him the disapproval of many non-Stalinist Asian radicals and intellectuals.

I realize, of course, that LABOR ACTION reprinted Deverall's condemnation of the Thailand government because, if Deverall criticized an ally of the United States, that ally must be bad.

Fraternally,  
Gerald McDERMOTT

LABOR ACTION, we are sorry to say, is not sufficiently informed on Deverall's

activities in Asia. We simply assumed that an AFL representative who writes for the *New Leader* would not be likely to denounce a U. S. ally in Asia unless its scandalous character simply could not be buried from view.—Ed.

### NO LITERACY TESTS!

To the Editor:

Re the undemocratic edict of the Guatemalan junta disfranchising the illiterate.

You mention that a literacy requirement for voting is reasonable in the United States, where compulsory education has existed for a long time. But the undemocratic nature of the Guatemalan edict is even more apparent when it is realized that even in the U. S. there is no literacy requirement!

Each state is empowered to set such requirements, but only New York and a couple of others actually have literacy tests. None of the big industrial states of the Middle West have any literacy requirement.

Saul BERG

July 15, 1954



# U.S. Proposes to Draw "A Line of Defense" in Southeast Asia Through Malaya—the Next Bastion of "Democracy"

By L. G. SMITH

As the Geneva talks looking toward some kind of a truce in the conflict for Indochina continue, the notion keeps cropping up that whatever may happen in that French colony, the capitalist imperialists had better "draw a line" somewhere in Southeast Asia. The Stalinists would then be warned: so far, and no further. And all governments which had agreed to "draw the line" would then be pledged to go to war to stop the Stalinists from crossing it.

Let us take a look at this "line" which is to be drawn. It will either have to run through Laos and Cambodia, in which case the argument can start right now as to whether the Stalinists have not already transgressed it. Or, if Laos and Cambodia are deemed too weak or too far gone, it will have to be drawn through Thailand and Malaya.

In its issue for June 21, Labor Action quoted Richard Deverall, AFL representative in Asia, to the effect that Pibul Songgram's regime in that country is "semi-totalitarian," that in it "corruption is reaching monumental proportions . . . public morality has deteriorated to the lowest depths; that there is no justice in the administration," and the like. He described the activities of the American representatives in that country as anti-labor. And he ended his article: "Thailand has been hailed as the bastion of anti-Communist democracy in Southeast Asia. Thailand is anti-Communist. But it is far less democratic today than before the American aid program began. . . ."

In these circumstances, it is clear that the Stalinists will have no difficulty in "crossing the line" politically in Thailand. This will not involve the marching of troops over the border from Laos and Cambodia. It would be the inevitable long-range result of an American policy which backs up a government of graft, corruption, exploitation and denial of elementary civil liberties to its own people.

## MALAYA

Directly south of Thailand lies Malaya, the last complete British colony in Southeast Asia. This fabulously wealthy peninsula, with its mixed population of Chinese, Malays and Indians is today, and has been for six years, little better than an armed camp. Stalinism crossed "the line" through Malaya long ago, and after six years of open guerrilla warfare the British are no closer to victory there than they were when the fighting started.

Americans, however, are being prepared to swallow the idea that Malaya is some kind of a peaceful democracy which can and must be saved for the free world. As long as the French seemed able to hold their own in Indochina, we received the same kind of lulling story about the situation there. To be sure, there was Stalinist guerrilla activity. But a succession of "stern" or "vigorous" French generals were sent to the scene who announced a succession of "vigorous" plans for "mopping up" the Stalinist "bandits." Then, one dark morning, we

were informed that the fate of freedom and democracy, of Southeast Asia and perhaps the world hung on whether or not American military intervention could save the country from complete Stalinist domination.

Now we are getting the same kind of preparation for Malaya. A case in point is an article by Keyes Beech carried in the July 3 Chicago Daily News. A sub-head on the article informs us that: "In sharp contrast to the tragedy of the French policy in Indochina is the apparent success of the British in meeting a similar Communist threat in nearby Malaya. Malaya may be an important key in new defense plans against the spread of Communism in the Far East." Then Beech begins with this punchy sentence:

## STARVE THEM

"The British have found the most effective method yet devised to deal with Communist guerrillas—starve them to death."

The difficulty in getting rid of the guerrillas, it seems, is that they draw support from the Chinese section of the population. Thus, British General Sir Gerald Templer hit on the ingenious scheme of defeating the guerrillas by proceeding against the whole Chinese population of the peninsula.

"In five years," Beech reports, "the British moved and resettled 700,000 squatters. One entire village was floated down river for 25 miles on rafts. The transplanted squatters were given a plot of land and \$33 to build homes. Schools and medical facilities were established.

"Barbed wire was run around the villages and they were under guard day and night. Some food packages leaked out to the Reds, but not many.

"Food withholding came next. Rice was rigidly rationed in Malaya and no family was permitted to have more than a two weeks' supply at one time. Storekeepers

were required to puncture a tin of food when it was sold, so that it wouldn't keep for more than a day."

Despite these harsh measures, and probably also to no small measure because of them, the guerrilla movement was not halted by the resettlement. The resettled villages were divided into "Red" and "White" depending on the amount of guerrilla activity which was taking place in the vicinity.

"Rigid discipline and stern reprisals," writes Beech, "were taken against 'Red' villages. Gradually, more and more villages began to turn 'White.' Their reward was more and better food, more freedom of movement, more entertainment and recreation."

All this no doubt made things very tough on the guerrilla bands in the jungle, and a number of guerrillas surrendered rather than continue to fight on a starvation basis. Despite all this, Beech reports that "the Reds still haven't been completely defeated. They are still able to dig up recruits." And he is stating the case not only mildly, but strictly for ill-informed American consumption.

## MANAGEABLE PROPORTIONS

The quieting down of the guerrilla warfare in Malaya has led, according to Beech, to a reduction of the Stalinist threat in that colony to "what the British call 'manageable proportions.'" And he deduces from this that General Templer ("a man of humanity, and yet one who demonstrated that he could be just as ruthless as the Communists") is just the man to become supreme commander of any Southeast Asian defense pact that may come into existence.

A completely different picture is painted in the June 12 and 19 issue of the Nation by Victor Purcell, for many years a British civil servant in Malaya. Or rather, the picture which we can feel is there under the imperialist veneer of Beech is filled in by Purcell.

"The situation at the time of the general's departure (May 31, 1954)," writes Purcell, "can be summarized thus. The number of terrorists in the jungle was the same as it had been when he first arrived—namely from five to six thousand—and they were still obtaining all the recruits they needed. In holding this small force some 40,000 troops—30,000 of them British and the rest Malays, Gurkhas, and so

on—100,000 police, and over 200,000 home guards were employed. The number of terrorists who surrendered in 1953 was 370, or about one a day, though for the first four months of 1954 the surrenders have fallen to an average of only a little more than one every other day. . . .

## STALEMATE

"Official propaganda at the moment has ceased to call attention to 'kills' and 'surrenders' and concentrates on the number of areas which have been declared 'white,' that is, free from Communist activity, and from which the emergency controls have been lifted. In late May these areas, mostly coastal strips, were stated to have 1,300,000 inhabitants—about a quarter of the total population of the federation. But how 'white' these areas really are is a matter very much open to question. If the Communists are free to levy toll on an area there will be no 'incidents' and to the naked eye a 'red' and a 'white' area will look equally undisturbed. The fact is, however, that the Communists are still able to stage incidents at will in thickly settled regions which are no more in the jungle than is Times Square. The Malayan war is correctly characterized by the Singapore correspondent of the London Times in October last as a 'stalemate.'"

Among the results were that when Templer attempted to recruit a Federation Regiment as a basis of a national army, only 75 Chinese could be found to volunteer. By the time he left Malaya, the entire legislature of the colony was still nominated by the general, and at least 30 per cent of the Chinese and 60 per cent of the Indians living in it were denied citizenship rights.

This then, along with Thailand, is another bastion of democracy and freedom in Asia, and is another country through which the "line" is to be drawn over which Stalinism dare not step at the risk of bringing on World War III.

It is of the utmost importance that the truth about Malaya and Thailand be spread among the American people, and specially that the labor movement educate its membership about the real nature of the regimes in those countries. For, as we have seen in Korea, and as we have come so close to seeing in Indochina, the fate of these far-off, and to us strange peoples can very well become the fate of ourselves.

# Labor's Choice in California

An exchange of letters in the July 19 New Leader casts a spotlight on the level of thinking on which liberals and labor leaders in this country debate the policies which the labor movement should follow.

In the May 31 issue of the New Leader Frank Mankiewicz had attacked the California American Federation of Labor for endorsing the Republican candidate, Governor Goodwin Knight, for re-election.

In the July 19 issue, one Sol Davison takes up the cudgels for the California AFL. Davison says that the AFL was justified in supporting Knight because "a *quid pro quo* exists in Knight's stand on anti-labor legislation and on the furthering of AFL-sponsored legislation in California. Is this not 'rewarding labor's friends'? What more can the labor movement ask of a political candidate?"

Davison then goes on to admit that "prior to becoming governor, Knight was not considered a friend of labor." He then points out that Warren was also at one time considered anti-labor, but then "went on to become the best friend labor had ever had in the governor's chair. And if Knight seems to be taking a leaf out of the Warren book on labor matters, and if he is to be judged by his actions as governor, does he, too, not deserve labor's support?"

The rest of Davison's defense of the AFL's endorsement for Knight consists of the claim that they had once endorsed Warren, that the teamsters and building trades unions were joined by some others in pushing for the endorsement, and finally, an attack on Knight's Democratic opponent Richard Graves for being a person who as executive secretary of the League of California Cities had lobbied against many measures supported by the AFL.

To this, Mankiewicz enters a firm rejoinder in the same issue of the New Leader. What more can the labor movement ask for a candidate than that he agree not to sponsor anti-labor legislation, says Mankiewicz. And he hastens to reply: "Plenty."

## QUALIFICATIONS

"The labor movement can ask a candidate, if it means what it says about its general responsibilities, for a genuine liberal platform, alive to the needs of the total community, and not the narrow pork-choppery displayed by the California AFL. For example, labor could ask that a candidate support an FEPC . . . that he support the State Senate reapportionment which the State AFL sponsored in 1950, and that he do more for the unemployed than suggest that they go to Ventura County and pick lemons."

Now that sounds like pretty radical talk for a liberal. So we naturally expect him to demonstrate, in the following paragraphs, that his candidate (and that of the CIO), Graves meets the test. Instead, dear reader, we are treated to the following two amazing if not amusing paragraphs:

"As for Grave's labor record," Mankiewicz continues, "it is admittedly meager. But, if he opposed the State Senate reapportionment and supported the anti-public-housing amendment, he did no more than Governor Knight. The difference, if these charges are correct, is that Graves did it from the comparative obscurity of the League of California Cities; Knight of it as Lieutenant-Governor, a powerful vote-getter and tacit leader of the anti-Warren Republicans of California.

"But there is more to it than that. The fact is that whatever his record in the past, Graves today stands forth for these

and all the other liberal measures in the AFL platform, and against the anti-labor measures which Knight had to reverse his field to oppose. On the record, there is no doubt that Graves will take the liberal-labor position if elected, whereas Knight's action in confining his labor sop to specific anti-labor measures would seem to indicate that he will remain the free-wheeling right-winger of old."

## "ON THE RECORD"

Well, there you have it, friends. What are the real qualifications a man should have to get labor's support? Why, he should have conducted his past anti-labor activities in obscurity, and not right out in public where even liberals can't close their eyes to it. What else should mark the man who is to be labor's champion at the hustings? Why, he should be willing to promise, regardless of his whole past record, that in the future he will be for the things that in the past he has been against. And this time, he should stand flatly for everything that he stood roundly or some other way against before. In that case, "whatever his record in the past," there will be no doubt that, "on the record," he will be 100 per cent for labor's program in the future, unlike people who "had to reverse their field" to be against what labor is against now.

These writers are supposed to be defending the policies of the AFL and CIO. But their arguments amount to a condemnation of the policies of both wings of the labor movement. Such is the price for the self-defeating policy of supporting the candidates of either party in California.



## Young Worker Victim Of No-Work Economy

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

I talked to a young high school graduate from Detroit last week. He has volunteered for the army, and so have quite a few of his classmates. His name does not appear in the lists of those affected by unemployment. Yet the reason he is going into the army is precisely because of the unemployment situation in the United States.

This young worker of the Class of '54, and several hundred thousand like him, are part of the hidden figures of unemployment. Since they do not draw unemployment compensation—having been in school for the last nine months—they are not counted in the official assessment of the current recession. More than this, even optimistic predictions of the future point to the fact that the young worker will be a continuing problem, even if other areas of the economy begin an upswing.

According to the June survey of unemployment, i.e., workers getting unemployment compensation, there were 3,347,000 men out of work. This was despite a rise in farm employment of a million workers from May to June. According to the official figures, unemployment had remained more or less steady between May and June.

Yet in that period the major portion of the seven-hundred-and-fifty thousand new workers who enter the economy each year appeared. What happened to these young workers? According to a New York Times survey, "Apparently 300,000 fewer young persons came into the job market than were expected. Those who were not looking for a job were not counted as unemployed. Why fewer young persons looked for jobs this June is largely a matter for theorizing. What evidence there is suggests that the jobs did not seem plentiful enough or the pay attractive enough."

Some of these young workers will eventually find jobs. Some will enter the army out of desperation. But a great percentage of them will simply be unemployed in the coming months or forced to scramble for low-paying jobs on the employment market. They are part of that vast surplus which Walter Reuther has spoken of in his criticism of official unemployment figures. They are among those who are not listed in the pronouncements of the Eisenhower administration because they are not drawing unemployment compensation.

But more importantly, there seems to be little chance of the pressure on the youth to cease even if the rest of the economy enjoys a considerable upswing. This is the opinion of some of the more conservative bourgeois economists. The American young worker is in for a tough time in this rolling-downward adjustment.

### DOCTORED FIGURES

At the peak of post-war unemployment in January of 1950, the percentage of unemployed in the work force reached 7.6 per cent. The highest it has reached in the current recession is 5.8 per cent. Yet, once again, it must be pointed out that these figures do not count all of those actually jobless, especially the young workers. Even with the doctored figures, there are four states today which have unemployment percentages of 9 per cent or over (Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky and West Virginia). In the highly industrialized states like Illinois, Pennsylvania and New York, unemployment as of this summer is between 6 and 8.9 per cent.

Within this context, Sumner Slichter, a conservative bourgeois economist discussed the prospects for the economy in the coming year. His over-all view is optimistic. Yet he writes that unemployment will remain high even if his predicted upsurge of the economy takes place. He holds that "Although the danger of a severe recession seems to be over for the

time being, and although an early upturn in production is in prospect, unemployment may be a troublesome problem for months to come. One reason is that any rise in the demand for goods will be met in part in many plants by restoring working hours to the normal level of the work week, instead of by hiring more workers. This is because numerous firms, rather than discharge employees during the drop in production have kept their people on by reducing the hours worked. A second reason is that many plants through better efficiency will be able to add substantially to their output with little increase in their employees."

The conclusion of this argument is particularly relevant to the problem of the young worker. Writes Slichter, "Finally, the normal growth of the nation's labor force this year will add about 700,000 persons to the number of job seekers." In other words, Slichter is optimistically predicting an economic recovery which will nevertheless be compatible with unemployment figures of over three million, and more specifically, with a vast labor surplus of young workers.

Two elements are very important in this analysis. First, that of the drop in inventories. Slichter rightly characterizes this situation as a result of the fact that "the nation was producing goods faster than it was using them up." Having stated this, more or less as an aside, Slichter lets it rest. He doesn't go into the massive problem of which the drop in the economy in late 1953 and 1954 is only a symptom.

The American productive capacity is now twice as great as it was in the late thirties. It is continually being revolutionized by a yearly technological advance of over two per cent. Within this context, it is necessary, in the long run, to have a continuously expanding economy. A stagnant-healthy economy of the kind Slichter predicts will run square into this technological growth and the yearly influx of new young workers, and will necessarily have the high unemployment which he predicts. In order to absorb the force of these elements, the economy must grow, not mark time.

### PRIMARY VICTIM

Note again that in this kind of an analysis, the young worker is a primary victim of economic instability. He is not even counted in the figures, yet he is among the very first to feel the effect of economic stagnation.

When discussing his second major factor—cuts in federal spending—Slichter's main point seems to be that there wasn't much of a cut, i.e., that tax policy and unemployment benefits actually took up most of the slack occasioned by reductions in government expenditure. Yet even here, Slichter confines himself to a very narrow base, for his conception of government policy is concentrated on individual cases (like tax cuts to the consumers) and nowhere brings in the huge war economy which is the rock-bottom of the economy.

## WHAT FUTURE FOR U. S. YOUTH?

The analysis of the problem facing the young worker made in this issue of *Challenge* was echoed by Walter Reuther, CIO President, last week. Reuther addressed himself to the same problem as the New York Times survey: why did 300,000 young people not show up in the employment figures this year. His answer was this:

"The reason is easily understandable. They have no hope of finding jobs. Failure of the economy to expand as it should has slammed the door to job opportunity in their faces.

"The decision of hundreds of thousands of our young citizens not to engage in a fruitless search for jobs that do not exist results in their omission from the official count of the unemployed."

In his analysis, Reuther went on to point out that there are now one hundred and thirty-two labor market areas classified as being labor surplus, 41 of these areas with more than 12 per cent unemployed. He also emphasized the factors of technological improvement and new workers which are discussed in this week's *Challenge* article. Said Reuther,

"Our labor force is increasing by approximately 900,000 per year. This means our economy must expand to provide that number of job opportunities each year. In addition, productivity advances made possible by advancing science and technology require further expansion to assure employment opportunities for upwards of two million workers who would otherwise be displaced."

The process which Reuther was describing was, in a sense, plain-as-the-nose-on-your-face. Yet two problems follow from it. The first is that the most advanced sections of American labor—symbolized by Reuther—still cling to a faith in a Keynesian remedy to the situation. Thus Reuther, after making of his excellent comment on what is going on, can only call for the administration "to face its responsibilities under the Employment Act of 1946."

We must repeat again that we feel that the history of the New Deal, and especially its inability to end unemployment, far from proving that such techniques will work established their extreme weakness. Today there is no general depression, to be sure. In such a situation, the ameliorative provisions of a Keynesian approach may well have some effect. But it is tragic that the labor movement continues to put its unquestioning faith in an economic technique which failed the only time it was used.

The second point concerns the American political scene. In these labor surplus areas, and among the young workers, recent developments may well have an effect on political sentiment. Right now, it is very important that we intensify our efforts to bring the point of view of democratic socialism to the youth. For today, the young worker is one of the principal victims of this recession in the most prosperous capitalist country in the world.

Today, it is: either the army or unemployment for nearly half a million young American workers. Those figures they are juggling with in Washington are the immediate future of our youth.

At one point, however, the war economy does sneak into his analysis. Writes Slichter, "In the face of the new trend toward the isolation of the United States in foreign affairs, it would not seem prudent for the government to carry out its announced plans for further cuts in its outlays on security." A political reason is given for this judgment—that the growing isolation of the United States is the main cause—but it occurs in an article on the state of the health of the economy. The moral of this aesopian approach is not hard to divine: American foreign policy is tied into the fortunes of the domestic economy, and if the Stalinists are one reason for the garrison state, the internal needs of capitalism are another.

Here is the second part of the equation for the young worker in Detroit. Internal economic crisis drives him into the army. Slichter proposes, in a very real sense, that this be taken as a long-range solution of the problem: that more young men should be driven into the army. Thus the young worker is not only among the first to be hit by unemployment. He is also among the first to be called upon to sacrifice himself in the interests of economic health.

One other "optimistic" element in Slichter's discussion deserves comment. He writes, "Every now and then concern is expressed as to whether business concerns will continue the present rate of spending on plant and equipment. The immediate outlook is good. The opportunities to raise

labor costs by the use of better equipment are great and are gradually being better appreciated by managements." In other words, in Slichter's world, the annual revolution of technology is a healthy, an optimism-creating factor. From the point of view of business, that is. For, as we have already quoted, he sees this force as one of those making for the continuation of unemployment—even in his "healthy" economy.

The conclusion of all this optimism? "The prospect that unemployment will remain unnecessarily high for some months indicates the need for stronger efforts by the government to stimulate business." Slichter does not, of course, mention the nature of this stimulation. But it seems obvious that the only politically safe kind of stimulation which the present American government can indulge in is: the increase of armament expenditure, perhaps the creation of a few more Indochina scares.

In all of these factors—technological advance, growth of the work force by young workers, over-production, the garrison state as an element of "health" in the economy—the fate of the young worker is in the balance. And as of today, all of these factors point to the fact that the balance is tipped in the direction of either joblessness or the army. This is the result of the rolling downward adjustment as far as the youth is concerned. This is the problem which does not appear in the unemployment statistics.



## BOOKS and Ideas

## Henry Steele Commager: "Freedom, Loyalty, Dissent"

**Freedom vs. the American Party Line**

By H. W. BENSON

Henry Steele Commager was among the first to take a stand against the Age of Conformity and remains one of the dwindling few liberals who still deserve to call themselves democrats. In his latest book, "Freedom, Loyalty, Dissent" we have a collection of five essays written over the years since 1947 and here reprinted, a work that is indeed welcome in these arid days; for it is saturated with a feeling for one simple truth: liberty in the United States is withering under the demand for strict conformity with an American party line.

"What is the new loyalty?" he asks in one essay. "It is, above all, conformity. It is the uncritical and unquestioning acceptance of America as it is—the political institutions, the social relationships, the economic practices. It rejects inquiry into the race question or socialized medicine, or public housing, or into the wisdom or validity of our foreign policy. It regards as particularly heinous any challenge to what is called 'the system of private enterprise,' identifying that system with Americanism. It abandons evolution, repudiates the once popular concept of progress and regards America as a finished product, perfect and complete. It is, it must be added, easily satisfied. For it wants not intellectual conviction or spiritual conquest but mere outward conformity."

In recent months, a small army of hitherto tongue-tied public figures has mounted the national platform to view with alarm. A quick concern with the fate of democracy in America was aroused at last by the dastardly attacks of McCarthy and the Republican Party upon the Fair Deal as a party of "treason." But they bear no resemblance to Commager. Unlike him, they speak out not so much for democracy in general as for their own democratic rights. When the rights of radicals, socialists, non-conformists—not to mention Stalinists—were being whittled away, they joined in the hunt; or condoned it; or, at best, were silent.

So it was when the witchhunt began under Truman. To this day, the chief defense of the Democratic Party against charges of coddling Communists is the proud claim that they invented the loyalty purges, concocted the Smith Act, and initiated prosecutions under it. And now while thundering boldly against McCarthyism (now and then), they are careful to say nothing that could be construed in defense of the democratic rights of non-conformist radicals.

**Self-Defense Only**

In brief, our modern-day liberals can rise only to the modest heights of self-defense. When they, themselves, are slandered, they decry unjust procedures by congressional committees but promise that if they had their way, the hunt for subversives would continue, but in accord with the punctillios of parliamentary etiquette.

Commager is not one of them. He describes himself as an "Independent Democrat" but his conscience didn't await the barbs of a Republican attorney general. He is an honest man who can tell us of the role of the Democratic Party as for example:

"But not until the miscalled Alien Registration Act of 1940 did guilt by association achieve the status of federal law and policy. It became not only a crime but a disability and sin by virtue of President Truman's Loyalty Order of 22 March 1947—an order which sets up as one standard for employment and dismissal membership in, association with, or sympathetic affiliation with anyone . . . organization, movement, group, or combination of persons, designated by the attorney general as subversive. Since then, this cloud, originally no bigger than a man's hand, has grown until it fills and darkens the whole horizon. For the notion that one might catch the contagion of subversion by

'sympathetic affiliation with whatever organization some official might think subversive was clearly the most hospitable and inclusive of catch-alls and was quickly seized upon by professional patrioteers for partisan and private purposes. Soon not only the attorney general of the United States but almost everyone else was busy compiling lists. . . . The lists themselves, needless to say, grew longer and longer . . . by now the most courageous are reluctant to sign a petition or to join an organization for the most laudable purposes, while the timid simply refuse to sign or join anything at all."

While the newly-bestirred liberals arouse themselves out of a catatonic state of indifference only to defend their own party from charges of "communism," Commager does not hesitate to speak in defense of those who are neither so powerful nor so popular. He criticizes the House Committee on Un-American Activities for its attacks on the National Lawyers Guild; he refers to charges against Lattimore and Fairbanks, accused of following a pro-Stalinist line, as examples of pressure against free thought. He quotes a member of the Board of Regents of the University of California who said, "I have a profound conviction that freedom in the world is being destroyed by Communism of which Socialism is the first step. Freedom has been destroyed in England by Socialism and the United States has travelled a considerable distance along the same line. It has been demonstrated many times that Socialism destroys incentive and reduces production."

**Totalitarian Philosophy**

Let us remember Commager's retort: "Clearly, if he is right anyone who departs from his position is guilty of error—which is to say, of heresy. But if he already knows demonstrated truth in the field of economics and of politics then the department of economics and politics at the University are superfluous. The philosophy of Mr. Teague's argument does not differ in any essentials from the philosophy behind Nazi and Communist control of university teaching."

All this is so close to the truth that it sets the practical, modern liberals atremble with its audacity. Plain talk on such subjects, no longer discussed in polite circles, sets Commager apart from them as a man of principle.

To the ultra-McCarthyites, our palpitating liberal replies somewhat as follows: you say you want to track down communists and subversives; we are all for this worthy, this noble, this public-spirited, this American objective; but you actually slander people, especially us, who are not subversives; you lie, you cheat; but if anyone just wants to hunt down subversives we applaud, we cheer; in fact we started it long before you.

In brief, they do not oppose the witchhunt they simply want to hunt authentic witches. Contrast such bloodless resignation to the essential demands of reaction with Professor Commager's view. He, by the way, is no subversive of any kind; he is a professor of history at Columbia University; a well-known, respected and even respectable writer and public figure.

He ridicules Attorney General Brownell's announcement that he had cleaned out of government all persons "suspected of Communist tendencies." Suspected by whom, he asks, and what are Communist tendencies? Then he concludes, "But even if it were possible to import some concreteness and clarity into the definition of subversive organizations, it would still be neither possible nor desirable for our people to engage in a check of membership, past as well as present, of all organizations to which we belong or which we are asked to join."

**Must Insist on Freedom**

The key to his point of view is found a few pages before when he writes, "The search for subversives results in the intimidation of the independent, the original, the imaginative, and the experimental-minded. It discourages independence of thought in teachers and students alike. It discourages the reading of books that may excite the suspicion of some investigator or some Legionnaire. It discourages the discussion of controversial matters in the class room, for such discussion may be reported. It creates a situation where free-rate minds will not go into

teaching or into administration and where students therefore get poor teaching. In the long run, it will create a generation incapable of appreciating the difference between independence of thought and subservience. In the long run, it will create a generation not only deprived of liberty but incapable of enjoying liberty. Turn where we will to apply the test of consequences, we discover that we must insist on freedom because we cannot do without it, because we cannot afford the price of its denial."

All this gives some idea of how this reviewer feels about Professor Commager and how welcome is the appearance of his book. Our readers, in fact anyone who wants to remain a sincere democrat, will enjoy it and will learn from it. This said, we call attention to the central weakness in the five essays and perhaps in Commager's general point of view. We do not refer to the fact that the author is not a socialist. His is the standpoint of a real democrat trying to defend democracy. What he has to say about capitalism from his point of view is instructive:

"There is, it should be added, a further danger in the willful identification of Americanism with a particular body of economic practices. Some economists have predicted for the future an economic crash similar to that of 1929. If Americanism is equated with competitive capitalism, what happens to it if competitive capitalism comes a cropper? If loyalty and private enterprise are inextricably associated, what is to preserve loyalty if private enterprise fails? Those who associate Americanism with a particular program of economic practices have a grave responsibility, for if their program should fall into disrepute, they expose Americanism itself to disrepute."

When Commager speaks of Americanism, he speaks not the language of the jingo but of the democrat. He means democracy. And we take his words to mean something that we find unexceptionable: if capitalism must go in order that democracy may live, then let it go.

**Key Question Evaded**

However, what we seek in vain is a clear-cut and forthright discussion of the rights of Stalinists, including rock-ribbed, authentic, self-admitted members of the Communist Party. This is a key question, especially since it is here that liberals and democrats have faltered and floundered. Their vacillation on this question is the source of all their weaknesses and vacillations on democracy in general. Anyone who knows our socialist point of view knows that we are not arguing in defense of the political views of Stalinism. What is at issue is not the program but the democratic rights of those whose views we find utterly reactionary and detestable.

But, if Commager's excellent defense of democracy applies in life, it must cover those whose platform we reject out of hand. Yet he refers only in passing to the prosecution of leaders of the Communist Party and by implication seems to justify the government's course.

At one point he says, "Guilt attaches itself to illegal acts, not to dangerous thoughts or suspicious associations. There is, of course, such a thing as collective guilt in a conspiracy, but conspiracy concerns itself with illegal acts, and laws now on the statute books are ample to take care of these."

This comment supplemented by two footnotes is the full extent of Commager's treatment of the anti-CP trials. In one note, he quotes Justice Jackson's opinion in the Dennis case. Jackson said, "What is really under review here is a conviction of conspiracy, after a trial for conspiracy, on an indictment charging conspiracy." (It seems there was a conspiracy!) Commager comments, "The confusion of 'guilt by association' with 'conspiracy' is widespread and dangerous."

**Conspiracy to Advocate**

Obviously, the author rejects "guilt by association" while implying his endorsement of trials against conspiracy. In another passing footnote, Commager, apparently with approval, cites the opinion of Justice Minton on the right to teach in public schools. Minton maintained that in order to justify the disqualification of a teacher, the association to which he belonged had to be "one that advocated the overthrow of government by unlawful means. . . ."

There is only a hint in all this of the fact that Communist Party members have been sent to jail and deprived of jobs for the simple fact of advocating a point of view, not for any other act. The "conspiracy" which is emphasized by repetition, repetition, repetition in the above lines is a "conspiracy" to advocate ideas. Whatever the juridical form of the accusation against the CP, the content of the charge is their public presentation of a program. The CP is penalized for what it says. And yet in a book devoted to free speech Commager neither defends by argument the abridgment of the rights of Stalinists to free speech nor defends their rights. He simply mentions the subject in passing but evades the basic issues involved. It would be impossible for him to present a worked out justification for the jailing of Stalinists under the Smith Act without vitiating most of his own book. It is noteworthy in this connection that he avoids any discussion of the Smith Act itself.

"Freedom, Loyalty, Dissent" is a valiant effort to hold the democratic line against attack, but it leaves its author straddling the issue.



# PUBLIC SUBSIDY, BUT NO PUBLIC CONTROL

## As Labor is Tied to Capitalist Thinking It Gets Caught in System's Contradictions

By LARRY O'CONNOR

The American labor movement is divided in its soul. Or, to put it in terms of logic rather than of spiritual conflict, it is caught in a contradiction from which it cannot emerge without making a basic shift in political thinking, and thus in its policies.

The particular contradiction with which we will deal in this article is between the immediate and direct economic interests of a considerable segment of American workers, and the general line on foreign policy pursued by the unions. To put it as briefly as possible: on the one hand, the labor movement accepts enthusiastically the administration's policy of preventing the spread of Stalinism by keeping the economic systems of its various capitalist allies in something which resembles a going condition. As the union leadership is well aware that this cannot be done indefinitely, by means of American loans and gifts, or even military grants, they are also for the idea that a maximum of trade within the "free world" will have a beneficial effect on the workers, thus preventing them from going Stalinist.

On the other hand, in certain industries competition from abroad is fierce. In some cases the effectiveness of foreign competition expresses the greater efficiency of the foreign industry, in others simply abysmally lower wages paid to the foreign worker at every stage of production as compared to that received by his counterpart in this country.

As long as economic conditions are booming in the United States, the problem of what position the unions should take on tariff policy, or on foreign trade questions in general is rarely acute. Here and there an industry may exist which is always marginal in the country, even in the best of times, and in which, therefore, both owners and workers are likely to demand that the government "protect" them from foreign competition.

### Feel the Squeeze

But when business conditions deteriorate generally, the problem becomes a much wider one for the whole American labor movement. In industries in which every capitalist made a whopping profit during the boom, the marginal ones begin to feel the squeeze as soon as the economy dips down from the peak. They demand wage cuts from the unions representing their workers, and point to foreign or Southern competition as the justification for the demand. And as the slump moves into a little deeper territory, whole industries which were at one time "healthy" tend to get a bit anemic, and these sturdy free enterprisers then run to the government with the demand for aid and protection. Often they are accompanied, if not preceded, by the representatives of the workers.

Just what demand the industrialists and labor leaders may make on the government at such a point depends on the peculiarities of the particular industry involved, and also, on the level of political consciousness on which the particular union is operating. Whereas one union will boldly and brazenly ask for a high tariff wall around the products of its industry, another will seek to camouflage this demand with less crude arguments. And a third will oppose high tariffs altogether, while asking that the government extend a direct subsidy to its industry on the grounds that this is needed in the interest of national security.

For instance, on July 14 Walter Reuther, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, sent a letter to President Eisenhower urging that he "reject the U. S. Tariff Commission's recommendation to raise the duty on lead and zinc imports." At the same time, he urged the president to "simultaneously set forth a program that will permit the metal mining industry to be preserved in the United States."

Reuther rejected the recommendations of the Tariff Commission because "free nations of the world who supply the United States with more than one-third of the amount of lead and zinc needed in this country would be adversely affected. Domestic miners would not be the beneficiaries of any in direct help. The so-called panacea resulting from higher tariffs would not materialize. An indirect subsidy would be given producers which would result in higher prices to the consumers. The majority of the producers in the industry would, as a matter of fact, not be aided. The higher prices may well result in substitution of other metals for lead and zinc."

In short, Reuther is against high tariffs in the lead and zinc mining industries for international political reasons, as well as for all those reasons which have generally led liberals to oppose high tariffs.

What kind of a proposal does he urge on the president which will keep these industries going? Perhaps

a vast housing program which will use up mountains of lead pipe in its plumbing and conduit systems? At one time Reuther had proposed that the war-expanded aircraft and tank industry be converted to producing housing components on a vast scale. But he did not get very far with it, and hence appears to have decided to address himself to a more "practical" program.

### Enter "National Defense"

So, Reuther turns to the old saw of "national defense." "It is essential for security reasons," he informed the president, "that the supply of lead and zinc available from domestic mines be sufficient to meet the requirements of our mobilization base."

"This objective could be obtained immediately by re-examining the size of the stockpile and authorizing, as was done in the month of June, purchases for the stockpile. However, such purchases should not be made at the market price, but at a varying price that will enable needed domestic lead and zinc mines to stay in production . . . serious consideration must also be given to the enactment of proper legislation designed to keep in operation, over a period of time, the mines needed to maintain levels of production essential to our mobilization base. Guaranteed prices should be the difference between the market price and what it takes for each individual mine to operate at a reasonable profit. In principle, this is similar to the recommendations made at the time you rejected the U. S. Tariff Commission's recommendations to increase the duty on wool."

In other words, a straight subsidy to each owner of a zinc or lead mine which would permit him to continue in profitable operation, while the product, after having been dug up out of the earth, is once more buried in it (this is known as stockpiling). Furthermore, Reuther wants this kind of thing developed as the permanent basis of the lead and zinc mining industry in America.

Well, that is one kind of answer to the problem of American capitalism's inability to absorb the products of its lead and zinc mines. But not every industry has the advantage that subsidizing it can be made to appear a vital necessity of war preparations, no matter how clever its leaders and publicists may be.

### A Declining Industry

One industry which finds itself in this position is the hat, cap and millinery industry, in which the workers are organized in the United Hat, Cap and Millinery Workers International Union, AFL.

This industry has been suffering from a general decline brought about by a growing trend among people in this country to go hatless. The industry is plagued by low capital costs which permit the rise of a tremendous number of small and fly-by-night shops which seek to evade unionization. There has been a strong trend in the industry to move out of the cities into rural areas, and also a general drift toward the low-wage, low-tax areas of the South.

In addition to all this, the industry has recently been exposed to increasing competition from Japan in cheap caps, and from Japan and Europe in the felt hat bodies which go into the manufacture of the better grades of hats.

This industry, and the union which represents its workers, can hardly demand a direct government subsidy on grounds that its preservation is essential to national defense. At the same time, the union leadership is as aware as is Walter Reuther of the general arguments against high tariffs, and of the specific ones which stem from the political considerations of the cold war. But they are also dedicated to the preservation of free enterprise, and above all, must face the very real problem created by the slump in their industry for their workers.

So . . . so they are for higher tariffs on foreign hats and hat bodies. Although it appears that some of their leaders find it difficult to advocate this policy publicly with conviction, the arguments for it are given in the July 15th issue of *The Hat Worker* with the vigor and bluntness which characterizes the style of its editor, J. C. Rich.

After describing the danger to the health of the workers in the industry involved in handling hat bodies made abroad with mercury (the use of mercury in these bodies is prohibited in this country on health grounds), Rich continues:

### "A Specious Argument"

"We are even told that it is patriotic and in the national interest to welcome these substandard products. The argument is that we must lower the tariff so as to encourage trade with foreign countries and thus improve their economic situation, and consequently strengthen their resistance to communist subversion and domination."

"The entire argument is a specious and misleading one, but the tradition of the labor movement as a whole and of the apparel unions in particular has favored so-called free trade and has made us a little shame-faced when we entered objections to an abatement of tariff protection. Possibly I go further than some of our leadership is ready to go, but I say we have nothing to be ashamed of in outright opposition to the importation of the stuff that comes in now to undermine our headwear industry and the health and earnings of our members."

Rich then goes on to point out that workers abroad get much lower wages than do those in this country, and that all that tariff reduction would do would be to "permit some sweatshopper in Japan, Italy or else-

where to exploit his own employees for starvation wages and then come in with his products to undermine the standards of American workers."

Of course, these are the old, old arguments for a high tariff. Rich does not bother to point out exactly what is "specious" about the argument for free trade as a method of bolstering America's allies in the cold war, nor just why it is that the "tradition of the labor movement" has been for free trade.

Now, we can agree with Rich's assertion that permitting other countries with their lower productivity of labor free access to the American market will not "strengthen their resistance to communist subversion and domination." At least, it will not strengthen it much. But the reason for this is that in our opinion capitalism abroad is so far gone that nothing can save it, and any foreign policy based on trying to save it is bound to play, into the hands of the Stalinists. And one of the reasons for capitalism's plight is precisely that not only in the hat industry, but in just about every industry, and specially ones that require a heavy capital investment, foreign capital cannot compete with American capital except at the expense of such a heavy exploitation of the foreign workers that they are bound to turn against capitalism in the process.

### The Devil Take the Rest

On the other hand, closing the American market to the competition of these foreign goods is not going to induce the employers abroad to stop being "sweatshoppers" and to pay wage scales based on the American standard of living. Quite the contrary. If they are turned inward on themselves, their economies will deteriorate even faster, and even more intensive exploitation will be resorted to keep them afloat.

In effect, the policy advocated by Rich is simply to take care of the American workers as best we can, and the devil take the rest (or if he has a proposal to keep them out of the devil's clutches, it is not referred to in this article). While Reuther's plan is to keep the American market open to a normal amount of importation from foreign countries (in the press release from which his views are quoted he does not refer to the question of how the profits derived from such importation are distributed abroad) while the American metal mining industries are kept afloat by public subsidy.

Actually, both union leaders are asking that the industries in question be subsidized by the American people. In the case of the hat workers this would be done by forcing the hat buyers to pay more than they would have to pay for the equivalent foreign product. In the case of the zinc and lead industries, the public would have to pay in taxes the money the government would then give to the mine owners to keep their industries going.

### Why Not Public Control?

Of course, there was a time when labor leaders used to draw some broader social conclusions from the fact that this or that industry could not keep alive except by public subsidy. The conclusion seems quite obvious: if the public must pay the bill, the public should control the industry. Why should all the workers as taxpayers or consumers pay the bill so that the employers in a few uneconomic industries can continue to make profits?

But the present union leadership cannot talk in these terms. They have been sucked into the idea that capitalism is the only free alternative to Stalinism, or bribed by the prosperity of the past few years into believing that capitalism, in this country at least, has found a way of functioning on an ever ascending scale of benefit for the people.

When reality contradicts these notions in this or that industry, their thinking no longer leaps to the conclusion that what is needed is not some special measure to "protect" the industry, but rather a sweeping change which will guarantee the livelihood of the workers without imposing a burden on the whole of society.

At best, they can claim that such broad-gauge programs may be all right for idealists and dreamers, but they are practical men who must protect the jobs of rank and file workers right now, immediately. Well, they may succeed as long as the recession is a mild one and only affects an industry here and there. But their success just digs a deeper hole, both economically and ideologically for the labor movement to dig itself out of before it can really start on a road to true, socially organized and controlled security for all.



LABOR ACTION

July 26, 1954  
Vol. 18, No. 30

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Asst. Editors: BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL

Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH



# U.S. Policy in Shambles — —

(Continued from page 1)

rivals use the democratic slogan of free elections only when it suits their purposes.

## ELECTIONS

This time it was the Stalinists who demanded early nation-wide elections because they are certain (and so are the French and the Americans) that they will win a free election. The French supported by the United States have stood firm against the Stalinist proposal to hold elections in six months. They wanted the date postponed for two years, and the Stalinists agreed. But in Germany and Korea where the Stalinists do not believe they can win, especially in Germany, they have placed every conceivable obstruction in the way.

For the French, the Geneva conference was an attempt to salvage something of their rich Indochina colony, and the results must be viewed as somewhat of a success, especially since they seem to have given up nothing that they had not already lost or were in the process of losing. But for the United States, Geneva was a complete disaster in every sense of the word. Never has there been a demonstration of the greatest power in the world floundering so hopelessly without a policy.

Geneva was the legacy of United States foreign policy since the end of the Second World War. It is the dead end of the foreign policy of the Roosevelt-Truman administrations as continued by Eisenhower. At Geneva, the United States played the role of an observer. Its slogan might have been: neither participation nor abstention.

From the beginning of the Geneva conference, Secretary of State Dulles was reluctant about United States participation. From the point of view of Washington, there was nothing to negotiate. Indochina was a military problem since there was a war going on, and Washington had already

made its decision. It was prepared to virtually underwrite the entire cost of the French attempt to continue this colonial war against the legal government; that is, support French aggression. In return it was believed that this would enable the French to ratify the European Defense Community so the United States could start the rearmament of Germany, as well as stop the advance of Stalinism in Southeast Asia.

However, the State Department did not reckon with the fact that the French were without popular support in Indochina and that the overwhelming majority of the people want the French rule of their country to end. Also when the United States stepped up its military aid, the Chinese Stalinists increased their aid to Vietnam. Therefore it soon became obvious that the only way to continue the war meant direct United States intervention, air-sea forces at first but inevitably ground troops too. And this is what the Eisenhower administration was preparing the American people for last April when it started to talk about how essential Indochina was to the defense of Southeast Asia.

## WAR OR NOTHING

The Washington policy for Indochina was all out intervention, or nothing. And since the Western Allies rejected the idea of intervention and with it the more than likely prospects of another Korea, and also rejected Dulles' policy of "massive retaliation" which if it meant anything meant the initiation of atomic warfare, the Eisenhower administration was left without any policy. The hastily proposed stop-gap plan of a Southeast Asian Treaty Organization patterned after NATO was also dropped like a hot potato at that time by the Allies, because it was just intended to be the flimsy justification for intervention.

The United States policy in the early days of Geneva seemed to be to let the

conference peter out by way of the refusal of either the French government or the Russian and Chinese Stalinists to make any significant concessions. However, the bankruptcy of the United States was revealed when the U. S. hand was forced by the fall of the Laniel government and the seating of the Mendes-France government.

Mendes-France was committed to the idea of liquidating the Indochinese war as a drain on French resources, to save as much in Indochina as possible, but to concentrate on holding the North African "protectorates," and to strengthen the French economy by relieving it of the burden of the "dirty war."

Faced with this determination to conclude the Indochinese war and the rejection of the United States policy of all-out intervention, Dulles' policy collapsed completely. When the final days of the month Premier Mendes-France gave himself to conclude an armistice came around, Dulles announced that the United States was going to abstain from the conference. It was only after frantic appeals by Mendes-France that this would force him into a weaker bargaining position, that Dulles made a flying trip to Paris where he concluded that Mendes-France was not an appeaser getting ready to sell-out Indochina, and agreed to send Under-Secretary of State Walter Smith to sit around in Geneva, but not to participate in the proceedings.

Then developed a series of statements by the United States as to why it would not participate in the conference. . . . First, they claim that they were opposed to negotiations "on principle." The principle turned out to be the refusal to recognize Communist rule over unwilling people. A principled statement in itself, except for the fact that at least a majority of the Viet Namees support the struggle of the Vietminh against French rule.

Then it was announced that the United States was disassociating itself from the impending agreement because it did not have a "primary responsibility" in the war. This could only have been said with tongue in cheek since the United States was on the verge of open military intervention three months ago, and at the least was prepared to underwrite the greater part of the cost of the fighting.

## A NEW REASON

In the last several days a new reason was found: that France was in a special position in Indochina which the United States did not share and therefore disassociated itself.

Despite all these lame excuses the blatant fact is that United States policy was completely bankrupt and had nothing to propose. Dulles and the Eisenhower administration were in a special position, and that is their need to placate the right wing of their own party which has added a stricture or two to the muscle-bound shambles sometimes called United States foreign policy, but has not changed its main lines.

Finally Dulles has announced that the United States would not upset by force any agreement that it could "respect," and that it would defend it against any attacks. According to the latest news reports the United States finds that it can "respect" this cease fire agreement (while refusing to become a signatory), although less than two weeks ago the main outline of the agreement was referred to as "appeasement."

If the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy has been such a disaster, then where were the liberals in pointing out the changes that are needed to make the foreign policy effective? The fact is that they had no proposals that were different from Dulles'. A great deal of effort goes into a demand for more bipartisanship, but all that adds up to is a bipartisan disaster; and they have that already.

Secondly there aren't many who are speaking up in anything that sounds like an audible voice. And those who do say something hardly constitute a rallying point for an effective policy, or any policy at all.

## FULBRIGHT AND DULLES

Senator William Fulbright of Arkansas finds fault with Dulles because he tries to bludgeon the Allies in public. Not that he is opposed to putting the pressure on Allies, he explained in a radio interview on July 18, in fact the Truman

administration used to do it quite effectively—but in private. It seems that the fault this liberal Democrat finds with Dulles is his open diplomacy.

Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana in a speech on the Senate floor accused the present foreign policy of being in "dangerous disorder." The president he accused of "speaking loudly and carrying a feather duster" and charged that the administration contains "too much bluff and too much partisanship."

A part of a debate on the Senate floor between Republican Senator Ferguson of Michigan and Senator Mansfield is an indication of the lack of any kind of real public discussion of the reason for the disaster in Indochina or what should be done about future policy:

"Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat of Montana, who yesterday charged that cooperation was made difficult while the Democrats were being 'kicked around and knifed in the back,' today answered Senator Ferguson.

"Senator Ferguson, meantime, had amplified his statement by a floor speech. He asserted that a 'fundamental blunder' as to Indochina had been made by the Roosevelt administration in 1945 by cooperating in the re-establishment of French colonialism."

"Senator Mansfield protested that the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt had in fact sought to bring an end to colonialism.

"Mr. Ferguson observed that while President Roosevelt 'originally' had been for an end to colonialism 'nevertheless our government allowed itself to be persuaded in this matter by the French and the British and we acted to restore France's colonial position in Indochina.'

"Senator Mansfield went on to accuse the Eisenhower administration of having made 'a 100 per cent failure' in the Big Four conference in Berlin that led to the decision to meet at Geneva with the Chinese Communists over the Korean and Indochina wars."

—New York Times, July 10

## NO ALTERNATIVE

The absence of an alternative to policies of the Eisenhower administration is apparent in those liberal Democrats who have spoken up on Asian policy. And Secretary of State Dulles is not the only one open to the charges that he is knuckling down to the pressure of the right wing in American politics.

Has anything been learned by the events of recent months? Can the labor movement develop a program capable of turning back the growing influence of Stalinism?

Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson confesses the dead end of the existing bipartisan policy when he is quoted at a news conference that the Stalinist victory in Indochina could not have been prevented "even if our army was twice as big as it is, if our navy had twice as many ships afloat, and if the air force had 200 wings."

Now that there has been the cease fire, what can prevent the Vietminh from continuing their conquest of all Indochina by other than military means? Nothing stands in the way as long as there is the continuation of the present programs that led to this much of a debacle.

The United States has announced that it plans to go full steam ahead with its plan for a Southeast Asian Treaty Organization, even if it means that Thailand and possibly the Philippines are the only Asian countries involved.

The French make it clear that they are going to continue their old colonial policy in Indochina with perhaps a bit of United States economic aid thrown in. An American policy that does not encourage the people of South Vietnam to win their independence from French colonial rule will only hasten the day of complete Stalinist victory.

## SPORTS FLASH

NEW YORK, July 18—The Young Socialists of New York suffered a stunning defeat of 15-4 at the hands of the SDA "Imperialists" in a seven inning, co-ed softball game at Clove Lake Park, Staten Island, today. This will no doubt go down as the liberal-radical contribution to the Hall of Fame. The YSL congratulates the victors and looks forward to a return match.

# Anti-"Red" Bill — —

(Continued from page 1)

fully eliminated the Stalinists as a serious force in the labor movement, these labor leaders now concur in asking for a public commission to investigate the problem. There is plenty of reason to believe that in the present atmosphere any public commission will hand down recommendations which will narrow the democratic rights of the labor movement. In such an event, the unions would then be in the position of having to oppose the recommendations of a committee which they themselves had demanded be set up.

## INVASION OF RIGHTS

In voting in favor of a commission to study the problem, the House Committee virtually stopped the administration in its efforts to carry any measure containing the main points in the above-quoted bill. The Reed Bill, in language somewhat different from the Senate Bill, urged similar measures and compelled the American Civil Liberties Union to declare that it would lead to an invasion of the First Amendment.

The Reed Bill, said the ACLU, "sets up only the barest outline of fair procedures," and commented on the "failure of the bill to provide specifically that an employee should have the right of counsel at a hearing, that he be given a written transcript of the proceedings, and that he have the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses against him."

In a second bill, Rep. Reed called for the dissolution of "communist-infiltrated" organizations, particularly unions. This bill with its loose definitions, the ACLU pointed out, "is not designed to reach groups that are Communist fronts, . . . it

threatens legitimate union activity."

The ACLU added: "Thus many organizations which are not Communist fronts, a vast majority of whose membership and leadership may be totally hostile to Communism, may be dissolved. . . . (The bill) could lead to serious attacks on labor organizations if applied by persons hostile to labor . . . with such wide scope, it would be difficult to imagine any union or organization which could not be brought within the compass of this legislation—for almost every organization might be considered in a position to affect the national defense or the security of the U. S. Unions of farm laborers, restaurant employees, clothing garment workers, indeed any union engaged in the production of any agricultural or industrial commodity might be affected by the bill."

## ACLU ATTACKS

Finally, the ACLU attacked the provisions which would allow the Subversive Activities Control Board to dissolve an organization before an appeal could be heard.

While it is true that the AFL and CIO intervened quickly against these bills, their intervention has been confined primarily to a lobbying action. They have not yet opened up a wide campaign of education and propaganda against the general authoritarian, anti-democratic trend in Washington spearheaded by the administration. No effort has as yet been made to mobilize the great strength of the many millions making up the labor movement. The time is more than ripe to involve them, for no force will lend strength to the struggle for democracy and against reaction as much as these ranks of labor.