

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 18, 1954

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

Private Poll

We are in receipt of promotional material from a new group, headed by Mrs. Roosevelt, called the National Issues Committee. A flyer asking for financial support starts out this way, excitingly:

"Take this private poll:

"1. Do you think as you please and say what you think—without hedging?

"2. When you see injustice, do you speak out against it regardless of what people might think?

"3. Do you support any movement you believe in?

"4. If you wanted to know what the communists or fascists were up to, would you read their publications in public?

"Did you answer 'Yes'?

"Think again. Think hard.

"HUSH! Can't join . . . might be dangerous. . . . Can't protest . . . might be misinterpreted. . . . Hide that book . . . the neighbors might see it."

"Still answer 'Yes'?

"If you do, congratulations!

"Not many people can these days. But in America, everybody should be able to—and this is the reason for NIC."

That's very nice. It got us all agog. In addition there was a covering form letter which kept emphasizing the need for militant defense of freedom of expression of

(Continued on page 2)

Colonial Freedom Day Rally Set for October 29

Plans are being rushed to completion for a big rally in New York to celebrate International Freedom Day on Friday, October 29, as a day of protest against colonialism and solidarity with the fight of colonial peoples against oppression by both power blocs in the world.

The month of October was designated originally by the Asian Socialist Conference as the time for such rallies. The Asian socialists called for solidarity rallies against imperialism.

The American response scheduled for October 29 in New York was initiated through the Third Camp Contact Committee. It is being sponsored, however, by a number of prominent people as individuals. Among those who have so far accepted as sponsors are: Waldo Frank, Donald Harrington, Professor Meyer Schapiro, A. J. Muste, Robert Gilmore, Max Shachtman, Conrad Lynn, Arlo Tatum, Bayard Rustin, Max Martin, and others. (Complete list and details of rally, including speakers, next week.)

The place will be Community Church, 40 East 35 Street, Manhattan.

Labor Action strongly urges all readers in and about New York City to earmark the date for attendance at this rally, without fail.



Triumph of 'Crackpot Realism': A Liberal Comes Out for Franco

. . . page 3

Definitive Split On in Mapam

. . . page 2

Politics at the Univ. of Chicago

. . . page 5

Liberal Party Swallows Hard On a Scandal

By PETER WHITNEY

NEW YORK, Oct. 11—Once again the Liberal Party of New York has had to substitute candidates in midstream.

This year, after endorsing Aaron Jacoby, Democratic nominee for state comptroller on the Harriman-Roosevelt ticket, they unceremoniously dumped him, with as little discussion after the event as before. Understandably, they didn't care to elaborate on his role as receiver of juicy plums some time back.

Jacoby's withdrawal recalls the fiasco of Judge Juvenal Marchisio during the Halley campaign of 1953. Marchisio was to be Halley's running mate for president of the City Council, and was dragged from oblivion by the Liberal leaders and presented with the usual flowery tributes as a worthy standard-bearer for a party of high principle and great moral integrity.

But alas for the invention of the printing press! It turned out that this great "liberal" had been associated with an Italian-language newspaper *Il Crociato* which made no secret of its pro-Mussolini and pro-Franco stand. He was quietly dropped from the ticket and replaced by another "independent" Republican whose past revealed no such ghosts in the closets. That year too was not the

(Turn to last page)

As Reuther Cracks Down on a Corrupt Local, Let's Look Behind the Relationship of THE LABOR BUREAUCRAT vs. THE LABOR RACKETEER

By BEN HALL

George Meany told AFL leaders at their convention in Los Angeles last month that a clean-up of welfare funds is the primary internal problem confronting the federation. As they deliberated, investigations into union welfare funds in New York State revealed that union officials, handling some of these funds, were grabbing off lush hauls of graft.

The facts in all their tawdry detail are commonplace enough. In general, funds were milked by officials who (1) voted themselves generous salaries for fictitious jobs; (2) added friends, supporters and relatives to the payroll as assistants in doing nothing; (3) set up phony new companies to act as middlemen between union and insurance companies to collect fat rake-offs in the guise of commissions.

In one small local, CIO Retail Union No. 923, President Samuel Rosenzweig siphoned off \$41,000 from the fund last year. As a man who appreciates the value of his own efforts, he still insists that he was worth it. But it came as a big surprise to some members of his own local. One waitress member told reporters: "We were never allowed to say anything at meetings. If you got up to say anything they told you to sit down. If they thought you were too smart, you

were told you're a trouble-maker and they threatened to throw you out of the union."

Four other CIO Retail Union locals were accused of shady practices and in their cases, the ax of union justice fell swift and keen. Walter Reuther demanded instant action from Max Greenberg, new international president of the Retail Union, and the latter summarily removed the offending corruptionists from office.

See the Connection

Presumably, honesty is or soon will be installed in its own. Very good. The locals become honest. But do they become democratic? That is the question which the indignant waitress member raises in our minds.

Bureaucrats with their hands in the till go out of office. Will they be replaced by honest democrats or by other bureaucrats with integrity? That remains hazy. In the furor over corruption, lack of democracy and the connection between bureaucracy and racketeering is ignored.

Indignant outcries in the public press are salted strongly with hypocrisy. Editors are outraged at men who dip into funds for the sick, maimed and aged, much as they are horrified at petty thieves who pilfer the church charity box. But their tender sympathy for the union

needy is too recently acquired to be convincing.

When unions fought for welfare funds, the press was almost unanimously in the enemy camp, especially in the days of the wage-freeze when the labor movement struck out for so-called "fringe benefits."

Occasional editorials deplore the lack of democracy in locals which have been victimized by racketeers. But struggles for inner-union democracy, inevitably occurring in an atmosphere of turmoil, nearly always hit up against the official press. Rank-and-file opposition movements are frozen out of the news; canned handouts of the official brass are accepted as gospel; and newspapers bemoan the "disorderly" conduct of insurgents, call for "responsibility" and "sanity," and end by endorsing the official bureaucracy.

Racketeering and corruption are ugly things anywhere, but nowhere more than in unions.

To the capitalist, business is business. Grafting, kick-backs, payoffs are near-legitimate forms of endeavor which are rewarded by somewhat illicit but not immoral super-profits, an extra exploitation added to normal exploitation. In fact, corrupt practices are so akin to ordinary enterprise that respectable citizens who

(Continued on page 6)

ISRAEL

Breakup of Pro-Stalinist Coalition

Definitive Split On in Mapam

By AL FINDLEY

The long expected split in Mapam—Israel's pro-Stalinist party, distinct from the Israeli Communist Party—has finally taken place.

Mapam (the abbreviated name for United Workers Party) was founded seven years ago by the union of Hashomer Hatzair, Achdut Avoda, and the Left Poale Zion, joined also by the pro-Zionist wing of the CP and by "populist" elements typified by Moshe Sneh. It is now virtually reduced to the Hashomer Hatzair elements.

It has long been obvious that a major split was looming between Achdut Avoda and Hashomer Hatzair, and the events leading to this development have been discussed in LABOR ACTION several times. Splinters have been breaking off from Mapam ever since the beginning of the Stalinist campaign against the Jews in general and Zionism in particular.

The arrest of Mapam leader Oren in Czechoslovakia, the anti-Semitic trials in that country, the case of the Jewish doctors in Moscow provided the background for these splits. These events made it extremely difficult for any Jewish group to balance its avowed pro-Russian attitude and its basic Jewish positions.

SNEH TO CP

The first two splits came with the resignation of two Mapam members of the Knesset (parliament), Lifshutz and Lamdan, who placed their main emphasis on Zionism. Then followed the expulsion of Sneh and his followers, who weighted the scale overwhelmingly in favor of Moscow, for example justifying all that the Stalinists did in Prague.

A week ago Dr. Sneh announced his intention of joining the Communist Party (Maki) in a brochure entitled "Summaries on the National Problem in the Light of Marxism-Leninism," which he submitted to the secretariat of his group for approval at its convention next month. He states that the differences between the parties have disappeared. And he is absolutely correct. Sneh has steadily moved to a full Stalinist position, though the CP has not budged.

The CP has published its secretariat's welcome to Dr. Sneh. There are reports that many of his followers, especially in the youth, will oppose entry into the CP.

In Mapam circles this news has been greeted with pleasure. A Mapam spokesman stated that it would help the party fight the "silent followers" of Dr. Sneh who still abounded in the movement.

THE JUGGLERS FUMBLE

The two main groups left in the Mapam, Hashomer Hatzair and Achdut Avoda, continued to juggle in their program their pro-Zionism, their pro-Stalinism and elements of socialist ideas. In a juggling act where two partners fail to synchronize, mishaps are bound to occur. In the last years Achdut Avoda and Hashomer Hatzair have been voting differently in the Knesset and acting almost as separate parties.

The current split situation began when Achdut Avoda published its own paper *Lamerchav* because the Mapam organ *Al Hamishmar* did not permit full and free discussion of its views. The paper refused to publish a resolution on Israeli security voted by Kibbutz Meuchad, etc.

The Hashomer Hatzair majority leadership of the party prohibited further publication of a rival organ. Then began

a series of proposals and counter-proposals. For a while *Lamerchav* was suspended while negotiations took place.

Hashomer went so far as to alter its procedure for discussion and propose that a representative of the minority be allowed to go along with the majority spokesman in the discussion. To preserve unity the Hashomer leader said he "proposed freedom of debate and agreement on many issues, conditions which no other minority succeeded in obtaining." (Quoted in *Israeli Horizons*, Sept. 1954.)

The aim of Achdut Avoda was to reorganize the party as a federation of equal groups, with parity on all questions and on the press. Hashomer wanted to use its slim majority to continue its control of the organization.

Hashomer proposed that on four basic questions, on which their views were not fundamentally different, mutual agreement be reached. These four questions were: (1) Relations with the CP. (2) Attitude toward Russia. (3) Security of the state. (4) Joining the government. There was to be a delay on reaching a decision on the admission of Arabs into Mapam.

The minority demanded agreement on "the great political problems of our time, including the four above, plus foreign policy, political organization of Arab workers, etc."

PROGRAMMATIC DISPUTE?

In the latter part of August a final conference was held and the representatives of Achdut Avoda walked out, leaving Mapam to the Hashomer.

There are of course conflicting claims as to who represents the majority. Each side claims 70 per cent. As far as we can judge, the Mapam followers in the cities (not too numerous) split evenly. On the kibbutzim (farm collectives) everyone has to go with his own kibbutz. The Hashomer Hatzair has a larger organization than Achdut Avoda's Kibbutz Hameuchad. The Erem group of the Left Poale Zion went with Achdut Avoda and have a majority of that small group.

The newly independent Achdut Avoda-Poale Zion party held its first convention in the beginning of September. It hailed Russia as a "ray of hope," expressed its sympathy for Russia and its allies, but demanded recognition of the Jews as a nation and called on Moscow to allow emigration of Jews. The speakers called for a coalition of all Zionist-socialist parties. Speakers asked a return to the policy of "non-identification" of the state of Israel with either power bloc, although it said the party will be with the camp of "social progress," etc.

As can be seen from the above summary, given the agreement stated on the four basic questions and the postponement of the Arab question, there is little or no important programmatic difference between the new AA-PZ party and the decimated Mapam. That has always been true. There are real differences, but they are differences in attitude rather than differences in formal program. These mani-

fest themselves in day-to-day problems particularly.

Programmatically, Hashomer and Achdut Avoda agree in considering Russia a socialist state leading the struggle for peace and progress. The basic programmatic document concretizing this agreement was the Haifa program, which was a compromise between the two groups.

The Hashomer Hatzair had proposed conditional *anschluss* with the Cominform, while the Achdut Avoda merely proposed greater cooperation with the Cominform. While Hashomer condemned Tito, the Achdut Avoda program was loud in its silence on that question. Hashomer favored abolition of factions in the party and the admission of Arab workers. Achdut Avoda opposed admission of Arabs, stressed the "Zionist" character of the party, and favored the continuation or groupings in the party.

This pro-Stalinist program was adopted after the Russian campaign against the Jews as "cosmopolitans," "rootless traders," etc. The program as finally adopted called for "eventual" affiliation to the Cominform and the "future" admission of Arabs into a single party.

ALTERNATIVES

Despite abolition of factions, Hashomer did in fact continue to act as a faction through control of its settlements. The Achdut Avoda also later created their de-facto faction by splitting the Kibbutz Hameuchad and transforming it into a homogeneous ideological unit.

The leader of Hashomer is right when he says that for years the opposition had considered the Haifa program a "mistake," a "failure," etc. However, given their basic approach, they were easily led to agree then, and the platform of their new party continues the same general political line. Despite their complete programmatic subordination to the Stalinists they remain emotionally anti-Stalinist. That is their main contradiction. How they solve this problem will to a great extent determine the future of their new party.

They face the alternatives of joining the Mapai, remaining independent, or reuniting with Mapam, and this choice will not be decided by such secondary questions as joining the government, or "activism" versus "active defense."

Their basic theoretical failure lies in the fact that, like the Mapam, they see only two contenders for power in the world, the Stalinist camp on the one side and the capitalist camp on the other. They fail to see the independent working class as a real alternative to both. They are thus pushed to hail the Russian barbarism as "socialism" and keep their criticism to private gatherings.

Once the glimmer of a Third Camp position enters their thinking, the possibilities of their development as an independent tendency would appear. Otherwise they can only differ with Hashomer on Zionist questions; but even Hashomer has a more consistent conclusion from premises that both groups share, i.e., friendship for the Arab workers, etc.

HASHOMER'S PROBLEM

The Mapam (what is left of it) has announced that it will now proceed with the immediate acceptance of Arabs into the party. It is hard to foretell how many Arabs, and of what caliber, will be induced to join a Zionist-dominated party. The problem has been seriously posed to their leaders but has not yet been answered clearly.

Will the Hashomer (now left holding Mapam) return to its original position of 1951 before it accepted the compromise of the Haifa program? The series of anti-Jewish and anti-Zionist acts of the Stalinist bloc would seem to rule this out. However, Hashomer has always acted as if it were not aware of what was going on in this respect, except on certain holiday occasions and when it is attacking the CP, and even on such occasions it is the fault of the Jewish Stalinists and not the true leaders of the CP. ("The tsar is good but he has bad advisers.") The assumption is always near the surface that Russia will return to its 1948 pro-Zionist position. Faith is also buoyed up by the "liberalization" of the new Malenkov regime.

Should the Hashomer return to its original position of 1951, which was held jointly with Dr. Sneh, the organization can logically develop only in the direction that Sneh has traveled since then. But there is sometimes a big gap between logic and events in a living political movement.

SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

any opinion. And attached to all this was a formidable list of liberal cognomens. Did these people really propose to do something to lift the pall of fear over the expression of unpopular views?

Closer inspection revealed that this nerve-shattering work-up was an introduction to a plug for subscribing to the new NIC's fact-sheets and publications. No visible proposal seemed to be contemplated to do anything about the "HUSH!" No greater expectations were warranted by a sample copy, thoughtfully enclosed, of the NIC's sheet *The Issue*, which tucked its only civil-liberty item away on the last page: a comment on the Communist "Outlaw" Act. The only comment seemed to be that it would get in the way of the McCarran Law of 1950.

Maybe Mrs. Roosevelt and her liberal colleagues ought to take that private poll themselves. And who knows what the answer would be?

The Right to Refuse To Stoolpigeon

We have several times pointed to the reluctance, displayed even by liberals, to make an issue out of the witchhunters' demand for stoolpigeonry.

In case after case, of teachers or officials who have been purged, the crime for which they were punished has not been previous membership in the CP — not even that—but rather their refusal to turn stoolpigeon and identify other former CP members whom they know about, even though they may thus be blasting innocent persons' lives. This was the issue, for example, in the case of Professor Furry of Harvard.

It is now the issue in the case of the three Hunter College professors who have been fired by the New York City Board of Higher Education.

Professors McGill, Weisner and Hughes are the current victims. They are all teachers who have broken with CP membership. As the *N. Y. Post* story reported: "They admitted past membership in the party but refused to give names of colleagues in the party 'as a matter of conscience.'... A basic issue of the trial [given them by the board] was whether quitting the party in good faith requires a person to cooperate with the authorities by disclosing the names of others who were party members."

Yet the *Post*, like other papers carrying the story, headlined it: "3 Hunter Teachers Fired Over Red Link." But it was not their "red link" but the issue of stoolpigeonry which was decisive. Headlines should tell the truth too.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

Have You Read Labor Action's Pamphlet-Issues?

No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism.

No. 2—Independent Socialism and War.

No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis.

No. 4—Socialism and Democracy.

No. 5—What Is Stalinism?

10 cents each

See You at the
New York ISL's

**HALLOWE'EN
HI-JINKS**

SATURDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 30

at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street

Triumph of 'Crackpot Realism': A Liberal Comes Out for Franco

By DEBBY MEIER

This is 1954, the age of conformity, the era for rewriting history and "re-evaluating" left traditions. Thus one *should* not be shocked to see one of the more liberal of the popular political weeklies coming out with a thoroughly reactionary and blood-curdling "re-evaluation" of the Spanish civil war and of Francoism in general.

The editors of the Reporter magazine, where such an article has appeared, claim to have a few "reservations" about some of the points raised in the article. Yet they feel that a re-evaluation is necessary in the light of present events and that this particular one is especially interesting and worthwhile.

Gerald Brenan, an English expert on Spain, reviews in the October 7 issue of the Reporter a recent book by ex-Ambassador Claude G. Bowers entitled *My Mission to Spain*. In this review Brenan takes Bowers to task for his foolish and naive support of the "Left Republicans" position.

Notes on Spain

The Barcelona correspondent of the revolutionary socialist *La Batalla* tells the story of a revealing scandal. A small airfield in Reus was being reconstructed by U. S. technicians in order to be refit as base for an American pursuit squadron. Local labor was hired, and the wage was set at a munificent \$2 a day for ordinary workers and \$5 for specialists. This would be a pittance for American workers, but in Spain it represented a gold mine.

The officers of the city garrison saw an opportunity for good business. They set up the following system: The officers would hand out leaves to soldiers under their command, so that the soldiers could enroll as workers and collect the wages, in return for which the officers would get half the wages of the worker-soldiers.

Higher-ups in the army put the kibosh on this big business, but found that even lieutenants and captains were laboring away on the airfield for the Americans. The Franco authorities got the Americans to pay the wages in pesetas and at a scale more in accord with the Francoist standards of hunger.

The reformist socialists who helped to lead the Spanish revolution to defeat by Franco are still at the old stand.

In a recent article published in *El Socialista*, Indalecio Prieto made the following declaration with his habitual nonchalance:

"I have returned to Spain certain valuable property, amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars, which have been in my personal custody, and I have returned it without consulting anybody, solely by my personal decision. . . . Everything therefore is chargeable to me alone; I am the only one responsible."

The POUM's *La Batalla* comments: on Prieto's arrogance:

"Under the shameful regime of Negrin—a regime inspired and protected by Moscow—all kinds of outrages, scandals and crimes were carried through. In its last days, while the soldiers were dying on the fronts, the 'big shots' disposed of the property of the state and the country at their whim. Many of them took things into their 'personal custody.' And later, in emigration, they used them at their whim, for personal or political ends, 'solely by their personal decision.'"

"The Spanish people has not yet been able to call for an accounting. But it will, one day. . . ."

The POUM suggests as a slogan for united anti-Franco action "Free elections!" Referring to the diplomatic jockeying over free elections in Indochina and Germany, in which the Western allies set themselves forward as partisans of free elections, *La Batalla* proposes that the idea be applied not only in those countries but in Spain, against Franco.

"The demand for free elections," it says, "can constitute an excellent common denominator for all the anti-Franco forces of Spain. A collective declaration to this effect, by all the political and trade-union sectors of the Spanish emigration, would be particularly opportune and effective today."

Much of what Brenan says in criticism of Bowers is both correct and insightful. He clearly and decisively demonstrates the naiveté of the traditional liberal position and therefore of Bowers' position also. But then, quite inadvertently to be sure, he proceeds to give us a demonstration of quite a different disease—the disease of cynicism, bankruptcy, hypocrisy, and reaction, which he defines as sophisticated liberalism, and for which he apparently wants to be a spokesman.

Bowers wanted a liberal bourgeois Spain. So did most American liberals, notes Brenan. And so did he. Therefore, he says, many of us felt warmly and deeply about the Spanish Civil War, and we wept and continue to weep bitterly at the defeat of the gallant Republicans by the fascists.

THE REAL CHOICE

But, says Brenan, let us re-examine this overly simple view of things. Actually a bourgeois republic had no chance—it was an illusion. The choice instead was between fascism and the revolutionary working class, and that alone.

This very important conclusion is precisely the same one that the revolutionary socialists have pointed out year in and year out. It was therefore with anticipation that we continued reading this analysis, especially as Brenan had made it absolutely clear that above all else he was virulently anti-fascist. Thus, undoubtedly, we concluded, he supported (perhaps critically) the struggles of this revolutionary working class.

But, alas, this apparently was the last thing from his mind. In fact he considers it so out-of-the-question that he barely gives us any explanation for rejecting it. He seems to think that the very label "revolutionary working class" is more than enough to do the job of dismissing this alternative from our minds entirely. Surely one does not support such a force!

Is it because of Stalinist domination of this revolutionary working class in Spain, one wonders? No, Brenan is quick to point out that the Communists were a tiny powerless sect at first, and he further notes that their power was augmented by the very embargo which Bowers is so strongly attacking (the arms embargo placed on the Republicans by the "democracies") and which he is so tirelessly "re-evaluating." He bases his support of the embargo (or at least, his implied support, for he never actually gets around to re-evaluating what the liberal of the civil-war years should have done) on another complicated analysis altogether.

IF-METHOD

What, he asks, would have happened to the course of history if Franco had been defeated and what has happened now that he has won?

If Franco had lost, he would have lost to the left-wing socialists, he argues. The difficulties which would have faced this left-wing government would have compelled them to establish a dictatorship. And even this would not have lasted long, argues Brenan, since Hitler would have conquered Spain when he invaded Russia. (Exactly how this simple event would have transpired is left purposely vague.) Hitler would then have closed the Strait of Gibraltar, thus making things considerably more difficult for the Allies.

And even if the Allies had overcome this obstacle and gone on to victory, this would still not have portended the re-establishment of a bourgeois regime in Spain, the only type of regime worth re-establishing. For after all these "proscriptions, counterproscriptions and counter-counterproscriptions" resulting from this constant seesawing of power, "not many Spaniards would have been left alive." Thus by a series of vague "ifs" Brenan decides against the socialists, and therefore against the anti-fascists of all varieties at the same time.

In contrast, paradoxically, the victory of the pro-German and anti-democratic party has resulted in a victory for liberalism and democracy! So he argues. For Franco was, fortunately, a man of unusual wariness and caution, and Hitler was unable to intervene in Spanish af-

fairs. Thus Spain remained neutral in the war, and in fact "its neutrality favored the Allies even more than intervention on their side would have done," claims Brenan.

And with the victory of the "democracies," Spain "has had to adapt itself to a democratic environment" thus making it progressively milder and more liberal in spirit and portending the rapid return to the Spanish national tradition of equalitarianism and tolerance.

The only exception, says Brenan, to this traditional Spanish tolerance is the persecution of "heresy," and the only heresy today in Spain is Marxism—by which is meant, we assume, the belief in the right of workers to organize unions or to strike, the right of political opponents to organize and hold meetings, and other such elementary democratic principles.

Thus everything turns out for the best. Franco won as we feared, but it was this victory of everything we abhorred which made possible everything we cherish today. Whether we like it or not (and Brenan apparently does) Franco has at least the grudging support of most Spaniards (a statement demanding a longer documented article!). He has survived great difficulties in the past and with American aid he will survive more in the future.

Ambassador Bowers, poor fellow, "is the voice of fifteen years ago," says Brenan: "Yes, we felt like that then, but the situation is different now." It is about time, he concludes, that foreign liberals give up this old sentimental "feud with Franco."

Today we must re-evaluate in terms of practical realism and admit that the end justifies the means, fascism is better

than the struggle of the revolutionary working class, dictators have their uses, democracy is a petty and trivial issue, democratic rights and a free and independent labor movement constitute Marxism, Marxism is *per se* indefensible, and finally, the values of the liberalism of 15 years ago are ludicrous, out-of-date, and to be forgotten. After all, this is 1954.

CONFIRMATION

It will be difficult for most contemporary liberals to refute Brenan's thesis—difficult for liberals, but not for revolutionary socialists. For Brenan's method is essentially that of posing the alternatives in terms of socialist revolution or fascism, for one thing, and too many contemporary liberals have conditioned themselves to equating the former with a Stalinism which they fear above all other evils.

For another thing, Brenan's method is that of choosing the lesser evil (from his own peculiar premises), and most liberals go along with the logic of this choice. And finally, Brenan's argument implies that the Spanish people can suffer dictatorship and oppression, as far as he is concerned, provided that this fate of theirs helps the cause of the Allies, "our side." Anything goes if it helps "our side," and here too is a species of *Realpolitik* which lurks everywhere in liberal American thinking.

Liberals will find Brenan disturbing, even though they think they can refute him in secondary details. Socialists will find him confirming in his own way the basic thought that, in our era above all, the logic of a consistent and thorough-going fight against fascism and for liberty leads to the struggle for socialist revolution.

Letter from a Spanish Jail

The following is an extract from a letter which has been received from members of former free trade unions now serving prison sentences in a Spanish jail. It requires no comment from us, except to say that this tragic document was smuggled out of the jail and passed on by the Spanish trade union federation in exile, affiliated to the ICFTU, and that the name of the prison has been omitted in order to avoid reprisals against the prisoners. — ICFTU Information Bulletin.

. . . Food is a serious problem for the prisoners. However much could be written on this subject would not be enough to make people understand, especially those who have not lived through such a tragic situation. We have been through bad periods, when the quality and the preparation of the food were poor, but there can be no comparison with the present situation.

The horrible food which goes by the high-sounding name of "communal feeding" is completely inedible. Vermicelli and bean-pods for dinner every night—a black and repulsive dish, with a sickening smell. The midday meal, equally revolting from every point of view, is composed of vermicelli and beans. For seven years we have been eating potatoes at every meal, and now they have started to give us beans, which are as inedible as the rest of the pig-food we are expected to eat. Can you have any idea of what it means, having to eat boiled potatoes at every meal for seven years?

Another horrible and inhuman detail is the fact that for four long years we have had no more than 4 ounces of bread. The prisoners are entirely deprived of proteins. Some of them have managed to keep themselves nourished, thanks to their families. They have never at any time asked for anything, as they fully understand the hardships which everyone is suffering. But it would be a good thing to give some material aid to these comrades, since they have families which they cannot look after.

The person chiefly responsible is the governor. Since the arrival of the present governor the prisoners' conditions have reached the lowest possible level. The nuns have to ask for what they need for the kitchen. Obviously, they have to apply to the director before getting the food from the store, but the ration is inadequate and not fit for pigs.

The officials themselves are scandalized at what is happening, and some of them

are not afraid of saying that the food is impossible. We could talk about this ad infinitum, but we will simply add that not only have we been condemned to dozens of years' imprisonment, but at the same time we are condemned to die of illnesses caused by the lack of the essential foods necessary for human existence.

For some time now, the health services have been taking a noticeable turn for the worse. For a whole year (ever since the new governor arrived), no attention has been paid to the issue of medicine, nor has provision been made for looking after the sick. Endless examples could be quoted.

There have been cases where prisoners have been in pain to such an extent that it was obvious even to a layman that their condition was serious and that the appropriate measures should be taken (such as removal to the provincial hospital, or even to Madrid). But nothing has been done. Sick men could ask in vain for some rapid and effective treatment; they would receive absolutely nothing. However, when their condition is desperate, they are taken to the hospital, with a very slight chance of being saved.

The hospital-doctors have protested on various occasions against the methods of the prison doctor, who sends people to the hospital when they are almost dying, whereas they might have been saved if he had sent them a few days earlier. All the patients who are sent to the hospital under these conditions have to undergo blood transfusions, otherwise they could not stand up to an operation.

In most cases, they are stomach operations. Anyone suffering from a stomach ulcer has to reach the stage of a perforation before being transferred to the hospital. It's not until you are at death's door that they start to think about applying remedies.

When penicillin and other drugs are needed—usually in extremely serious cases—the patient has to buy them at his own expense. As for requesting other more expensive medicine, it would be like asking for the moon. If the prisoners want medicine, they have to keep their own pharmaceutical supplies, at their own expense, and under the supervision of the nuns. The only medicine available in the prison is aspirin, with jugs of water and four different potions, which are kept merely for appearances. It is obvious who bears the responsibility for this state of affairs.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

ILP EDITOR REPLIES ON THE 'OUTLOOK' CASE

To the Editor:

I notice that in the issue of LABOR ACTION dated 20th September there is some wild criticism by your London correspondent of the editorial attitude of the *Socialist Leader* on the British Labor Party's decision to ban *Socialist Outlook*.

At the risk of still further increasing your correspondent's blood pressure, may I give the facts which he, apparently, in his excitement, completely overlooked?

The British Labor Party has not suppressed *Socialist Outlook*. It hasn't the power to suppress any paper whatsoever. It has simply declared that "support and association with this paper" is incompatible with membership of the Labor Party. It has the right to say that, and its reasons are that the paper has been a "disruptive influence" within the party; that "the paper has continued to publish propaganda hostile to the declared policy of the party . . . and there is an organized faction at work within a number of constituency parties." In effect, that *Socialist Outlook*, an unofficial paper, whilst ostensibly supporting the Labor Party, has sought to undermine it from within.

It may well be that the Labor Party has overestimated the influence and importance of *Socialist Outlook*, but surely no one—apart, perhaps, from your London correspondent—is foolish enough to argue that the party hasn't the right to ban a group which it believes is conducting propaganda hostile to the party's best interests.

The Labor Party Conference, meeting this week at Scarborough has, in fact, endorsed the Executive's action on *Socialist Outlook* by 4,475,000 votes to 1,596,000.

All that can and should be allowed within any political party are full democratic rights to seek changes in the policies and programs of the party by debates and votes at conferences and meetings, with, of course, the acceptance of majority decisions. If a dissident group within a party is allowed to publish papers and manifestos directed against the accepted policy (majority decision) then the party is speaking with two voices.

I know of no political party which allows the sort of "free-for-all" which your London correspondent appears to be hankering for. Indeed, most of the smaller parties and groups are much more rigid in this respect than the Labor Party.

For instance, *Socialist Outlook*, itself, recently ejected an editor, and denied voice to close-on half its supporters because the editor and his supporters did not toe the line laid down by others, who have since taken control of the paper.

In conclusion, if *Socialist Outlook* believes that it has something vital to say against the policies of the Labor Party, it can surely do this more effectively when it isn't ham-strung by restrictions or concerned about party loyalties.

George W. STONE

Glasgow, Oct. 1

(1) Our criticism of the *Socialist Leader* was not signed nor written nor inspired by our London correspondent. It was written by the undersigned after reading the *Socialist Leader*.

(2) No facts were "overlooked." Comrade Stone's deplorable quibble on how to suppress an organ adds no facts; we had already read that peculiar point in his paper. Since they do not possess state

power, the Labor Party bureaucracy could suppress *Outlook* only with the usual threat of expulsion from the party.

(3) The right-wing bureaucrats sincerely believe that not only *Outlook* but more especially the Bevanite *Tribune* "is conducting propaganda hostile to the party's best interest." Who doubts that they would like to suppress it? If Attlee-Morrison took the same action to get rid of *Tribune*, or *New Statesman*, or other critical Labor papers, would Comrade Stone also applaud and approve? The point was posed in his columns but he did not say.

In other words, what is involved is the whole left-wing Labor press and not only the relatively unimportant *Outlook*, whose suppression sets a precedent.

(4) Does an "unofficial" organ published by Labor Party members have a right to criticize the majority line? Comrade Stone considers this unthinkable for any party. And he refers accurately to the "rigid" attitude taken by "most of the smaller parties and groups," including the kind of people who published *Outlook*. But—

(a) Precisely with respect to its organizational structure, the British Labor Party has always been quite different from most socialist parties, and most especially different from small sects and grouplets. It was born as, and still retains much of the structure of, a federated party of constituent groups. It was sometime before it even organized membership branches. Constituent groups have from the very beginning published their own organs in which they expressed their distinctive opinions. With this structure it became a mass party of the British working class, not a sect jealously guarding its party line from public criticism. This special character of the Labor Party, and its whole tradition and structure, is ignored by Comrade Stone's position of approval.

(b) The above point would be ample to settle the matter. We must state, however, that even as far as the ordinary type of socialist group is concerned, we believe that Stone is wrong. Since our foundation in 1940, the ISL has specifically recognized the right of factions to express their critical views in a public press (the party's or their own). Comrade Stone may be unaware that this was standard practice in all the parties of the old pre-war Second International, including the *Bolshevik Party before and after the revolution up to its Stalinization*. But this old and worthy socialist, social-democratic and Bolshevik tradition has been so long forgotten that it would require more elucidation than we can give it here. The present case rests adequately on point (a).

(5) We had also pointed out that the *Socialist Leader* went further. Stone actually argued that Labor Party members have "signed a membership form and thereby accepted the constitution and policies of the party" (our emphasis) and that therefore they have no right to "bellyache about the leaders, the policies and the constitution of the party."

(6) Comrade Stone's position on this question does not cease to astonish us. In his present letter, he writes that "surely no one—apart perhaps from your London correspondent—is foolish enough to argue that the party hasn't the right to ban a group which it believes is conducting propaganda hostile to the party's best interests." Surely he knows that the ban on *Outlook* was fought as an outrage by the whole left wing of the Labor Party. He himself cites the figures (over one third of the party conference voted to reject it). One feels, however, that he cites these figures to prove that the bureaucratic right-wing majority of the Labor Party agrees with him. It is surprising that this gives him comfort.

We are aware, and said, that the ILP fell into this unfortunate position because of its anxiety to justify its regrettable line of staying out of the Labor Party. It wants to prove "you can't work within the Labor Party." But hasn't it gone too far to justify a poor policy?

Hal DRAPER

YOU'RE INVITED

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

ISL Convention Acts On Socialist Issues

By ALBERT GATES

The Third National Convention of the Independent Socialist League has taken place and adopted several important decisions that will govern the work of the organization until the next convention. All the important sections of the ISL were fully represented at the gathering and the delegates from all parts of the country participated fully in the convention's deliberations. It was a spirited convention, even though smaller than previous similar meetings.

Four major and several minor questions came before the convention. Because of the length of the discussions on these, several important points were left untouched since the convention could not deal with all of them in the three days allotted for its sessions.

The two main resolutions were those which dealt with the world situation and the political situation in the United States. These were followed by a report on the ISL, and then by several press questions.

Quite properly, the convention opened with a discussion of what is commonly referred to as the "international resolution." This resolution, as well as the one on the United States, will appear shortly in their full texts in the *New International*. (The draft versions were published in *Forum*.)

THIRD CAMP LINE

The international resolution, as the discussion established, did not propose any changes from the views of the ISL as presented in two previous conventions. For the most part, basing itself on these two previous resolutions (1949 and 1951), the resolution reviewed the world events and foreign policy developments of the last three years in terms of a Third Camp socialist policy.

It surveyed the trend of the capitalist war camp, particularly the U. S., toward an increasingly reactionary foreign policy, its inherent inability to defeat Stalinism with any progressive consequences; the illusions raised after the death of Stalin in the "liberalization" of the Russian regime; the mistakes of neutralism; and many other aspects of world politics today. As against the policies of capitalist and Stalinist imperialism, which can only end in world catastrophe, the resolution develops the conceptions of genuine democracy and socialism as the means to destroy all imperialism.

On invitation of the Political Committee, the floor was taken for a brief minority report by a League member who held the view that in Indochina socialist support should be given to the Vietminh, as being primarily a movement for national liberation, as against the majority position of no support to either side. The pro-Vietminh position was rejected by almost the entire convention.

In the course of the main discussion, possible differences in view were also discussed, although inconclusively. As the outcome, however, no counter-resolutions or amendments were presented embodying any counter-views to the resolution, with the above-mentioned exception.

U. S. RESOLUTION

The resolution on the political situation in the United States contained one section which produced a sharp debate in the convention and on which the division extended from the ISL leadership down into the ranks. The point at issue was the position to be taken by the ISL on "political action," i.e., the political action of the labor movement, and the relationship that this position bore to the general policy of the ISL for a labor party.

Aside from this disputed section, however, it should be noted that the U. S. resolution itself contains rather lengthy analysis of the situation in the country, both economic and political. Rejecting the notion that the country faces an economic crisis, the resolution points out how the world political situation creates demands on the nation that reinforce the existence of the war economy. The war economy maintains the general high level of economic activity and forestalls any possibility of a deep-going crisis.

At the same time the resolution notes the trend to the right in national politics. It is particularly concerned with the assault on civil liberties and the widespread witchhunt, which, in turn, produced the phenomenon of McCarthyism. The document, however, rejects the theory that McCarthyism represents fascism on an American scale, that is to say, a peculiar

American type of fascism. It says:

"McCarthyism is not a fascist tendency or movement. Still, it is not an 'ordinary' conservative or even reactionary bourgeois current. Its course is away from bourgeois democracy. It presents not the traditional fascist danger of mobilization of the discontented petty-bourgeois masses as a mass force to smash labor, but rather the danger of the imposition of a dictatorial, labor-curbing regime from above by authoritarian state measures of repression.

"McCarthyism represents premature attempts to impose now the kind of regime toward which American capitalism tends in the absence of a vigorous and conscious struggle by the labor movement for socialist and democratic policies. This accounts both for the resistance which it meets from the most solid sections of the bourgeoisie and Republican leadership, as well as for the relative feebleness of their resistance for the division it brings into their own ranks."

One other important section of the resolution is the section called "The Struggle for a Democratic Foreign Policy." Here is contained an important aspect of ISL views, for it seeks the intervention of labor into the field of foreign policy and toward a government which can guarantee a democratic foreign policy as one of the decisive means of defeating not only reactionary Stalinist imperialism but capitalist imperialism as well.

The resolution points out how American foreign policy today, resting as it does upon the world regimes of reaction and opposing the powerful forces of national liberation, plays into the hands of Stalinism and drives to war as the only solution of their antagonisms. Related to the struggle for a democratic foreign policy is the creation of an independent labor party, which would mark the break of the mass of people from the reactionary parties of capitalism.

POLITICAL ACTION

The final section of the resolution, which follows the above, describes the actual status of the American labor movement in the politics of our time. It notes that labor is in politics as it has never been before and is allied most definitely with the Democratic Party and in that party with the Fair Deal wing.

The resolution notes that it is necessary to counterpose to the activities of the labor movement in the bourgeois parties the idea of independent labor politics and an independent labor party; it proposes that our friends in the unions should seek to stimulate "and participate in the running of independent labor candidates on the basis of the most radical platform possible."

At the same time, the resolution notes that labor is in the bourgeois parties (i.e., the Democratic Party) and will very likely not follow our advice at this stage in its development. Shall the ISL take a hands-off position? The resolution says:

"It is entirely permissible, in fact it is indicated to our friends, to point out to union militants who have rejected our proposals and who look toward the Democratic Party and who hope to utilize it in the interests of the working class that they, from their viewpoint, which we do not share, ought to fight for their own candidates from the ranks of labor and responsible to it even in the Democratic Party. It would be correct, in this connection, to discuss in advance how to stimulate or prompt such militants to press in union debates for such decisions."

DISPUTED ISSUE

The disputed section picks up from here. The dispute, as a matter of fact, goes back several years. In 1950 in Chicago, a leading unionist named Willoughby Abner, a Negro union leader on the south side, decided to fight the Democratic Party machine by running in the Democratic Party primaries as a labor man against the machine candidate. His campaign was organized by his own "ma-

(Turn to last page)



LABOR ACTION

October 18, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 42

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Asst. Ed.: GORDON HASKELL,
BEN HALL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Evaluating the Maroon's Picture of the Campus

Political Life at the Univ. of Chicago

By DEBBIE MEIER

"University of Chicago students have always been widely known for their participation in political activity both on and off campus," notes the *Maroon*, weekly student newspaper at the University of Chicago, in an article in the autumn "Orientation" issue. Yet sadly enough, even this first issue of the *Maroon*, devoted as it was to twenty pages of information on student organization, refutes this glib claim.

For the article on student political organizations, covering 10 different political groups, was buried on page seventeen in the midst of the sports page, and it received less space than an article on sailing and tennis, less space than a special report on the University of Chicago switchboard operators, and about equal space with one on the Outing Club!

Unfortunately while part of the blame for this lies with the *Maroon*, a much greater source for this "disproportion" lies in the real situation on campus. The ten campus political organizations are: Young Democrats, Young Republicans, NAACP, Robin Hood's Merrie Men, the Young Socialist League, the Socialist Club, the Student-Faculty Committee for Congressman O'Hara, the Student Committee for Douglas, the Faculty-Graduate Committee for Peace, and the Crusade for Freedom.

While they obviously deserved more space than the switchboard operators or the Outing Club, etc., they have seriously declined in their role on campus and are in fact far less impressive in reality than their titles might imply.

Few of these organizations exist in a meaningful fashion.

Neither the Young Democrats nor the Young Republicans hold public meetings or announced business meetings. If they actually exist, they exist "underground." It is said that each has hundreds of members and a huge executive committee which meets weekly. Yet the student body rarely hears of them; they never participate in all-campus political events and they assiduously avoid propagandizing the student body.

The O'Hara and Douglas committees are obviously both temporary and will exist only for another month.

The Crusade for Freedom, an adjunct of the National Committee for a Free Europe, merely exists to hand out the latter's literature and perhaps to sponsor an occasional speaker, but they are in no sense a membership organization.

POLITICAL APATHY

Thus in reality only five permanent campus-oriented political groups exist—the Young Socialist League, the Socialist Club, the Faculty-Graduate Committee for Peace, the NAACP and the Robin Hood Club. There exists no official or unofficial liberal organization—no SDA, no broad Political Action Committee and no liberal discussion group.

How different from half a dozen years ago! Where are the World Federalists, or their offspring WORLD; where is any equivalent of American Veterans Committee, where is SDA or SLID, or even the Labor Youth League? They have all disappeared, retreated, or been forced off the campus.

But more deplorable than all of this is the general "tone" on the campus. For the University of Chicago has won its victory over "radicalism," "politicalism," and other such youthful "diseases" by subtler techniques than those used at UCLA, for example.

There has been no crude witchhunt, and, in fact, the administration is to be commended for having stood out against the trend of political suppression better

than any other large educational institution. The political witchhunt has taken place only in the more subtle, quiet, petty ways.

But the apoliticalism of the campus is due also to something else—something far less tangible. On Activities Night this year (a university-sponsored occasion at which all campus organizations are given booths to display their literature, program, etc.) one had a feeling that most of the young students shied away from the socialist (and other political) booths not because they were anti-socialist, nor even because they were apathetic—but out of a feeling of social conformity.

SOCIALIST ACTIVITY

After all to be "seen" touching that kind of stuff, to appear interested in politics would be "gauche" and "out of place." It could be "compromising" in the same sense that an adolescent girl is "compromised" by not keeping up with the latest fad, by wearing the wrong kind of socks, or by appearing in a fancy dress at a "sloppy" party, etc. The psychology of adolescence seems to have crept into

the psychology of the once independent-minded and spirited University of Chicago student body.

Yet there are a few things to be optimistic about. And as the year progresses, perhaps events will belie all of this previous analysis. The most promising event at present is the formation of a healthy Young Socialist League unit on campus, one of considerable size, energy, youth and heterogeneity.

And besides this there exists, quite independent of the YSL or individual YSLers, a broad Socialist Club composed of various degrees and brands of socialists. One feels happily surprised by this sudden blossoming of socialist activity in the midst of what seems a slumbering student body. It augurs well for the future.

And then too there still exist those other sources of political protest whose exact nature and size this year are still undetermined—the Student Representative Party, the NAACP, Robin Hood Clubs, etc. We wait, we watch, and we will join enthusiastically to aid dissident voices and organized protests against "the trend."

NSA Convention: The Liberals Were 'Resigned'—and in Retreat

By PHILIP WRIGHT

Timidity, resignation and indifference vied with each other to determine which would be the dominant mood at the seventh annual congress of the National Students Association, held this past summer at Ames, Iowa.

Not that this fact should surprise anyone, since an NSA national congress is widely regarded as a fairly accurate gauge of American student opinion. What should excite at least liberal sensibilities, however, is the failure of student liberals to develop any sort of effective opposition to the program which the NSA national leadership handed to the congress for rubber-stamp treatment.

On issues of civil liberties, academic freedom, racial discrimination and "international relations," the disparate elements which comprise the NSA's "liberal bloc" were unable to wring from the national organization even those minimal concessions which were achieved in former years.

Most illustrative of the congress's cautious and politically insensitive approach to current campus issues is the document "The Student's Right to

Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof," a "Basic Policy Declaration." The viewpoint outlined in this resolution, if it distinguishes itself from the typical contemporary newspaper editorial on the subject, does so only by virtue of the fact that it adds a few "enlightening," "liberal" postscripts.

CRITERION

The declaration begins well indeed: "At the outset, it should be stated that NSA believes that the only grounds on which a professor should be judged are his professional competence and integrity. This principle is basic. Only for lack of professional competence or integrity should a professor be removed from a teaching position."

The principle that ability to teach rather than membership in a subversive organization should be the sole criterion for determining the tenure of teachers was inserted in the declaration at the insistence of liberal delegates to the congress. And what is the criterion for ability to teach?

The next sentence tells us: "The NSA believes that membership in any totalitarian conspiratorial group or organization that advocates the violent overthrow of the United States government requires acceptance of certain principles and methods which surrender freedom in the search for truth. At the present time, in almost every case, such membership extinguishes the ability of a professor to be professionally competent."

The logic of liberalism in cold-war America, as the liberal delegates demonstrate, displays a rather peculiar form. The liberals did not oppose the organization's position on what constitutes incompetence, for they had asserted their principle and it looked mighty fine in

print. The logic of cold-war liberalism provides that the heritage of American democracy is preserved so long as homage is paid to it by making it a part of each and every resolution.

"The undemocratic, illiberal way of handling Communist teachers, with which we'll have no truck, would be to bar teachers from earning their means of livelihood simply because of their membership in the Communist Party. We have a better principle. We believe that the standard should be professional competence, which of course can be determined by the organizations to which a teacher belongs." So in effect said liberalism at the congress.

Another stipulation serves to distinguish the NSA manner of handling the problem of Stalinist teachers. In accordance with the notion that an accused individual is to be presumed innocent until proved guilty, and in line with the viewpoint that members of "subversive" organizations are incompetent to teach, an examination of each case must be made in order to prove that there is a lack of professional competence or integrity.

And if they can't be hung on the competence score, then absence of integrity is easy to establish, given the NSA approval.

TIMID WORDS

It is not the headline-seeking congressional investigators who should prove the incompetence or lack of integrity of subversive teachers. "The NSA believes that a tribunal of one's faculty colleagues is competent to determine the facts and

(Continued on page 6)

Coming Events at the Chicago YSL

Tuesdays at 8 p.m.—at Ida Noyes Hall
(except for Friday meeting on Nov. 12—see below)

- Oct. 12—The Rise of the Socialist in the Labor Movement.
- Oct. 19—Milton Mayer: on Liberty and Loyalty (co-sponsored with Socialist Club).
- Oct. 26—Debate: Can the Democratic Party Defend Democracy?
- Nov. 2—The Nature of Capitalism.
- Nov. 12—(FRIDAY at 8 p.m.) A Panel: The Labor Movement in Crisis.
- Nov. 16—The Nature of Stalinism.
- Nov. 23—Imperialism: Stalinist and Capitalist.
- Nov. 30—Panel: Why Is America Unpopular Abroad?
- Dec. 7—The Road Ahead: The Third Camp.
- Dec. 14—The Road Ahead: An Independent Labor Party.

IDA NOYES HALL, 1212 E. 59 Street (U. of Chi.)

This issue of *Young Socialist CHALLENGE* written and edited by the Chicago unit of the Young Socialist League.

Editors: Jim Burnett, Philip Wright
For more information on the YSL at the University of Chicago, write to: Reynolds Club, Univ. of Chicago; or to: Meier, 5426 S. Maryland.

THE LABOR BUREAUCRAT vs.

(Continued from page 1)

frown upon it cannot become emotionally indignant: "Smart fellow, that crook, you've got to hand it to him."

Built-In Racket

Insurance schemes afford a startling example of how racketeering is built into union welfare funds by the ordinary legal practices of presumably legitimate business.

Insurance companies will pay commission to middlemen. But when unions get their insurance direct, without the intervention of a third party, the companies refuse to turn the unpaid commissions into lower costs for the workers. They will either pay the commissions to brokers or keep them as added profits. Union officials could become grafters almost in good conscience. Why not set up a phony brokerage service and pocket the commissions themselves? They could argue that the commissions they are grabbing do not come out of their members' pockets.

But in the labor movement, racketeering is a morbid and mortal sickness, a sign of the decay of its democracy and of the degeneration of its objectives.

Unions came into existence as a movement created by the working class, popular, idealistic, by men who sought not only to improve their own daily lot but who wanted to uplift all society, to refurbish its democracy, to preserve or restore the dignity of mankind. This was true

not only of the socialist-inspired unions of Europe but of those in the United States as well.

The ordinary, non-murderous racketeering official, from his own perverted standpoint, simply seeks to perpetrate an honest swindle no different in type from hundreds like it in the day-to-day practices of business; but what a terrible debasement of unionism, the perversion of a noble, liberating, democratic institution into an instrument of the filched dollar. How does it happen?

First Step: Bureaucratization

Unions that end in corruption first become bureaucratized.

Once control passes out of the hands of the membership, the union can be warped to fit all kinds of alien interests. Bureaucracy does not always lead to rackets. But wherever officialdom rises above the membership and is removed from its control, tendencies toward corruption inevitably set in.

This is certainly true in the United States where the stream of class idealism is now relatively feeble and all politics and business is permeated by the philosophy of the quick buck. Racketeering is bureaucracy run amuck, in a state of utter degeneracy.

Union bureaucracy is more than a simple transgression on the formal democratic rights of the membership. It involves perquisites in pay and privilege which raise the standard of living and mode of life of the official well above

the average member. It often means gifts from employers, special discounts, "expense" money as an undercover addition to salaries, hotel bills never fully paid. . . . And on the basis of these customary privileges, petty and not so petty, it means the construction of an organized machine to maintain close control of the union.

But which of these practices are legal and which illegal? And which are legal but unethical? If it is legal and constitutional and moral to accept easy union jobs at lucrative salaries and to distribute them around to supporters in the union, then why exempt welfare funds? Some distinctions to indiscriminating minds seem too delicate to detect, especially when no membership is permitted to remind them of subtle shadings.

Case in Point

Three members of the Retail Union local were understandably confused by the rough treatment meted out to their president and they wrote to the editor of the *New York Post* protesting that "a grave injustice was done to our president, Mr. Samuel Rosenzweig." Their letter is worth quoting at some length:

"The only criticism of our union was that Mr. Rosenzweig received a large salary from the Welfare Fund. What was not brought out was that for some years Mr. Rosenzweig's salary was as low as \$800 or \$1,200 a year; that he

(Continued on page 7)

NSA Liberals in Retreat — —

(Continued from page 5)

judge fairly the nature and degree of any trespass upon academic integrity, as well as the penalty such trespass merits."

On the question of congressional inquisitors performing this task, we have what is surely the most powerfully worded criticism of the witchhunting hysteria of our time: "The NSA recognizes the right of the Congress of the United States to conduct investigations for legislative purposes; however, we condemn the methods of some of the current investigations into education as unjust and unsatisfactory. These investigations can lead to the destruction of freedom in the academic community and in society itself. Therefore we recommend that Congress change its methods so as not to endanger freedom in the academic community."

It is, at any rate, the most powerful criticism of anything that came out of the congress.

OPEN QUESTION

Academic Freedom Week, an institution inaugurated by NSA and widely celebrated on campus throughout the nation, may have died at the congress. The majority resolution on Academic Freedom Week called for a commission to investigate the feasibility of continuing the event and report their findings to the NEC in December.

Proponents of a minority resolution, calling for definite endorsement and preparations to ensure the existence of an academic freedom week, argued that if the decision to have the week this year

was not made until December there would be insufficient time to carry out plans. The question of Academic Freedom was an uncertain one as the congress closed.

The most charitable explanation for why the organization refused to make definite plans for the event would be to attribute it to the general indifference of the representatives. The fact that the observance of Academic Freedom Week has a tendency to stimulate critical evaluation of cold-war America, and to bring into question administrative policies and procedural rights on various campuses, may be a more incisive interpretation.

BRAIN-WASHERS

The International Commission of the NSA, which concerns itself almost solely with the questions of relations with student federations of Stalinist coloration or alleged Stalinist coloration, and similar matters, rejected any further cooperation with the International Union of Students; and the congress overwhelmingly defeated the proposal of Richard Ward, former editor of the *University of Chicago Maroon*, that an exchange program be initiated with Russia. The same proposal had been voted down by 137-131 in 1953.

Socialists do not object of course, to international exchanges of students, including Russian-American student exchange programs, except when the latter become Stalinist-front sponsored junkets or instruments designed to aid Kremlin propaganda. This latter could have been a matter of legitimate concern at the NSA confab. Instead, however, there was

manifested a paranoiac apprehension of anything connected with "the Russians," and this we must deplore.

The NSA's conclusions about relations with Stalinist-dominated youth organizations may be judged correct from a socialist standpoint; but they were developed for the wrong reasons; and the policies adopted in regard to these organizations were prompted by the wrong motivations.

During the course of the dispute over this question, considerations of Washington's needs were brought into the discussion and these proved to be decisive in formulating the organization's policies on the IUS and similar organizations. The NSA's International Commission, a selected cadre of 15 students who had completed an intensive "State Department" course on foreign policy, was responsible for setting the general political tone of the discussion.

Members of this commission completely dominated the session. They were repeatedly called upon by the national leaders to "recite facts" and to see to it that the orthodox, official American Party line way of dealing with Stalinism was respected. The dictates of American foreign policy, rather than an understanding of Stalinism, governed all considerations.

Before the convention was over, these people were dubbed "the brain-washers" by liberal students.

And yet these liberal students, urged on by the Stalinists and Stalinoids in attendance, were able to offer no more opposition than to argue for cooperation with IUS on the idyllic ground that it would spread international understanding and diminish the possibility of an atomic war.

"GONE CONSERVATIVE"

Perhaps the most disheartening product of the entire convention was the weakness of the resolution calling for the implementation of the Supreme Court ban on segregation in the schools. For there are powerful social forces behind the desegregation struggle, powerful enough at least, one would think, to spur the largest organized representation of students in America to heights as progressive as that upon which, say, Dwight Eisenhower takes his stand.

But the same want of courage which the NSA displayed when facing other vital issues was shown on this problem. The resolution was so weak, so banal and so satisfactory to all, that not a reactionary Southern voice was raised in protest. A few Northern students thought it went too far and they were quickly appeased by a compromise in the wording of the document.

If one had to give a brief and concise

commentary on the 1954 congress of the National Students Association in terms of its significance for our times, the account of the event in the September 13 issue of *Time*, entitled "Conservative and Resigned," would serve well:

"At Iowa State College last week, some 800 delegates, claiming to represent U. S. college undergraduates, wound up the annual Congress of the U. S. National Students Association. In 10 days of argument and discussion, resolutions and amendments, one thing was clear: there was not a wild eye in the house. The NSA, born in 1947 to a rough and tumble fight over controversial issues (e.g., racial discrimination, banning of Communist teachers, etc.), had gone conservative, in expression, even more than in politics.

"When one group proposed to seek a U. S.-Russian student exchange program to further 'communication'—a surefire controversy in 1948 [and even in 1953—P. W.]—there was little inflamed oratory. The notion was merely voted down, 235-69. An almost inevitable resolution on segregation packed a surprise; it was far milder than the U. S. Supreme Court ban, was challenged by four Northern delegates—for its severity. Joe McCarthy was routinely deplored, rather than denounced; not even a stout-hearted right-winger rose to Red-bait in reply. Nor did the students spend much time discussing the vagaries of the draft and U.M.T. (rejected by NSA in 1952). Said one NSA officer: "we're pretty well resigned to all that."

The YSL's Aim

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

JOIN THE YSL NOW!

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

714 West 14 Street

New York 11, New York

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

NAME

ADDRESS

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

SCHOOL IF ANY

THE LABOR RACKETEER

(Continued from page 6)

took over a bankrupt local union whose members had no job security and poor working conditions; and that over a period of 14 years Mr. Rosenzweig, by his tremendous efforts, gained for the union members the best working conditions in the industry. In the same period of time, Mr. Rosenzweig built up for the union a reserve welfare fund of over \$300,000 and a strike fund of over \$100,000. Every penny received by Mr. Rosenzweig from the union was voted to him by the executive board and the rank-and-file members of the union in return for 14 years of faithful service to its members."

Rosenzweig, himself, justified last year's grab with this self-righteous defense: "Good administrators deserve good pay." He and his admirer pick up standard arguments, time-worn in the service of bureaucracy everywhere.

Vague Boundary

The boundary between corruption and honest bureaucratism is not always sharp and clear. And so, when an honest well-meaning union leadership tries to discourage racketeering without combating bureaucracy, its efforts become ineffectual—especially if the honest racket-fighters are themselves bureaucrats. At least, that seems to be the trouble with the campaign to root out racketeers from the American labor movement.

Here in the United States, the bureaucratic method is the accepted thing. Unions must be dominated by machines controlled closely from above: this is a transcendental truth like religion, flag, and family. Union leaders cannot exorcise racketeering, which they will not tolerate, because of bureaucratism which they do.

In the glare of the New York exposés, many locals, CIO and AFL, were spotlighted. But only President Reuther of the CIO acted promptly and decisively against grafters. The others report in gingerly fashion that they have begun to investigate. But "I will fight corruption wherever I find it—within or without the labor movement," wrote Reuther to the Retail Union. Here Reuther, acting under the stimulus of a spectacular public exposure, moves to protect the labor movement and its reputation.

When Reuther Was Silent

But only a few months ago, serious charges of corruption were made against officials of the National Maritime Union (CIO). They were not made by a highly touted governmental commission, nor spread on front pages. But the men who leveled the charges were responsible high-ranking NMU officers. They demanded that the union itself investigate an organized union-book selling racket. When President Joe Curran refused, insisting that this was a matter for the police and not the union, they formed an opposition group, campaigned against the administration—and lost.

But through all this, not one word from Reuther.

In this case, it meant intervening not at the behest of clamorous public officials but in behalf of an opposition union group fighting to overturn the leadership. During this campaign, Reuther wrote no imperious letters, no public pronouncements, no press releases. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the campaign against corruption was momentarily postponed in the interests of smooth relations among officials.

AFL Crusade

But the CIO has been relatively free of the curse of gangsterism. In the AFL, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union has been pushing a lonely crusade for years demanding that the federation take action to root out racketeering in its affiliates.

Now, however, David Dubinsky, ILGWU president, has won a powerful ally in the person of George Meany, AFL president. It was Meany who fought through the precedent-shattering campaign against the ILA, a campaign that failed when the ILA hung on by its teeth to a majority of the longshoremen in the port of New York.

But the AFL presented no hostile monolithic front to the ILA. Before he could fight the ILA, Meany had to induce his own AFL to back the

convention decision. Even after the conflict had reached a war-to-the-end stage, high AFL officials in New York pressed for the ILA's reinstatement. Local officials of the Teamster's Union openly spoke at ILA rallies against the AFL longshoremen's union. In general, reports of corruption in AFL locals in New York are ignored.

Beck as Philosopher

As the banner of honest trade-unionism was raised on the New York waterfront, Dave Beck of the Teamsters Union was selected as one of the board of trustees of the AFL longshore union. His appointment to the board was not a burning necessity of the struggle against grafters but a concession to his own expansive ambitions. Any free-floating energies at his disposal could be well-occupied in rooting out corruption in his own union.

The New York investigation peered into the affairs of Teamster Local 805 and discovered that fund administrator Abe Gordon was drawing \$30,000 a year. Four other local officers together extracted another \$350 per week. Moreover the fund was obliging enough to buy land from Gordon's cousin; it was worth \$10,500; he received \$85,000. Mathematicians detect a clear profit.

Teamster Local 804, under the presidency of Leonard Geiger, also got into the act. Geiger's brother-in-law pocketed \$38,062 in commissions out of the local welfare fund.

In Detroit, officials of two Teamster locals pleaded guilty of accepting bribes from employers while on trial in the Records Court. Daniel J. Keating, president, and Louis C. Lin-teau, business agent of Pontiac Local 247, and Samuel J. Marosso, business agent of Detroit Local 247, were the guilty men. Keating was charged with accepting \$2,500 from one trucking company and \$10,000 from another for dropping union demands and selling out in negotiations. In Los Angeles, Frank Brewster, vice-president of the Teamsters Union, was accused before a congressional investigating committee of accepting \$5,000 a year from a broker doing insurance business with the union.

Beck, because of his own tender connections with the collective officialdom of his own union, has been singularly philosophical about all these charges. At the AFL convention he made plain that he had no intention of ousting any union official until he had been convicted of a crime.

They Call The Cops

In a special letter to his membership, Beck wrote: "There will probably be charges that will make newspaper headlines that racketeering exists in our ranks. I have made my position clear on many occasions. We will not tolerate racketeering; we must stamp it out with every legal instrument at our command. At the same time, I will not be panicked or pushed by headline hunters or headline writers into violating constitutional, judicial rights of our members as defined by the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights."

This line of argumentation is a duplication of Joe Curran's position. More significantly, it is identical with the defense of the ILA against its expulsion from the AFL, a defense that the whole federation had rejected.

In reply to the New York State Crime Commission, the ILA argued: "If crime has flourished in this port it has been primarily the function of these men and agencies [police, army, mayor, FBI] to ferret it out and prosecute those guilty of its commission." It is a typical reply of those who (at best) shrug off responsibility for action against crooks.

Dubinsky's Solution

With all this in the background, the AFL drive against racketeering stalls: who is a friend, who a foe, and who neutral in the fight? Federation leaders who are eager, even desperate, to wipe out gangster infiltration call for help from the government. David Dubinsky would seem to have achieved an outstanding success in his one-union campaign. He enlisted Meany and saw a convention move against a racket-infested union. But his very high point of success became the moment to admit failure.

In the July issue of the *American Federationist*, an article by Dubinsky entitled "Safe-

guarding Union Welfare Funds" finally concedes that the labor movement cannot keep itself clean and comes out for government help:

"American labor traditionally and properly has resisted all efforts on the part of governmental agencies to interfere with the conduct of internal union affairs. We felt that to open the door to interference is to allow a wedge to be driven into our 'house' that could ultimately shatter the union home we have built so laboriously."

But he can no longer hold on to this principle because "The internal structure or unwillingness of some unions to deal with this problem [rackets] among their unions, where an abuse does develop, leaves the trade-union movement in a weak position to argue against governmental intervention."

And finally: "in the face of the evil that does exist, we must begin to think about lending our support to legislation that may . . . set a minimum code of propriety and responsibility in the handling of these [welfare] funds."

In convention, the AFL voted a resolution breaching its traditional stand against government intervention in the internal affairs of unions. It offered willing cooperation to legislators and government investigators in policing union welfare funds. Unlike Dave Beck, Meany appealed to the unions not to wait for the district attorney to do their housecleaning for them. But he also indicated that government action had proved necessary to supplement the self-policing of the AFL.

Admission of Failure

It was a serious admission of how deadly the disease had become; but more important, it was an admission of failure. The bureaucratic method of handling racketeering had reached a dead end; the cops had to be called in.

Responsible union leaders are determined to clean out the crooks. Racketeering could be overlooked with impunity when the labor movement lived in its own private world. But men like Meany and Reuther, the new representatives of a new labor movement, are aware that the unions face large social responsibilities; they must exert pressure in shaping national policy; they must appeal to the people for support and sympathy; and they cannot permit their moral position to be undermined by petty embezzlers or extortionists. Only the old-line labor officials who would choke down labor's rôle into a stifling narrowness can remain complacent and phlegmatic.

But why are the enemies of the rackets stymied? The clue to their failure in this field lies in their approach to all the problems of union internal life.

The "Danger" of Democracy

A crusade against crooks in the labor movement that would not depend upon cops and judges would have to begin by arousing the active indignation of the membership in every union. It would have to stimulate their idealism and make them feel what the union movement is and can be. They would be encouraged to organize against, to oppose, to resist, to oust-conquering officials.

But consider what must necessarily happen once such a mood took hold.

To be sure that their locals were administered honestly and properly, the ranks would have to insist on regular meetings, plus detailed reports subject to open verification and questioning. That alone would cause a crisis in hundreds of union halls. And if the reports are freely made, closely examined and frankly discussed, who will guarantee that an aroused membership will strike down only dishonest officials? What is legitimate and what is not? If legal super-expenses and fattened salaries are uncovered along with illegal ones, where is the membership to stop? Where does normally high pay for officials end and graft begin?

In sum, in order to be organized and aroused to throw out racketeers, a membership has to be set in motion and once started may throw out good, honest ordinary bureaucrats. It would freshen up the whole labor movement but even the best of our labor leaders has no stomach for that. Their punishment is the stubborn persistence of rackets.

Liberal Party Swallows Hard —

(Continued from page 1)

year to run Liberal Party leaders whose records and program are well known, at least to the rank and file of the party.

This year the state convention of the Liberals endorsed Jacoby (as well as most of the other Democratic nominees) without any discussion whatsoever on his program, policies, record, or qualifications from a Liberal Party point of view. The air was still ringing with the echoes of the accolades given him when the newspapers announced his withdrawal by the Democratic machine.

Why? It seems the sterling candidate had been involved in a sordid transit scandal during the LaGuardia administration. In fact, there had been a long and messy court case, with Paul Blanshard, then commissioner of accounts, prosecuting the company with which Jacoby was connected. Eventually the bus line was compelled to pay the city thousands of dollars of unpaid taxes.

A nice record indeed for the nominee for state comptroller, who was going to handle the state's money!

And who brought this interesting and relevant fact to light? Was it perhaps the Liberal leaders, who defend their policy of support to the Democratic Party by asserting that they exercise great influence and pressure on the Democrats to put forward the best types of liberals? What happened to these watchdogs? How did they let a Jacoby, typical product of Tammany corruption, slip by like a thief in the night?

Could all the Liberal leaders have been ignorant of his record? After all, many of them were prominent figures in the LaGuardia administration — including State Chairman Adolf A. Berle. What accounts for such a case of total political amnesia?

Or can it be that they were committed in advance to accept any mess of pottage dished up by the Democrats, since they gagged in the case of an anti-labor, injunction-issuing judge?

It wasn't the Liberals but the Republicans who let the cat out of the bag. When the Democrats got wind that the latter were going to make political hay out of this scandal, the Democratic chiefs quickly met and substituted Colonel Arthur Levitt, president of New York City's Board of Education. To date, no one has remembered any scandal about Levitt, at least not any financial scandal, but one can never tell.

Once Jacoby's withdrawal was decided, the Liberal leaders demonstrated anew their subservience to the Democratic machine. Why didn't they raise a big stink about Jacoby and insist, even from their own point of view, on a bigger share in return for their support to the Democrats?

WHY BE RUBBERSTAMP?

They keep repeating that now is not the time to run independent Liberal candidates—some time later—maybe—we'll see. But why couldn't they have fought to have a Liberal Party leader run for that post? The Liberals could have named a dozen men of the highest financial and moral integrity from their own ranks. Instead, they sat silent while the Democrats exchanged one hack for another.

The new candidate, Levitt, duly endorsed by the Liberal leaders is no improvement on the old candidate. As head of the Board of Education, Levitt is closely associated with the pro-Franco, McCarthyite George Timone, also on the board. Timone favors the firing of ex-communist teachers who refuse to become stool-pigeons, and Levitt has gone along with that view. When the city's school teachers fought for increased pay from Mayor Wagner, Levitt sat on his hands.

Yet the Liberal leaders quickly rubber-stamped the Democratic choice.

Even if the Liberal leaders should argue that they had to accept the Democratic state nominees as a "package," what about the possibility of running

Liberal candidates in the two congressional districts to replace Republican Jacob Javitz and Democrat Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr.? All the time, energy, and money spent in previous years in these two districts to elect and re-elect these two men could have been channelized in this election to build Liberal Party sentiment in these districts by running independent candidates.

These two situations were excellent opportunities for the Liberal Party to capitalize on its work and influence, but the leadership is too busy grasping the coat-tails of the Democratic Party.

This humble position opens them to some well-aimed kicks on the part of the Democrats who have not been slow to deliver them. Their gubernatorial candidate, Averell Harriman, while willing to accept Liberal endorsement, publicly and openly rejected the Liberal Party plank to raise an additional \$65,000,000 in new taxes to finance certain state welfare programs.

But the last thing in the Liberal leadership's mind is to demand that candidates endorsed by them should endorse their platform. In fact, to spare Harriman any embarrassment at the hands of the Republicans, Murray Baron, New York County Liberal Chairman, reassured the Democratic candidates that "only substantial compliance" was expected of them and no commitment "in detail" on the platform. What's a detail like \$65 million for social welfare?

Since the Liberals don't take their platform seriously, one can scarcely expect the Democrats to do better.

The Liberal Party is thus left with only one state-wide candidate running in this election committed "in detail" to their program and platform — their own George Rifkin running for a judicial post. A Liberal leader in Queens County and a labor attorney, Rifkin is running as the independent candidate of the Liberal Party, along with a few candidates for assemblymen scattered through the five counties.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ISL Convention Acts —

(Continued from page 4)

chine" based on the local PAC organization which he also led.

At this time the question was raised whether socialists should support Abner's fight in the Democratic Party. The 1951 convention of the ISL rejected such a policy by a majority of one, after a warm debate at and before the convention.

This disputed point was reactivated at the present convention. An amendment offered by half the Political Committee read (referring to the 1951 policy): "In this connection the Convention decides that the categorical prohibition against ISL support for such candidates under any circumstances, which was adopted at the last convention of the League, is no longer operative."

A majority of the National Committee

also proposed the following amendment to the convention: "Moreover, in those instances where the participation of the trade unions in the Democratic Party has reached the point where their political activity dominates or controls the local functioning of that party, it is incumbent on us to urge that labor run its own—labor-controlled—slate of candidates in primary and general elections for both public and inner-party office. By this means labor's active commitment to the Democratic Party can be turned into a progressive channel by projecting a struggle within that party, a struggle which will highlight the present contradiction between labor's domination of local party functions and the utilization of that party machinery for anti-labor ends. Such an independent stand, even while within the Democratic Party, will tend to split labor from its conservative, bourgeois and imperialist allies, and may be a step in sparking labor into an Independent Labor Party course."

With the adoption of the above amendments by the National Committee, the issue was debated in the convention. The longest and warmest debate in the convention occurred around this question, which was, in important respects, a discussion of how to struggle for a labor party. In contrast to 1951, the convention voted overwhelmingly in support of these two amendments and they were incorporated into the resolution itself.

PRESS QUESTIONS

Under the report and long discussion of the ISL, came the press question and attitude toward the magazine *Dissent*. In the first case, the convention was presented with a proposal to merge the *New Internationalist* and *LABOR ACTION* into a single press organ, on the ground that the objective circumstances and the financial condition of the ISL made it impossible to continue to issue two such periodicals. At this point, the financial situation of the League was discussed at some length; it did not present a very happy picture. Nevertheless, the majority of the delegates considered it a mistake to give up the magazine which has existed almost continuously since 1934 and has a high reputation throughout the world.

In order to help meet the difficult problems associated with the publication of the *NI*, a proposal was made by comrades working on the *NI* that, beginning

with 1955, it be converted into a quarterly. This proposal was adopted by the delegates with the knowledge that no great ease will be introduced into the problem, but they nevertheless did not want to give up the *NI* with its rich tradition without another strong attempt to keep it.

On the question of attitude toward *Dissent*, two questions had been raised. One was of political characterization of the *Dissent* tendency, and the other of relations with it.

With regard to the first part of the question, the convention endorsed the political estimate which the Political Committee had made on this point: "Politically, *Dissent* is the organ of elements who desire to express their separation from the politics of Third Camp independent socialism while still attempting to express a variety of 'leftist' or socialist opinion. While we do not believe that its editors can find a stable position in this area, that is their problem; for ourselves we cannot look with sympathy on this attempt, which essentially is simply an attempt to establish a semi-organized political halfway house in which backsliders from independent socialism can feel that they are still functioning in politics. This is in fact the only role that *Dissent* can hope to play, and while we do not believe that it can expect to maintain a viable existence on this basis, what is certain is that we have no reason to encourage or support such a role."

The convention motion also endorsed the subsequent article in *LABOR ACTION* on *Dissent*.

On relations, however, a convention majority differed from the Political Committee. It adopted a motion that "ISL members are free to write articles for *Dissent*" with some added qualifications.

By this time, the convention had run out of time and such important questions as the Cases of the ISL, relations with the Young Socialist League, and various proposals made by members to the convention could not be considered. These were referred to the incoming National Committee.

While the convention did not accomplish everything it set out for itself, it did complete the major work for which it was called. The comrades who participated felt that the gathering was quite an achievement for these times, for through the convention, they felt the genuine vitality of the ISL.

A great thinker on the problems of American socialism—

Marxism in the United States

by LEON TROTSKY

35 cents Order from:
Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

A Marxist Classic

Rosa Luxemburg's

The Accumulation of Capital

Yale Univ. Press\$5

Labor Action Book Service
174 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Get Acquainted!

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

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

I want to join the ISL.

.....

NAME (please print)

.....

ADDRESS

.....

CITY

.....

ZONE STATE

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

1 year at \$2. New

6 months at \$1. Renewal

Payment enclosed. Bill me.

.....

NAME (please print)

.....

ADDRESS

.....

CITY

.....

ZONE STATE