

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

DECEMBER 20, 1954

FIVE CENTS

EXCLUSIVE:

**The Reuther Brain Trust's New
Line on Politics and Capitalism**

... page 2

America's Ally in Morocco

... page 3

Sacrilege and Anathema

... page 6

A 'General Shift in Policy': Now the U.S. Openly Votes for Colonialism in the UN

Vote on Cyprus: The Theory of the Lesser Ally

By PHILIP COBEN

The little island of Cyprus, lying between Greece and Turkey in the Mediterranean, is no important world power; on the contrary. Yet it now becomes a world issue, and not merely an issue between Britain and Greece, with the definitive United States government's announcement of its decision to vote against self-determination for Cyprus.

Let no one charge us with artificially inflating a small quarrel. It is Washington that has now done this.

For the sake of the "strategic advantages" of using the Cypriots' home as a military base, it has decided to ignore any and all of the political, moral or diplomatic advantages of suiting its actions to its democratic talk—even this once, even in connection with this small island.

In doing so Washington has definitively illustrated and dramatized the essence of U. S. foreign policy under both Truman and Eisenhower: "Militarize, militarize, militarize—this is the primary answer to the challenge of Stalinist imperialism. Everything else has to be subordinated to building up armed power. Democracy may be trampled on, colonialism supported, reactionary dictators propped up and even installed in power—everything goes as long as more guns can be counted. . . ."

Cyprus is such a small stake for an international quarrel? Well, so much the more dramatically does it illustrate the line of U. S. imperialism, which cannot make even a small democratic gesture in this case.

Agonizing Choice

There is another special aspect of the Cyprus issue which particularly underlines the reactionary military-imperialist content of U. S. policy.

No one (not even the British who use the argument for the record) believes that it is "the Communists" who are behind the Cypriot movement for Enosis (fusion) with Greece. As we shall see, the record is perfectly clear on the desire of the overwhelming majority of the people for union with Greece. And Greece is an "honored" ally of the U. S. and a sovereign member of NATO in defense of what is called the "free world."

Not only that but if there are any rambunctious Stalinists on Cyprus to any effective extent, the Greek government is likely to repress them even more brutally, more undemocratically, than the British; so that certainly Washington cannot argue that the fusion of Cyprus with Greece would or might open the island up for the well-known Washingtonian nightmare of "Communist infiltration." On the contrary, insofar as Cypriot Stalinists make hay out of present British mastership, their opportunities

(Continued on page 7)

China and the 13: Who Won What?

By HAL DRAPER

The State Department seems to be very happy about the fact that it was able to round up the non-Stalinist votes in the UN for intervention against Stalinist China on the case of the alleged American "spies." Anthony Nutting, the British delegate to the UN, seems to be very happy about the fact that he can tell the American people: "See how staunchly we British stood foursquare behind you" even though Britain recognizes Peiping. Chiang's delegates are probably happy to.

The practical effect of this U. S. victory in the UN, however, would seem to be a great deal more doubtful.

Let us assume that the Americans who are held are detained illegally and unjustly, as the U. S. charges. Some cautions on this point will be mentioned below, but certainly, of course, the brutal Stalinist masters of China would not hesitate to pursue this sort of game if they saw advantage in it.

(Continued on page 3)

Vote on Morocco: Lodge Plumps for France's Rule

By BERNARD CRAMER

One day after the U. S. announced its decision to cast its UN vote in favor of Britain against Cyprus [see story in column one], U. S. delegate Henry Cabot Lodge Jr. put this country on the side of colonialism on a second issue—UN consideration of the question of freedom for Morocco.

Like the question of Cyprus, the Moroccan issue at the UN is even more important in its meaning for U. S. foreign policy than in its meaning for the Moroccan people (who have other ways of winning freedom than mere reliance on a UN vote).

In fact, with the Moroccan stand of the State Department following the Cyprus declaration, a N. Y. Times editorial started seeing "a general shift of United States policy . . . toward a hands-off attitude in these so-called colonial issues," that is, to use straight English, toward open support of the colonialist powers against all appeals to the UN by the subject colonial peoples.

Actually, there has not been a *shift* in policy

(Turn to last page)

U.S.-Adenauer Rearmament Policy Is Losing Out Against Socialists

By GORDON HASKELL

The ratification of the Paris agreements and the actual rearmament of Western Germany are still far from being accomplished facts. It appears that the opposition to West German rearmament is mounting both in that country and in France, and the Russian government is doing its utmost to help this opposition along.

The most recent action of the Stalinist government in Moscow has been to send notes to Paris, London and Washington informing the peoples of the world and the governments centered there that "the remilitarization of Western Germany will make impossible her unification with the peace-loving East Germans into one state."

This threat by the Russian government could be expected. But coming at this moment, it tends to reinforce the growth of sentiments and movements which are actually non- or anti-Stalinist, but which oppose the rearmament of Germany for their own reasons.

In the first place stands the Social-Democratic Party of Germany which has opposed the rearmament of its own country until such time as it achieves complete equality with all other nations in Europe, and only under circumstances which will not prevent the unification of the country. The SPD insisted right along that the rearmament of West Germany would bar such unification for the foreseeable future. The Russian note now backs this con-

tion to the hilt. And it appears that it is being accepted as correct by an increasing section of the people of West Germany.

SHIFT TO SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS

In the recent elections in Bavaria, Chancellor Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union lost 20 per cent of the vote it polled in 1953. It lost a quarter of a million votes in the elections in Hesse, and in West Berlin the Social-Democrats came up with an actual majority of all the votes counted. Furthermore, Adenauer's coalition in Bavaria has split apart, and it appears that the Social-Democrats will form a coalition state government with the Bavarian separatists and the Free Democrats.

It is true that the rearmament of West Germany was not necessarily the only or even the

(Continued on page 4)

THE STORY BEHIND THE NEWS

Discussion Meetings That Fathered the Right Turn —

How Reuther's Brain Trust Adopted the New Line

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Dec. 11—When at the CIO convention Walter Reuther and Emil Mazey pounced on Michael Quill of the Transport Workers Union for advocating the formation of a labor party at the convention, they were presenting the "new line" of the Reuther leadership of the United Auto Workers Union.

The "new approach" to the American political scene came after many discussions, including a fairly representative gathering of ex-socialists, one-time pro-labor-party advocates, and others who are considered Reuther's cadre in the UAW, which took place after the November 2 election

It was in line with this decision that Roy Reuther, for example, was at the New Orleans meeting of the Democratic National Committee advocating persuasively the unity of the Democratic Party.

These top-level discussions were partly reflected in the caustic remarks Reuther made in replying to Quill's criticism of the Democratic Party, for Quill was guilty of the kind of "sectarianism" which the UAW leaders scorn and reject (with precisely the arguments that Lewis Coser uses in his contemptuous article on sects and sectarians in the current issue of *Dissent*).

Back to the Swamps

In summary form—and as objectively as possible—the viewpoint of the Reuther cadre may be outlined as follows:

- Due to the dynamic character of American capitalism, and the different historical background of its development, the political course of events has taken a turn unexpected and unexplained by any so-called socialist thinkers, including ourselves when we were socialists. There is no need nor room for a socialist movement in America. Its advocates past and present were doomed to sectarian sterility since the American scene is basically different from Europe.

- We do not deny that in England and on the Continent there is need for labor parties, and the old schemas do have significance. But it simply isn't true in America. The two-party structure fits the American society better than any other conceivable pattern, and, broadly speaking, the Democratic Party may be termed the party of the people.

- Our experience in Michigan—and we of the UAW are far ahead of the rest of the labor movement here—shows what excellent results can be achieved by having working harmony and unity with outstanding progressive leaders like Soapy Williams. It would be absurd to push for control of this party or for our own candidates when we have such excellent allies and terrific vote-getters like Williams with us. We would be guilty of stupid sectarianism to attempt any such tactics.

[Parenthetically, nobody denies more vigorously and vehemently than Michigan CIO leaders any charge that they are trying to capture the Democratic Party in Michigan. A good case in point was the violent attack by Gus Scholle on Fay Calkins for her book on the CIO in politics, in which she concluded that the CIO was capturing the Democratic Party here because of the many delegates it controlled. Scholle pointed out that in that year, 1950, the CIO let Williams write his own ticket.]

- In New York, our policy signifies working with Harriman and with Carmine DeSapio, for the Democratic Party in New York is the best vehicle for political action, even though many CIO leaders, influenced by the existence of the Liberal Party and the "radical" milieu of New York, lose sight of this and go off on tangents like the Roosevelt mess. Success in politics does need to take into account the attitudes of the large blocs of voters, including the Catholics. If you can get Harriman, a New-Dealer, with Catholic support, but you lose that support to get Roosevelt, who after all is less qualified than Harriman for a big job, why bother? We were right in supporting Harriman, no matter what the CIO convention or New York labor leaders thought, then.

- It's sheer nonsense to denounce "party bosses," and to repeat arguments that the Republicans used against us. The so-called "boss system" in American politics really is not as unsavory as seems. Every organization does have its leaders, and they are necessary. The object should be to get responsible leaders,

and work with them. DeSapio, Tammany's leader, fits into this pattern very well.

- Our political task in America is facilitated by the split in the Republican Party; and through a prudent policy of social reform and through working in harmony with Democratic Party leaders in Congress, we can win the election in 1956. Fortunately, we have many fine candidates, from Stevenson who is the best of them all to Harriman and perhaps Williams.

- What our critics, and we ourselves, have failed to grasp thoroughly are the important changes taking place in the Democratic Party, especially the rise of a new, powerful liberal wing in the South. Of course, many of them have to be educated on the Negro question, but so does the whole country. And many of them, even good people like Senator Fullbright, are blind when it comes to issues like minimum-wage laws, but they too can be brought along. We do see eye-to-eye with them on most foreign-policy questions, and on the domestic scene they do tend to go along with our kind of legislative program. And they did vote to censure McCarthy.

[At the CIO convention, the PAC resolution gave special emphasis to this viewpoint on the new Democratic Party in the South.]

- While such a perspective could be changed by a drastic economic turn downward in America, and we would have perhaps to reappraise our outlook, this is not likely since we are in a Permanent War Economy. Sure, unemployment will be a bit of a problem but it can be worked out with the pressures of our plan for a guaranteed annual wage. As a matter of fact, only Marxists think that unemployment is inevitable under capitalism.

- No one has really tried, except haphazardly, to make capitalism work. Steady employment can be achieved, as we'll show everyone in 1955 when we win our negotiations for the UAW.

- It's just a hangover of old days and old thinking to view the temporary conflicts of interest reflected in negotiations, for example, as the class struggle in the European sense. John Maynard Keynes has far better answers to the problems of economy than Karl Marx. Actually the system operates more along the line of the countervailing theory of Galbraith than any other theory.

The Ideology of the Fat

At the CIO convention, Reuther's press spokesmen insisted that his public views against any third-party movement represented "a basic change in Reuther's personal philosophy." This is self-evident, of course.

What is new, however, is that this also represented a significant change in the outlook of his main cadres.

Until now, the theory prevailed in the UAW, and it was spread by many of his secondary associates, that the third party or labor party disagreement was mainly one of "timing." The critics, of course, were too "impatient," and one should trust "Walter's judgment."

Coincident with this was the theory that secretly Walter and many others really were socialist-minded, if not socialists at heart. What is decisive now is to recognize that the Reuther cadre, consciously, deliberately and with many discussions, have broken with their ideas along those lines.

It would be stupid merely to denounce or agitate against the Reuther viewpoint and his theory of American politics, nor is it enough to ridicule them with claims that the present outlook is simply a rehash of John L. Lewis' brochure of the 1920s *The Fight for an American Standard*. Naturally a serious and thorough rebuttal will be in order.

In America, the new Reutherite outlook abandons the role of critic to the residue of Stalinism, and opens new fields for them to exploit in circles where socialists are not able to make their voice heard from a totally different point of view.

The Reuther outlook represents a sort of Victorian age of American trade-unionism, with its vast wealth and power and the new privileged position of its leadership in the country.

But these comments are only preliminary. For there will be ample time and events, including the wage struggles of 1955, to debate the ideas presented by the Reuther leadership as the answer to the workers' problems.

Reuther versus Quill at the CIO

By L. G. SMITH

The exchange between Walter Reuther and Mike Quill at the CIO convention in Los Angeles on the idea of a labor party got national coverage in the press. It is quite understandable that the labor reporters would sense in this discussion something important—something which would give satisfaction to newspaper editors, owners and their business colleagues all over the country.

At the moment we do not have the official text of the exchange between Reuther and Quill. We have to rely on the reports in the New York papers. But even from these it is clear that Reuther's opposition to the idea of a labor party was of a different KIND from his opposition to labor party resolutions in the UAW in the past.

Previously he always appeared to oppose the formation of a labor party from a tactical point of view—it was inopportune at the moment. Now he appears to have taken the position that a labor party is unsuited to American conditions in general, and that labor has found its true and lasting home in the Democratic Party.

Quill's sudden interest in a labor party is in all probability a reflection more of the unhappiness of this old opportunist demagogue with some recent rebuffs he has received in the Democratic Party than with any real conviction on the need for and feasibility of an independent organizational and political course for labor in this country. At most he may have been thinking of threatening the Democratic bosses with a labor party for the purpose of wringing some concessions from them.

Yet even in such an idea, of the efficacy of the labor party as a threat, there is more sound politics and a better appreciation of the real political potential of labor than in Reuther's conversion to a completely standardized liberal-bourgeois view of American society, the development of American politics, and labor's role in it.

In his speech, Quill is reported to have accused the Democrats of "fumbling and blundering" all over the country. He pointed out that 14 of the 17 states with "right to work" laws are Democratic-controlled. It is not reported what Reuther had to say in answer to these arguments, except to propound a theory to the effect that a labor party cannot be successful in this country.

With this declaration by the top leadership of the left wing of liberalism in the labor movement of its loyalty to the Democratic Party, not as a temporary tactic but as a strategic tenet or even a dogma applicable to a whole historical period, the air may be cleared of at least one illusion: that some kind of leadership can be expected from them in the direction of the formation of a labor party, or even in conducting a conscious, independent struggle for labor leadership inside the Democratic Party.

The advocacy and leadership of a struggle along either or both of these lines falls clearly and unambiguously on the shoulders of militants in the labor movement who have not lost the consciousness of the independent role of the working class in American social and political life and become absorbed into the completely pro-capitalist ideology now put forward by Reuther. It is they who will be the "architects of the future."

**HOLD OPEN
New Year's Eve**

ISL-YSL PARTY

at

LABOR ACTION HALL

9:00 p.m.

114 W. 14th St.

Our Partner in the 'Free World' — French Colonialism

Morocco Is a Land Beseiged

The British Peace News publishes an account of an interview with a young Iraqi (now in England) who recently visited Morocco—Gailan Mahmud Ramiz. His report, as described below, is a vivid picture of Morocco under French imperialism.

By DOUGLAS ROGERS

French Morocco is like a land besieged, according to a young Iraqi who has recently visited that country.

He is Gailan Mahmud Ramiz, and in a long interview with me he said that in all the towns he visited he was astonished to find a complete absence of young people.

He visited, amongst other places, Marakesh, Casablanca, Fez, Meknes, Rabat, and Tangier. "I saw hardly anybody between the ages of 20 and 35," he said. "When I asked the people why this was, they shrugged their shoulders and said that all the young men had been arrested by the French. I asked how many had been arrested and was told, 'Nobody knows, but there must be over one million.' In Fez I asked a prison warden how many people there were in his prison and he said there were over 10,000. There are three prisons in Fez.

"In every street are barbed wire barricades, and the scene resembles a battlefield. Every day troops and police searched the houses of Moroccans, turning everything upside down. Whilst this is taking place, the streets are completely barricaded and armed guards put at each end. Moroccans complained to me that soldiers often take advantage of these searches to steal anything of value. If a Moroccan makes a movement during the search of his house, he may be shot at sight on the ground that he is trying to run away. Everywhere there is fear."

So absolute is the repression of the Nationalist movement that educated peo-

ple are afraid to confess that they can read or write. They say the French assume that any educated person is dangerous.

Everywhere Ramiz went he was told whispered stories of French atrocities. A Moroccan told him he had overheard two French soldiers talking and describing the riots in early August, when they said that 1,200 Moroccans had been killed, put in sacks and dumped in the sea. Stories were told of Moroccan nationalists being tortured in prison to reveal the names of their comrades. He was told of prisoners being injected with bacteria and of being given electric shock treatment. He could not verify these stories, but the genuineness of the fear was obvious.

The acute poverty of the people was plain for all to see. Everywhere one sees people begging in the street. "I saw old women, who must have been 70 or 80, sitting on the streets day and night. It

is common to see women moving about on all fours. Everywhere there are children as thin as rakes and in rags."

Moroccans seemed to be excluded from all public employment. He only saw three Moroccans working in the Post Office or banks. Even the shoeshine men are suffering from French competition!

Ramiz himself had experience of the suspicion of the French police. In Rabat he was taken to a police station and questioned about half-an-hour. Why had he come to Morocco? Whom did he make contact with? He said he wanted to get to Casablanca and take a ship to Tangiers. The police delayed him so much that he missed his boat.

In Casablanca he was trailed by the police and questioned at his hotel. The police came three times a day. Eventually, they took him to the police station and kept him there for nearly twenty-four hours. All they could find on him was an Arab grammar. He told them that he was an Iraqi tourist. They asked why he had this book if he was only a tourist.

At the police station he was kept in a sort of barrack room. After he got permission from an officer, he gave money to a soldier to get him some food.

"I was taken there at 2:30 p.m. one day, and not released until 1 p.m. the next day. In the early hours of the morning, I asked an officer if I could go and have a cup of coffee. He took me downstairs and, on the way, I heard a man screaming. The officer brought me back a different way. All through the night the telephone was ringing and jeeps were driving off and returning with the loads of youths.

"There were so many prisoners taken, that the police made an enclosure of ropes in the open air and kept them there. When I was released next day, I caught a plane to Tangiers and got out of the country as fast as I could."

ALGERIA: French Jitters

The jitteriness of the French over North Africa was revealed in a letter to the N. Y. Times of Oct. 16, from Paul Graeser, U. S. air force lieutenant. He wrote:

"During the Algerian earthquake disaster, U. S. air force supplies and other aid were at first irately rejected by the French authorities. They objected to our showing up the local administration by providing sudden, overwhelming aid. Later this ban was lifted, but reportedly only after some heated discussions. . . ."

The UN Vote on Morocco — —

(Continued from page 1)

so much as a more frank and open expression of previous policy, which was sometimes concealed beneath the tactic of abstaining on UN votes when abstention would have the same effect as a pro-colonialist vote.

This time, however, it is important to note, the U. S. was partially defeated in the UN. The majority passed a motion which at least would keep the Moroccan question pending before the Assembly, for consideration at another time. Washington demanded a vote against even this concession, though actually the Moroccans once again were shooed off the present agenda.

"THIS IS NOT THE TIME"

Lodge could not even keep the Latin American delegates in line for his open pro-colonialist policy, precisely because it was open. Lodge insisted that France was "sincerely trying to settle this problem" in accordance with UN principle; but when the Dominican delegate proposed an amendment which would express confidence in French intentions, this usually meaningless compliment was defeated.

(Incidentally, while 16 of the Latin American states regretfully found that they could not afford to expose themselves like Lodge, it was the government of the Dominican Republic—perhaps the most unsavory dictatorship in all Latin America—which was found to do the dirty job. U. S. foreign policy again showed its positive genius for attracting to itself the full loyalty only of the most disreputable reactionaries in the world.)

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.

Since Lodge still claimed (like everybody else) that his heart is unceasingly filled with soft and loving sentiments toward all peoples' aspirations for freedom, as long as nothing has to be done about it, the American delegate's justification for supporting French colonialism was the one about "this is not the time."

More ironically, however, Lodge is quoted by the press as saying, more precisely, "This is not the time when resolutions here will do some good." This is remarkable in view of the fact that a few days before this same Lodge had clobbered a resolution through the UN to condemn Stalinist China.

We are also reminded that in the course of that previous debate on the China case, Lodge had complained of the Stalinists' speeches: "It is typical of the contempt in which communism holds human intelligence. . . ." The ironical fact which we have been noting is obviously also typical of the other kind of imperialism which today opposes the Stalinist totalitarians.

HYPOCRISY

"We are in an era of practical action rather than exhortation," orated Lodge, as he urged the Assembly to take no practical action even to exhort. It seems that he was holding up before the Assembly the example of France's steps toward concessions to Tunisia, and arguing that France should get a chance to do the same for Morocco.

In the first place, the hypocrisy of this argument is perfectly evident in view of the fact that the conclusion to be drawn is to postpone the Moroccan case but not to kill it—exactly what the majority did. Lodge's motion was not to give France more "time" but to take the Moroccan issue off the UN's books. This is true even if we concede that the argument has all the justice Lodge thinks it has.

In the second place, everybody in the world, or at least everybody in North Africa, knows what finally pushed France to make conciliatory gestures toward Tunisia. It is not much in dispute since Mendès-France has admitted it.

This was precisely the rise of violence and guerrilla action in Tunisia, by the so-called fellaghas. It is immaterial here for

us to observe that, from the socialist point of view, terrorism is no substitute for militant mass action. Tunisian terrorism was a reaction to the fact that no really militant struggle was else being conducted by the Nationalists.

Well then, does Lodge want the Moroccans to get action from France, in the same way? This is a useless question to ask insofar as it applies to Lodge; but one must make no mistake about the fact that it is a present thought among the Moroccans.

In any case, insofar as Lodge helps to close all other avenues of action like the UN, he encourages Moroccan nationalism to resort to relying on its own strength. And we know that through its own strength it will fight, whether through the modern methods of mass struggle or the desperate measures of terrorism.

TRUTH FROM TRUMAN

Ironically, it was only a few days before this "general shift of U. S. policy" that "Wild Bill" Donovan, former head of the wartime OSS—who is no anti-imperialist radical or even liberal, as God knows, or at least as the State Department knows—came out with a statement warning the United States that it must not set itself up as a supporter of colonialism because it would thereby forfeit world support. Such a statement, which might be considered a platitude under other auspices, is still newsworthy when it comes even from such a character as Donovan.

But its wisdom is not for Lodge, not for the State Department, not for the White House, not for United States imperialism. Nor is it a question of the bad Republicans who are in office. It happens by coincidence that the same day's news which reports the Moroccan vote of the U. S. also carried report of a press conference by Harry S. Truman, the Democratic predecessor of the present bad Republicans.

Truman told the press that "he thought the country's basic foreign policy under the Republican administration 'is just what I set up.'"

That's the simple truth.

TUNISIA: They're Taking Whole Families as Hostages

In the course of current French negotiations with the Tunisian fellaghas (nationalist guerrilla terrorists), it has been revealed that the French authorities have been taking whole families as hostages.

A dispatch from Le Kef, Tunisia, in the December 30 N. Y. Times discloses this fact in passing.

On other occasions — i.e., when not busily engaged in suppressing colonial peoples—bourgeois democrats like to express great horror of this practice, especially when denouncing the Bolsheviks for defending the Russian Revolution during the wars of intervention by the imperialists.

It has not yet been reported that the New Leader (for example) has rushed to denounce the French as uncivilized and barbaric.

The Times dispatch mentioned that the Tunisian chief negotiating with the French, Ahmed Thili, presented as one of his demands "that the detained members of the fellagha families be released." According to the story, this particular demand was granted. In a second dispatch another fellagha chief, Lashar Chraiti, is quoted as expressing confidence in "the guarantees concerning the security of the fellaghas, and their families."

Now You See It, Now You Don't

In preparation for the discussion of Morocco at the UN [see story in this issue] the French government made a show of concessions to the Nationalists.

As reported by *Toward Freedom* last month, "About 80 Moroccan nationalist leaders have been freed, minimum wages for farm labor have been raised, and a guarantee of freedom of trade-union organization . . . has been announced. In addition, hints have been dropped that the puppet Sultan, Ben Arafa, will be replaced, though it is considered incompatible with French 'face' to bring back the nationalist-minded Sultan Ben Youssef, who was dethroned last year."

The gestures were small and verbal enough, it is clear, but even so it can be expected that even these will wither away now that the U. S. has helped Paris over the UN hurdle.

As far as trade-union rights in Morocco are concerned, it is interesting to note that, right along, Stalinist labor organizers have been able to operate freely. The apparent mystery is not very dense. On the one hand, encouragement to the Stalinists acts as insurance against native-led nationalist trade-union organization, and on the other, insofar as Stalinism gains some strength, French imperialism can claim that its continued oppression of the country is necessary in order to save it from falling into the hands of Moscow.

At the same time (that is, before the UN vote), *Free Morocco*, U. S. organ of the Istiqlal party of Moroccan nationalism, reported that French troops had violated a Moslem sanctuary previously respected for 1000 years, in order to arrest 70 religious leaders who had petitioned for the return of Ben Youssef.

Labor Action FORUM New York

THURSDAY, DEC. 23 at 9

BEN HALL on
Racketeering in the Unions

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

SPAIN

Franco Officially Rejoins the 'Free World' (U.S. Says So)

From IBERICA, Nov. 15

By BART ALLAN

Franco's Spain is now officially classed by the United States Information Service as a member of the "Free World." Spanish fascism is grouped in the agency's official reports with the democratic systems of France, Italy and Western Germany. This is the basis upon which the agency receives several hundred thousand dollars annually from the American taxpayers to maintain (a) its broadcast service over the air, (b) its Spanish desk at the broadcasting center, (c) five information centers in Spain.

These information centers, located in Madrid, Barcelona, Valencia, Bilbao and Seville, are serviced exclusively by Spaniards, four at each center with the exception of Madrid. There the records show one full-time and one part-time American, and six full-time and one part-time Spaniards.

SUBSCRIBERS—ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

18-51

If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW!

Special Book Sale

GIVE A BOOK FOR A GIFT

- CAPITAL**, by Karl Marx (3 vols., Kerr; like new)..... \$20.00
- STALIN**, by Leon Trotsky (U. S. ed.)..... 3.00
- HANDBOOK OF MARXISM**, ed. by Emile Burns..... 6.00
- COMING STRUGGLE FOR POWER**, by John Strachey..... 1.50
- THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA**, by Leon Trotsky..... 5.00
- AN AMERICAN LOOKS AT KARL MARX**, by William J. Blake..... 5.00
- WORKERS BEFORE & AFTER LENIN**, by Manya Gordon..... 2.00
- HISTORY OF GREAT AMERICA**, by Gustavus Myers..... 1.25
- AMERICA'S 60 FAMILIES, CAN FORTUNES**, by Ferdinand Lundberg..... 1.50

All books on this list are single copies, sold on a first-come first-served basis. Most are used, but all are in excellent conditions. All orders must be accompanied by payment.

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



LABOR ACTION

Decembr 20, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 51

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

Assistant Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

It is to be presumed that they have been duly "cleared" for their jobs by Spanish fascism and consequently have the blessing of Franco. They doubtless understand very well that under the Spanish fascist regime—so denominated by the United Nations—it is a crime to propagate republican sentiments or to engage in such subversive activities as to call into question one of Franco's cardinal principles, as set forth in the Falange platform, that the state is "a totalitarian instrument." With this understanding, it is to be assumed that they govern themselves accordingly.

WOONG FASCISTS

The U.S.I.S. budget shows that servicing that part of the "Free World" where the Spirit of Freedom, like ancient Prometheus, lies chained to a rock and tortured unceasingly, costs the American taxpayers \$391,474. One wonders what the truly free spirits still remaining in Spain could do with that money.

The breakdown is as follows: Maintenance of the five centers in Spain, \$110,932; maintenance of Spanish desk \$65,440; broadcast facilities, \$163,218; other programs and various overhead, \$51,884.

U.S.-Adenauer Rearmament —

(Continued from page 1)

decisive issue in all of these elections. The net effect, however, has been to decrease considerably the power of the Adenauer coalition, and even to deprive it of the straight two-thirds majority in both houses of the Bonn parliament which is required to give rearmament of the country clear constitutional sanction.

Aside from the political shift away from Adenauer and toward the Social-Democrats, there has been rising evidence of the reluctance and even opposition of the German people to the remilitarization of their country.

Last month, a public-opinion poll in West Germany showed that 68 per cent of the men and 73 per cent of the women opposed the idea of becoming or having relatives become soldiers. A professor at the University of Wuerzburg (formerly a paratroop colonel) asked two thousand students individually if they would accept careers as officers. Not a single one said yes.

Opposition to rearmament has become so popular that West Germany's unofficial war minister, Theodore Blank, has been booted down repeatedly when attempting to make speeches for the new army, and has had to seek police protection on at least one occasion. The demonstrations against Blank, and others against former generals like Von Manteuffel, Ramcke, Student, Von Schimpf and Von Roon have been led by students, Social-Democratic youth and young trade-unionists.

"NEGOTIATION" DEMAND

As against the rearmament of West Germany and its inclusion in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as provided for in the Paris agreements, the SPD is urging further negotiations among the occupying powers for the reunification of Germany. They demand a "real test" of the possibility of an agreement between Russia and the American bloc.

Actually, this demand cannot be expected to arouse great hopes among the German people. In the past, the Social-Democrats have been the first to expose the phony proposals for unification made by the East German and Russian Stalinists which are directed toward ensuring the Stalinization of the whole country. So far the Russians have not proposed, to meet the excellent conditions for a free nation-wide election to establish a new government, put forth by the SPD. But in their effort to halt the remilitari-

This takes care of a regular 30-minute program.

By contrast with the \$280,542 total cost of the broadcasting service to Spain, a similar service to Vietnam before the fall of Hanoi was budgeted at \$285,190 and to Japan at \$287,617.

When the Senate Appropriations Committee was inquiring into the services performed by the information centers, Theodore G. Streibert, the agency's director, explained that "the tools of these centers are books and related materials," and that their activities "are directed consciously and positively toward the leaders of the communities in which they are located." "Consciously and positively" that is, to the duly approved fascist leaders of Madrid, Barcelona, Valencia, Bilbao and Seville.

At Madrid the work is helped along by a printing press for the publication of pamphlets and leaflets.

SPLIT OPINIONS

Members of Congressional committees did not question Mr. Streibert too closely about the nature and effectiveness of the

broadcasts to Spain. Nor were any observed to raise eyebrows when the classification of Spain as a member of the "Free World" family was submitted.

However, Maine's Senator Margaret Smith did raise the question of evaluating the broadcasts to the different countries. "When did you last evaluate their effectiveness?" she asked.

Streibert replied: "We are now in the process of trying to evaluate our Spanish broadcast. There is a difference of opinion between the broadcasting people here and the people in the post."

Doubtless there are also some decided opinions on the part of Spanish lovers of freedom living in exile.

Senator Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee has just returned from a tour of Western Europe where he investigated the efficacy of the USIS and other aid extended to Europe. At a press conference he was asked whether the USIS centers in Spain were allowed to hand out, under a Fascist regime, information about the American system.

"Oh, yes," he replied. "We're giving them money, aren't we?"

zation of West Germany and its definitive inclusion in the American bloc, the Russians have been coming closer and closer to offering something approaching the SPD's conditions.

There is nothing in the record of Stalinism which would lead one to believe that the Russians would actually be willing to give up their hold on the Eastern part of the country in exchange for a very indefinite and (from their point of view) insecurely "neutral" government over the whole of Germany. Further, any genuine approach to unification could not fail to raise the question of the German territory beyond the Oder-Niese line which was annexed by the Russians and from which the German population has been expelled wholesale.

Thus, although the remilitarization of West Germany will no doubt freeze the division of the country for some time to come, a policy of opposition to remilitarization which is based on the demand for a negotiated unification of the country is based on the fallacy that such a deal is possible, given the realities of the cold war, or if it were possible, that it would be achieved on the basis of a really democratic arrangement.

Yet this fallacy has a certain popularity, not so much because the West Germans believe in the possibility of unity through negotiations, but because they are absolutely convinced that unity cannot be brought about through the rearmament of their country. And over and beyond that, they do not believe that such rearmament can even obtain for them what is claimed for it: safety from the danger of Russian aggression.

IN FRANCE TOO

The people of Germany are now in the position, which they had not previously experienced in this century, of knowing at least as much as any other nation about the horror, destruction and degradation of modern war. Although they have not yet experienced nuclear warfare, their imaginations do not need enormous stretching, after the thousand-plane raids with blockbusters, to "feel" what such a war could mean.

And they know that if push should come to shove, Germany itself will be the initial battleground, and as such exposed to both strategic and tactical atomic weapons.

Under such conditions, the idea of the remilitarization in the middle of the cold war can appeal to them only if every other possibility seems to have been sealed off. And as long as the line of "unity through negotiations" seems to have any possibility at all, large numbers of them have shown a readiness to buy it, even if with a marked lack of enthusiasm.

In France, the sentiment against German rearmament is of the same type, with the added fear of German militarism thrown in. But the French also seek fundamentally some road out of the cold war rather than a method of waging it more effectively "from strength." Here, too, the neutralist, anti-American, anti-German and pro-negotiation sentiment could quite conceivably deliver to the Paris agreements the same kind of blow

the European Defense Community received in the Chamber of Deputies. Actually, if this does not take place, it will be far more as a result of French fears that Mendès-France represents their last hope for some kind of stability on the basis of his domestic policies rather than of confidence or support to the rearmament of West Germany.

In this situation, the social-democracy in Western Europe finds itself hopelessly split. Once again the Second International appears not as any kind of central coordinating or unifying force for internationalism among the parties of the social-democracy, but rather as a figleaf over the shamefulness of their nationalism and disunity.

While the SPD leads the fight against the Paris agreements, the Labor Party in England orders its members of Parliament to abstain on the vote. The Belgian Socialists vote to ratify, and the only thing one can be sure of about the action of the socialist parties of the Netherlands, Italy and France is that their decisions will be based not on internationalist considerations, but on the very narrowest of national calculations.

MISSED OPPORTUNITY

The contrast in the behavior of the German party with that of its sister organizations in Western Europe does not actually favor the former either in principle or in tactical adroitness. For the fact is that the SPD policy has failed to rally a decisive section of the German people to that party, and a good deal of the appeal it continues to have is a result of the fact that the United States and Adenauer have been so afraid of Russian propaganda advantages which could result from further negotiations, and have been pursuing so sterile a policy of their own, that no real test of the notion that the Russians might be induced to withdraw peacefully from East Germany and permit the democratic unification of the country has been possible.

Of course, the German Social-Democracy missed its great opportunity during the East German uprisings in the spring of last year. At that time, a series of massive demonstrations in West Germany for the demand of withdrawal of all foreign troops from the country and democratic unification to be undertaken by the Germans themselves would have delivered the most powerful blows at the two war blocs while mobilizing support for the socialism and democracy both inside Germany and throughout Europe.

Although there is not now any occasion as dramatic as the East German uprising, it is only the development of an independent policy for the unification of Europe under labor and socialist auspices that provides any real hope for the mobilization of the political forces which could make the unification of Germany possible. All other policies, however attractive and "practical" they may appear at the moment, are bound to founder on the realities of Russian and American power, because they leave these powers intact and cannot create a positive movement which opposes them in the interest of the common people of the continent.

CCNY and Antioch Introduce New Blows Against Student Right to Form Club

By MAX MARTIN

A new threat to student political life has sprung up in at least two colleges in recent weeks. The latest attack on academic freedom takes the form of regulations requiring student clubs on campus to submit full membership lists to the administration in order to be chartered or "recognized" as campus clubs.

Failure to do so would result in denial to the clubs of the use of any school facilities, such as meeting rooms, and also the right of the club to exist at all.

The schools affected thus far by this reactionary move are City College in New York and Antioch College in Ohio.

The action at City College came via a ruling of the Student-Faculty Committee on Student Affairs (SFCSA) which requires that, as of the beginning of next semester, all clubs will have to provide the Dean of Student Life with the names and addresses of all their members.

The ruling has called forth a healthy storm of protest from student opinion at CCNY. The Student Council Civil Liberties Committee, both college newspapers, and many student organizations have called upon the SFCSA to rescind its decision at its next meeting.

A letter addressed to the Dean of Student Life, James S. Pearce, by the presidents of Students for Democratic Action, Young Democrats, Young Liberals, Student Council Civil Liberties Committee, Young Progressives of America (the Stalinist-front group) and the Political Alternatives Club (a student group of socialists and radicals), read as follows:

"We, the undersigned, feel that the decision taken by SFCSA last week in compelling all student organizations to submit their entire membership lists to your office was not in the best interests of democracy or of the student body.

"We believe not only that the personal political beliefs of individuals will be violated but that numerous organizations on the campus will have a harder time than ever acquiring new members. An employer may be justified in wanting to know whether a graduate was a member of a fraternity or professional society but whether he is a Democrat or a Republican is purely his own business.

"Considering the seriousness of this ruling and the opposition it has generated from both newspapers, the SC Civil Liberties Committee and many student organizations, we hereby request a hearing before the next meeting of SFCSA in reconsideration of last week's decision."

ANTIOCH RENEGES

As of the moment, student action in opposition to the ruling has been confined to the demand for a hearing by the SFCSA and preparations for testifying at it. In addition to student leaders, several faculty members have announced that they will also appear to urge a revocation of the decision. In addition, Student Council will consider the matter.

Apparently proposals for more militant student action have elicited the response from most of the student organizations that they wish to wait until the SFCSA acts on the demand that it reconsider. The Political Alternatives Club has decided not to wait and is sending a letter to the student newspaper outlining its proposals for the fight against the ruling.

At Antioch College, the proposal for submission of full membership lists emanated from the president of the college and was accompanied by a number of other restrictions. These include the obtaining of faculty advisors acceptance to the administration by all organizations, furnishing of information about financial

resources and expenditures, information on affiliation or connection with outside organizations or persons, and the giving of full biographical information on speakers and club sponsors.

What is significant about this development at Antioch is that it occurs in a school which up until now has had a very good civil-liberties record and where student organizations have been able to function with a minimum of red tape and school regulation.

The effects of these new requirements should be obvious to all. The first result will be to increase the reluctance of students to join political organizations, to make them more wary than they are even now to commit themselves to a relationship with non-conformist political groups.

RESTRICTION AND FEAR

The cooperation of reactionary college administrations with the FBI and other witchhunting government agencies has been an established fact for many years. The special desire now by some schools for complete membership lists can only impress upon students the fact that joining a Stalinist or socialist or radical or even liberal club will result in their names being turned over to the FBI.

Indeed, the document in which this proposal was framed at Antioch almost openly stated as much. It contained a sentence to the effect that one of the two copies of the lists of members shall be kept in the office of the president, who may show them to prospective employers of graduates and other persons.

Further, it increases the red tape which students must deal with in order to keep an organization going on campus and makes it a little harder, as all increases in red tape procedures do, to organize a student club in the first place. The new regulations also give reactionary school administrations an additional handle to use against student groups which they might wish to hamper or disband. Each new regulation restricting

the functioning of student clubs provides another pretext for an administration wishing to hinder or smash a student group on the grounds of its having violated the regulation.

Above all, the effect will be to increase fear and apathy, and to decrease what little political life remains on the campus.

All students will be affected, not merely those who are members or potential members of radical organizations. Those students who today are not radicals or even liberals, who are not the kind who will join political clubs, will be further intimidated into avoiding those activities they may still consider engaging in, the signing of an occasional petition or attending an occasional meeting, for example.

What reasons are students being given for the latest move?

The commonest explanation is that employers desire to know about the extra-curricular activities and "leadership role" of graduates who have applied for a job. But of what legitimate concern is membership in a political organization to an employer?

Any student who wishes to give prospective employers such information can do so when applying for a job, or can list his club affiliation on the "extra-curricular activities record card" which most schools have. And any student not desiring to do so has the right to keep such information secret.

Indeed, in today's witchhunting days, it frequently becomes necessary to keep such information from the boss to obtain and hold on to a job. The right to privacy about political views and affiliations is, therefore, no academic matter.

AGAINST THE INVASION

In addition to "the employer wants to know" line, arguments for the proposal include statements about the right of the school to know what activities all students engage in, because the school is responsible for the actions of its students and student groups.

Such arguments have no foundation whatsoever. A school administration has no more right to know about the affiliations of its students than it has the right to know which candidates or party a student voted for. Nor does it carry responsibility for the views and activities of a student group so long as the club makes clear that any ideas it propounds or actions it undertakes are being done in the name of the club and not in the name of the school as a whole.

Students at Antioch and City College must begin now to struggle against the adoption or for the revocation of these new regulations. All democratic forces on the campus must unite their

energies against this latest invasion into the democratic liberties of students and demand the right of students to keep their political lives on the campus their own personal business should they so desire. Students at other campuses must be alerted for the introduction of such regulations at their colleges and prepare to resist them when they are proposed.

Moreover, this development raises the entire question of what legitimate requirements a school administration can impose for chartering a student organization and giving it access to school facilities.

RED TAPE

Almost all colleges make certain minimum demands. These include that the club provide the administration with a list of club officers and a minimum list of members (in some schools 5, in others 10). The club must also find a faculty member to serve as its advisor with the rights of this advisor varying. In addition, there are certain procedures to be gone through when the club wishes to hold a meeting or distribute a leaflet (in those schools where leaflet distribution has not been entirely banned), or bring a speaker to the campus.

Since the advent of the witchhunt these requirements have become greater and more cumbersome, enmeshing efforts to hold meetings, etc., in yards of red tape—that is, in those schools which still allow student political clubs (there are some which don't) and for those clubs which are permitted (most schools have banned the existence of Stalinist and even socialist or radical clubs).

Administrations always justified their demands that a club submit a list of five or ten members, in order to be recognized, with the argument that the school has the right to make sure that there is a real club in existence, that it consists of more than one person, before it turns school facilities over to it.

Before the start of the current witchhunt, this demand did not present too many difficulties to political organizations on campus, except where the amount of members required was too great, and therefore it had some seeming justification. At the same time, of course, even prior to witchhunting days, it raised a problem with respect to those cases where fewer than the needed number of students desired to form a club.

INTIMIDATION

After all, do not four students, let us say, have the right to organize if they wish to? Also, it's frequently difficult to attract additional students to an organization until it can hold meetings, distribute leaflets, etc. So, even prior to the witchhunt the demand for a minimum list of members had the effect of curtailing student rights.

Since the onset of the attack on civil liberties and academic freedom in this country, however, such requirements have an even more shameful significance.

For one thing, those students who are courageous enough to have their names given to the school as members of a radical group are endangered thereby. This information is turned over by many schools to employers requesting information about job applicants, thus creating problems for radical students when they seek work after graduation. These names also frequently turn up in the files of the FBI and other political-police organizations.

Furthermore many students who would otherwise join a club refrain from doing so because of these consequences, and this makes the existence of dissenting political life on the campus possible only with the greatest of difficulties, where it is still possible at all. Thus the rights of radical students are denied and the

(Turn to last page)

YSL Educational Conference in Chicago

The Chicago Unit of the Young Socialist League will conduct an Educational Conference on Thursday and Friday, December 30 and 31.

While primarily intended for members and friends of the YSL in the Chicago area, those living in other vicinities are strongly urged to attend. Housing arrangements will be made for all coming to the conference from out-of-Chicago which will not involve any expense.

The exact details of the conference agenda have not yet been determined but a number of important and interesting political topics will be discussed. Among these are the questions of Socialism in Colonial Countries, "Lesser-Evilism in American Politics," and others. These sessions will be led by leading comrades from the National Office of the YSL.

All desiring to attend or needing further information are urged to contact the YSL, c/o the Reynold's Club, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; or YSL, 114 West 14 Street, New York.

SACRILEGE AND ANATHEMA:

Two Sociological Notes on Christianity and Judaism Today

By HAL DRAPER

A while back, we expressed the idea in a LABOR ACTION note that some good real Christians (by which we merely mean people who actually believe what Christianity preaches) would be of some help on the scene in this country today; and we'd like to make the point again, provided readers understand that we make the point objectively from a strictly non-theistic angle.

If there were any real Christians around, for example, there would unfailingly have been a flood of letters to the N. Y. Times on that Easter morning when the paper came out, fresh and crisp, with a photograph on its front page depicting a cross in the sky—a cross formed by army bombing planes.

If we were Christian, we'd have considered this sacrilege, but there did not seem to be any believers around.

And if there are any considerable number of Christians left in this country, we cannot understand how Hollywood can get away with the sacrilege which regularly appears on its screen, especially in historical films dealing with the development of Christianity.

Rarely, for instance, have we seen pictures which were as contemptuous of the ideals for which early Christianity stood as that CinemaScope pair consisting of "The Robe" and "Demetrius and the Gladiators." We admit that the sacrilegious propaganda which imbues them is very subtle, since probably not even the makers of these wretched films were consciously aware of it. But sacrilege it is.

GLORIFYING VIOLENCE

Consider: A big point is made in both pictures about the principled pacifism (insistence on non-violence) of the early Christians. The filmmakers could have chosen to ignore this ancient peccadillo; but no, they insist on flaunting it before the audience. And in each case, this principled pacifism is systematically shown to be absurd, futile, self-defeating. In fact, in each case the *deus ex Hollywood*, who saves everybody at the end, is not the man whom Christians like to call the Prince of Peace on holiday occasions, but is rather the man of violence, who brings the plot to a triumphant conclusion with an act of violence.

In the case of "The Robe," the Christian protagonists are saved as the armed (pro-Christian) legions pour into the arena, glittering with shields and javelins. The case of "Demetrius and the Gladiators" is even worse.

In the latter film, the climax hinges around the renewed pacifist convictions of Demetrius, who has been forced into the gladiators' arena and told to defend himself. Dramatically in the face of certain death, he faces the emperor and flings down the sword symbolically. A symbol? It turns out to be a signal for rebellious guardsmen to shoot an arrow into the breast of the bad emperor Caligula, revolt, and crown the good emperor Claudius. The Christians have been saved—by stark violence and murder—in a film which revolves around the theme of Christian ideals of non-violence.

REVILING RELIGION

We are "complaining" of all this as unbelievers in either theism or pacifism, ourselves.

We are merely interested in pointing out how the American bourgeoisie and its dream merchants and entertainment-propagandists spit upon and revile the ideals to which they give lip-service, the religious homilies without which no speech by Eisenhower is complete.

No one is in any doubt about why they do this—it is in the interest of the militarized capitalism which goes along with militarized institutional-Christianity. And with the exception of a small band of Christian pacifists, whom of course we know, the ideals of the dominant religion in this country are a thing to be mocked at, not lived. It is a para-

dox, but not hard to understand, that it should be revolutionary socialists writing this in some regret, not the spokesmen of the church.

II

While on the subject of the sociology of institutionalized religion in the United States today (to give our comment an academic air), a recent event turns attention to the Jewish synagogues, and raises an interesting problem.

First of all, here is the news as summarized in the *Jewish Newsletter*, published by the liberal William Zukerman:

"A reform of Orthodox Jewish marriage laws which have not been changed for 1000 years has been introduced last week by a group representing Conservative Judaism, which occupied a middle-of-the-road position between traditional Orthodoxy and Reform Judaism. The Conservative group, which claims to represent 40 per cent of all religious Jews in this country, announced a revision of the old Jewish marriage contract known as *Ketubah* which imposes many hardships, indignities and discrimination on Jewish women. The *Ketubah* goes back to the time when women were considered and treated as chattel slaves and when wives were sold and bought as property of man. It is not a marriage agreement freely entered by a man and a woman on the basis of equality as a marriage contract is in all civilized Western countries. It is a one-sided contract according to which the man 'acquires' a wife, and has all the rights and privileges of the property owner, while she has none. A man may divorce his wife at will for any reason or for no reason at all, without her consent, while she cannot do the same. Under this contract, a Jewish widow is not allowed to marry unless actual evidence of the husband's death is furnished, nor can a childless widow remarry without obtaining a property release from her late husband's brother. These and similar inequities prevent thousands of Jewish women from remarrying and result in untold suffering for thousands of others.

MEDIEVALISM

"The new marriage contract of the Conservative Jews provides for the establishment of a special Religious Court (*Bet Din*), which is to be empowered to consider all complaints arising from the backwardness of the Orthodox marriage laws and to try to settle family claims in the light of modern conditions. The announcement of the Conservatives has met, however, with the instant fanatical opposition by the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of America who issued a declaration that the Torah laws given by Moses cannot be changed under any circumstances, no matter what human misery they cause. The rabbis threatened with dire consequences, including excommunication, if the Conservative Religious Court is established."

We can add to this account that (as reported by the *Orthodox New York Day & Morning Journal*), the prohibition pronounced by the Orthodox Rabbis included the following threats:

"The *Bet Din* and the reformed *Ketubah* will lead to forbidden cohabitation and to bastardy, leading to a split in the Jewish people and to a breach in Jewish family life. . . .

"We declare that the false reforms of the Conservative Rabbis undermine the foundations of the Jewish religion, and they will lead to a situation in which we shall feel ourselves compelled to prohibit marriage unions with families who married under such reforms; and it will be necessary to keep a roster of families

married under such reforms in every city. . . ."

All this has the smell of authentic medievalism. What is paradoxical about it is that we are not dealing here with a backward people. On the contrary, in all other respects, it is perhaps no exaggeration to say that the body of Jews, even those who follow the Orthodox rabbis, are probably more "enlightened," not less, than the average in the United States.

Yet a not inconsiderable section of the American Jews, those for whom the Union of Orthodox Rabbis speak, permit themselves to be bound by certain social customs (at least in form) which have few if any peers in backwardness in the modern and civilized world.

MEANING OF A PATTERN

The mystery may seem to be deepened—or, from another point of view, an answer may be indicated—when we see that in the state of Israel the medieval customs of Orthodox Judaism (for example, the marriage laws) are not only insistently imposed on the population by the rabbinic but even reinforced by the state. And here we are dealing with a state whose leadership claims to be modern, indeed "socialistic" (god save us), and beacon lights of progress in the world.

Yet in this otherwise modern state, today mobs of zealots can conduct a campaign of terror on the streets of Old Jerusalem in order to force strict Orthodox practices on the Jewish population: stoning passing vehicles, beating up people caught smoking on the Sabbath, attacking mixed gatherings of men and women (forbidden by the Torah), etc.

Are we not dealing here with a pattern of desperate attempts to preserve intact a crumbling whole, lest any change whatsoever cause the whole structure to fall apart?

The student of sociology can scarcely fail to conclude, from the statement of the Orthodox rabbis, that they consciously fear that any change whatsoever in the laws of Judaism will open up some rift which will inevitably widen, that therefore the whole edifice must be defended with the cry of No Change.

But this is typically a phenomenon which accompanies a social structure which is already dead, though not yet buried. Only such need be defended by such methods.

What is it that is dead—not, we stress,

necessarily in our opinion, but in the eyes of the desperate Orthodox who hurl such anathemas at Change? What is it that they fear so much?

Their own answer—varying in form for the Orthodox or for the Israeli Zionist—is (1) Jewishness, in answer to the first question, and (2) assimilation, in answer to the second.

Consider, for example, the following statement by David Ben-Gurion, former Israeli premier, as he hammers away in the Jewish press:

"The Jewish people in the Diaspora [dispersion] . . . is now faced with a question of uncommon urgency and importance. It is this: Will it be able to survive for a long time, and if so, what kind of Jewishness will sustain it? A Zionist movement that does not endeavor to give a positive answer to this question, thereby denies its own purpose and the reason for its existence. . . .

"It is true that we do not have an official Jewish assimilationist party in America. On the contrary, there are very few Jews who are ashamed of their Jewishness and hide it. . . . Yet there can be no doubt that practical Jewish assimilation is proceeding apace, as the old obstacles to Jewish integration in other cultures are being swept away. It is an undeniable fact that the old religious traditions and observances have lost much of their power over the masses. The same is true of the language of the Jewish masses. There is hardly a barrier left to hold back the onrush of Jewish assimilation in the free lands of the world.

"It is ironic that in this process of assimilation and integration into a non-Jewish culture there is hardly any difference between Zionists and non-Zionists. . . ." (*Day-Morning Journal*, March 7.)

FREE CHOICE

Here Ben-Gurion ties together the joint fears of the Orthodox and the consistent Zionists (note his reference to religion), and indicates how the same phenomena can appear in both circles. In both cases the religious forms, no matter how reactionary, are important to preserve as guardians against the devil of "assimilation," the "danger" of which Ben-Gurion perhaps exaggerates.

Now Independent Socialists do not believe, on principle, in having a "party line" for or against assimilation (as we have stated in our resolutions), for we consider that this is a matter to be freely chosen by the Jewish masses themselves in the course of their free development. What we do insist on, as socialists, however, is creating and maintaining the preconditions of free choice.

What is socially and politically reactionary about the Orthodox anathemas and the practices of the Zionist state and zealots in Israel is that they are directed toward destroying freedom of choice for the Jews with respect to assimilation and other courses. They insist on forcing all Jews, by political or spiritual terror, into a predetermined separateness which their ideology insists on.

Such a course can have only reactionary social consequences, as we have been seeing. Nor can it help any genuine religious feeling, for those to whom this is important.

THE ART POLICE

George Biddle, painter member of the National Commission of Fine Arts, in a letter to the *New York Times* on November 17 revealed to what lengths the artists of the country are now being subjected to FBI scrutiny. Mr. Biddle gave details concerning the cases of two artists who have recently been offered commissions for Federal jobs but have failed to meet FBI standards of what an artist should be.

In both cases the artists were veterans of both World Wars and had served their country nobly not only on the battlefield but also in the enrichment of its culture. That was not enough. The first artist had been given the unanimous approval of the Commission of Fine Arts but was deprived of the job, and the government agency responsible based its veto on the secret files of a certain congressman obtained from the FBI" (sic).

Mr. Biddle illustrates the capriciousness of the witchhunt in this and other areas when he writes, "None of the facts in this file was as startling as those recently revealed in an Alsop column of the *Herald-Tribune* as to the purportedly subversive background of our Secretary of State." He goes on to say:

"I am not troubled about the loss of personal freedom inherent in such secret police antics. There is a quality about it

of 'opera bouffe.' To me there is a greater danger. For twenty years I have struggled, when occasion arose, to improve the techniques of our federal art projects in the selection of distinguished American artists for the creation of outstanding works of art. We have adequate legal safeguards to control or suppress such art as is a threat to the safety or public welfare of the nation. But I cannot feel that the techniques I have described can result in the happiest selections. Such investigations do not exist in England, in France, in Italy, in Mexico or in Brazil. As far as I know they exist—outside of the United States—only in the orbit of Soviet countries"

For the well-established Mr. Biddle the "antics" of the FBI may have a quality of "opera bouffe." But to the young and struggling artists of this country, as well as all those who cherish personal freedom, the idea of art police is a matter of grave concern. Mr. Biddle has, however, effectively raised the question of whether President Eisenhower's message to the Museum of Modern Art has real meaning: "For our republic to stay free, those among us with the rare gift of artistry must be able freely to use their talent."

—from *Rights* (Nov.)

Cyprus: The Lesser Ally — —

(Continued from page 1)

will now increase, and so will anti-Americanism.

We mention this, not because any democrat can even think of justifying the suppression of a people on the ground of a putative danger of "Communist infiltration," but to underline: that even the demagogic and reactionary pretexts for suppression which the U. S. gave in the case of Guatemala or British Guiana or North Africa do not apply here.

Rather, Washington's problem was to choose among allies. Antagonize Britain or Greece? Both are in NATO, both on "our side." One can only conclude that the U. S. measured the British army, navy, air force, H-bomb potential and general military power against those of the Greeks' and adjusted its UN vote accordingly.

U. S. foreign policy not only subordinates all considerations of democracy and freedom to the acquisition of military allies, but it also subordinates all democracy and freedom even to a choice between bigger or smaller military allies.

So the press reports. "The decision has not been an easy one for Washington to make," writes the N. Y. Times dispatch (Dec. 13). "The State Department would have preferred to take a neutral position as it did in the debate and votes on the Netherlands-Indonesia dispute over West New Guinea. In the end, however, strategic considerations prevailed over the desire not to hurt either of two good friends, Britain and Greece. . . ."

They Call It "Strategy"

As a matter of fact, the U. S. remained neutral (straddling) on the Cyprus issue up to now, for such reasons. It was silent in the debate over including the Cyprus question on the agenda of the UN Assembly, and it abstained in the vote. Why the difference with the Netherlands-Indonesia dispute?

The Netherlands, also one of "our honorable allies," must conclude that, weighed in the State Department's balance, its military weight did not much out-tip Indonesia's. The Dutch may not feel happy about this particular case of American discrimination in favor of stronger imperialisms as against weaker imperialisms, though they know that this is the way of the world.

But on Cyprus the U. S. had to shift out of neutral and exercise its self-given right to be arbiter of the imperialist world. Being compelled to confess that the reasons are military expediency within the reactionary terms of its foreign policy ("strategy," they call it), the U. S. is hard-put even to cite "strategic" reasons. And the reasons given are doubly insulting to its Greek ally.

Here are the reasons as given in semi-official form through a N. Y. Times editorial, in this case a standard method of conveying State Department thoughts. The editorial admits that "For generations the Greek Cypriots have longed for 'enosis' or union with Greece and they seem almost unanimous in that desire now," and that the Greeks make up 80 per cent of the island's population. This disposes of England's big lie on this score. But—

"The British say flatly and rather convincingly that Cyprus is too valuable strategically to the Commonwealth and the West in general to be given up even nominally. The island lies athwart the sea and air routes through the Mediterranean and is the only remaining British territory in the Middle East. The British argument is that leases are impermanent by definition, Greek governments can and do change, and Britain's responsibilities are world-wide in scope."

The Times (the State Department) approves the essential part of this argument: ". . . self-determination, like many other fine principles, is not always and everywhere practical or applicable. The question of timing is vital, and as of today the overriding factor is the strategic necessity of the West."

Overlook, right now, the brutal cynicism of the last statement, which equally justifies every Russian oppression today. Just from the point of view of the intra-allied relationship of forces,

the argument is made that this glorious ally of ours, the Greek government, cannot be trusted by Washington even to hold on to Cyprus, or even to keep a Communist government out of Greece, or in some other way to retain the Cyprus base for American H-bombers.

This justification of an injustice will add to the Greeks' unhappiness with the injustice, and not least of all in precisely the case of those Greeks who are in favor of hanging on to NATO's coattails.

According to the press, the U. S. gives another reason for its position, if only in rationalization.

"Nor has it been easy," writes the Times' news report, "to adopt a position that, on the surface, flies in the face of the traditional American belief that all peoples have the right to determine their own future. However, United States officials feel that this is not the time to disturb present arrangements in the eastern Mediterranean and that the United Nations is not the place to discuss the possibility of such changes."

The significance of this last phrase is that, simultaneously, the U. S. has been arguing in the UN that the world organization can and must intervene with Stalinist China on behalf of Americans arrested as "spies," whether justly or unjustly.

Peiping has answered that the UN ought to stick its nose out. Now this is discussed in another article in this issue, but surely it is relevant to point up a moral: Washington's claims of what the UN should or should not take up are just as cynically motivated by its own narrow imperialist interests as are those of Peiping. It takes a diplomat whose tongue is as crooked as Malik's or the late Vishinsky's to argue that the UN must intervene when a non-member government arrests foreigners as spies (even unjustly) but should not intervene when a member government keeps a whole people prisoner against its will.

Greek Patience

As the Times (and by implication the State Department) concedes, the democratic case for Enosis is overwhelming, and we have noted that official-British claims are thereby implicitly rejected as lies. But the Times' editorial at the same time cannot resist buttering the British with at least one falsehood even on this side of the question.

With a grimace which truthfully reflects American annoyance that the British and Greeks should have put the U. S. on a hot spot, the Times writes: "The rest of the Western

world can only sit back unhappily and wish the British had been more deft in their handling of the issue and the Greeks more understanding and patient."

As for the first part of this double growl, the Times makes it easy on itself by not explaining its recipe for deftness; in any case such a recommendation comes with bad grace from a source which approved of the overthrow of the legally elected government of Guatemala by force and violence supported by the State Department.

But the reference to Greek lack of "patience" is likely to try that Greek virtue even further. Britain's former Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations (under the Labor government), Philip Noel-Baker, currently writes, for example:

"Both the Cypriots and the Greeks have shown exemplary patience and restraint. Eleutherios Venizelos, the greatest prime minister Greece has ever had [please remember this is a Laborite pro-imperialist talking—P. C.], told me in 1919, and often afterwards, that he would not raise the question until a British government was ready for him to do so, and that he would never allow it to impair the friendship [read: imperialist alliance—P. C.] between Britain and Greece, which throughout his life was the guiding principle of his policy. Field Marshal Papagos, while urging Enosis in May this year, said that Greece was 'bound to Britain by a traditional friendship,' and that his government would 'omit nothing nor take any steps which might give this (Enosis) campaign an anti-British character.' . . . Yet the immense strength of Greek opinion has obliged him to lay the Cyprus issue before the General Assembly of the UN. . . ."

No Wonder Stalinism Spreads

As you can see, this is no new question. However, no one can claim that the U. S. press is exactly flooding its columns with information on how far back Greek patience does go.

When the first British governor came to Cyprus in 1878, he was welcomed by the archbishop in a speech which spoke of Enosis. A Cypriot appeal was made to Gladstone, as prime minister of Britain, in 1881; a new petition in 1885; another to Joseph Chamberlain in 1896; a motion was laid before the Legislative Council in 1903; in 1907, the then Under-Secretary for the Colonies, named Winston Churchill, witnessed a great popular demonstration when he visited the island; a delegation was sent to London in 1923; another in 1929; still another in 1946; a plebiscite was organized in 1950 by the Cypriots themselves.

The background for Enosis, for that matter, goes back to ancient times. Cyprus has been Greek or predominantly Greek for 3000 years (Greek legend made it the birthplace of Homer and the place where Aphrodite rose out of the waves; and the Cypriot cities were invited to send ships to Troy, where only Greeks could fight). The British governor of the island from 1926-1932, Sir Ronald Storrs, has said: "The Greekness of the Cypriots is indisputable. No sensible person will deny that the Cypriot is Greek-speaking, Greek-thinking, Greek-feeling, Greek."

The Cypriots have been patient with British promises too.

In 1897 Gladstone said that he hoped to see the Cypriots "placed by a friendly arrangement, in organic union with their brethren of the Kingdom of Greece." In 1907 Winston Churchill said that the feeling of the Cypriots for Enosis was "an example of the patriotic devotion which so nobly characterizes the Greek nation," and that the only Greek he had learnt during his visit to Cyprus was "Zefo i Enosis"—Long live union with Greece.

All of this—any and every democratic consideration, any consideration of political warfare against Stalinist claims—is thrown out because Washington knows only one way of stopping Stalinism: military bases, atom bombs, bases for atom-bombers, etc.

And so Stalinism and its influence spreads. No wonder.

Pakistan Socialists Against SEATO Alliance

The Socialist Party of Pakistan, at an Executive meeting in Karachi on October 3-4, adopted its statement on foreign policy. The central idea was its "call upon the nations particularly in Asia and Africa, to strive for the establishment of a neutral Third Force which would work toward settling the conflicts. . . ."

In this, the Pakistan Socialists join most of the other Asian socialists in adopting a neutralist-type of "third force" language to indicate their suspicion of both war camps. "The Socialist Party views with alarm the present trend toward a polarization of world forces," the statement begins.

Heavily attacked was capitalist colonialism. SEATO, it says, "was sprung on us with provocative suddenness, and almost all important countries of Southeast Asia were excluded from it." It also refers to the Nine-Power Pact on rearming Germany as among the moves revealing poisonous fear and suspicion in the world. Colonialism was condemned in North Africa, Malaya, Kenya, Uganda, etc.

The statement ends on the note of the need for closer relations and friendship between Pakistan and India, and particularly the danger of communalist strife (Moslem versus Hindus):

"Friendship between India and Pakistan is essential for the maintenance of peace in Asia. Reports of recent communal disturbances in India are alarming, for such disturbances endanger peace. The party therefore urges the government of India to take speedy action to meet this danger, and asks the people of the two countries to strengthen the ties of friendship which exist between them."

China and the 13 — —

(Continued from page 1)

Assuming the innocence of the Americans, then, we still note with interest, first, that Peiping has been letting out hints of a certain swap—and that the U. S. press and the U. S. delegation to the UN have not been eager to talk much about it.

For the U. S. has a little crime of its own to account for. There are in this country a large number (a "few thousands," says one source) of Chinese students who are being detained here against their will. Back on September 13, we published the protest being circulated by 26 of these Chinese students, through the offices of the New England Quakers. True, these students are not in jail, but the offense is a serious one, and has been going on for at least three years.

WHAT MAO PROVES

Now, incidentally, we would like to know how many of the indignant delegates of the UN would vote for a resolution requiring UN interventions into this offense, which also involves the unjust detention of foreigners; but we raise this question in passing only to cast some doubt on the moral fervor behind the UN vote. The relevance of the matter is that Peiping has been hinting at a swap of the American "spies" for the detained students.

One need not whitewash Mao's government by claiming that the poor dear innocents in Peiping are merely using hostages to call attention to another crime, that of the U. S., since they are excluded by U. S. insistence from the world forum of the UN. But no apologist for American policy can get highly moral about it.

One thing that Mao is succeeding in doing is to show that the U. S. and the UN cannot ignore the fact that China is ruled by a government which is not in the UN and that the "Chinese delegates" to the UN are fakes. One might even build a theory (which would be as good as the next month's) about why Peiping is acting so belligerently at a time when Moscow is purring and cooing.

The UN, under Washington's insistence, persists in pretending

that China has delegates at the UN, but Mao very easily demonstrates that this is a childish fiction. The very fact that the State Department went to the UN to complain was such a demonstration. The vote was such a demonstration. It was a demonstration when Dag Hammarskjold was instructed to deal with the non-existent government of China which rules China.

And Mao is undoubtedly interested in hammering home the elementary fact that the UN cannot hope to accomplish its avowed purposes, from its own point of view, without letting Peiping join. It is proving each time there is such an imbroglio that in order to intervene to keep the peace the UN must recognize Peiping and not Formosa as the capital of China.

LIES AND WILD TALES

Whatever the leaning of opinion in such a matter as the arrest of the Americans, no political policy can be based on a futile attempt to ascertain the fact. The only thing that can be established with certainty about such matters is that both governments are proven liars in these cases. By the law of averages each side must be "in the right" somewhat less than half the time—less than half, we explain, on order to allow for the times when both are lying.

If one has a right to believe that the Chinese Stalinists invented the famous germ-warfare tale, then one has an equal or better right to believe that the American government told something less than the truth about the plane-shooting imbroglio with Peiping, where evidence pointed to provocative action by the U. S.

In the present instance, the U. S. case was bolstered by the admission of the Russian delegate that the flyers were taken in uniform, which would seem to be prima-facie evidence against their being "spies"; and this was the big point at the UN debate. It is impressive.

But even if this were an unplanned blunder on the part of Malik—we mention this because of the cheerful speculation about rifts between Peiping and Moscow—and even if the flyers were not "spies," it is risky, we repeat, to play the game of trying to determine which side is lying this time. Historical experience on this point is in order, but instead we will refer to an intriguing item which has only just appeared in the press.

Suppose, dear reader, the Chinese were to claim that the devils from the U. S. were flooding their country with a "flour," for relief purposes, which really was gunpowder and explosive; that this pseudo-flour was being smuggled into the country under the cover of humanitarian purposes. . . .

It sounds wild, wilder than the germ-warfare charges, an "obvious" though crude attempt to discredit American relief missions and at the same time besmirch the United States. Letting people bake an "explosive flour" into bread. . . !

But, truth being stranger than fiction (even stranger than the Stalinists' fictions), an ex-OSS officer has recently explained how he did just that, in China, behind Japanese lines during the Second World War. The item made an inconspicuous page in the N. Y. Times.

Of course, it was in wartime; it was directed against the Japanese; and the story was unclear on just why this explosive substance had to be able to pass as flour and even be able to be baked into bread. But we cite it as a caution.

PEIPING PROPAGANDA

The fact is that political judgments on the Chinese issue not only cannot, but need not, be based on attempts to decide on the truth of such cold-war charges and counter-charges. As LA has argued several times now, the exclusion of Stalinist China from the UN is not only a strategic mistake but a reflection of the State Department's reactionary line of supporting Chiang Kai-shek; and that the United States' stupid and anti-democratic foreign policy is a boost to the Peiping Stalinists, not a hindrance.

Even as the UN votes the empty victory for Washington, the newspapers report real victories for the Stalinists. This morning as we write (December 13), the N. Y. Times front-pages a story about the impact on India of a traveling "Chinese Communist package of culture, entertainment and propaganda," a good-will show. It has been packing in thousands on thousands in New Delhi, and, the correspondent indicates, the propaganda is not ineffective. Enviously the dispatch says:

"The impression made here by the talent and wit of the Chinese artists has made many Americans in town wish their own country would put its best cultural foot forward. There is a strong feeling that artists like Marian Anderson, Jascha Heifetz and Maria Tallchief could do a lot more in one tour than any number of broadcasts and statements.

"So far there never has been a troupe organized by the United States in India."

SAY IT OR SING IT

Now we would be the last to deny that absolutely non-political music by three such artists might indeed be better than the U. S.'s broadcasts and statements, though this is a terrific indictment of those broadcasts and statements; but let no one think that such an American troupe would be the equivalent of the Chinese show which is wowing India.

The Chinese show is a political one, as the correspondent himself emphasizes. Hence the weakness of his wish for the "best cultural foot forward."

Would the U. S. have anything to say through such a show, that could counter the Stalinist appeal? This, at any rate, and not the comparative talents of Marian Anderson et al. versus the Chinese is the problem of the cold war, which the Chinese Stalinists are winning in Asia.

Could a U. S. traveling show explain, via Maria Tallchief perhaps, why Washington is backing Chiang Kai-shek? Could a U. S. traveling show adequately explain to an Indian audience why the U. S. supported French imperialism in Indochina, or now in North Africa? Could Jascha Heifetz's great violin adequately explain why Washington believes in trampling on the rights of the people of Cyprus for the sake of what it calls "strategic advantages," that is, military alliances and bases?

And so while well-behaved delegates in the UN find a good reason for voting the U. S. side against Stalinist China (the flyers wore uniforms after all), such hollow votes will not win the heart and mind of Asia in revolution.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

Holiday Book Sale

GIVE A BOOK FOR A GIFT

- FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY, by Karl Kautsky \$3.00
- KARL MARX, by Franz Mehring 3.50
- THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV, by Victor Serge..... 1.50
- THE BENDING CROSS, by Ray Ginger 1.00
- HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THEORIES ("Vol. 4" of Capital), by Karl Marx 5.00
- ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL, by Rosa Luxemburg 5.00
- THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION, by Leon Trotsky 3.50
- WHITE COLLAR, by C. Wright Mills 6.00
- THE NEW COURSE, by Leon Trotsky and Max Shachtman 1.50
- FROM HEGEL TO MARX, by Sidney Hook 4.50

All orders must be accompanied by payment.

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

ISL and
Young Socialist League
invite you to
our joint

New Year's Eve Party

9 p.m. and on and on
at Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

CCNY — —

(Continued from page 5)

state of democracy in the country as a whole is decreased.

Whatever justification for requiring clubs to turn over some minimum list of members may have seemed to exist in the past, the conditions of the witchhunt make them entirely untenable.

Were there a college administration somewhere in this country which genuinely desired a lively political life among its students (including those students who dissented from the majority political ideas) it would sharply cut such requirements, asking only perhaps that the names of two or three officers of the student club be submitted or even that (as has up till now obtained at Antioch) only one student is necessary to organize a meeting or a club.

Academic freedom today needs with great urgency a large reduction in the number of students' names that have to be submitted to school authorities before student groups can function on the campus.

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