

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**THE MEN WHO CONTROL
THE DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS**

... page 6

**IMPERIALIST BRASS KNUCKLES
A LA MENDES-FRANCE**

... page 3

JANUARY 17, 1955

FIVE CENTS

In Cable to Belgrade and Appeal to Socialists ISL Calls for World Socialist Defense of Djilas and Dedijer

The Independent Socialist League has taken two steps to stimulate international socialist protest against the persecution of Djilas and Dedijer by the Tito regime in Yugoslavia.

A cablegram to Edvard Kardelj, as acting president of Yugoslavia, went out on Tuesday. It read:

"INDICTMENT DJILAS DEDIJER ON CHARGE CRITICISM YUGOSLAV CP AND GOVERNMENT VIOLATES EVERY SOCIALIST DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLE STOP AS SOCIALISTS DEMAND END LEGAL OR ADMINISTRATIVE REPRISALS DJILAS DEDIJER FOR CRITICIZING REGIME."

In a letter sent to a long list of socialist organizations throughout the world, the ISL is urging all socialist parties and groups to organize protest in defense of the two Yugoslav democratic-oppositionists. Thus far, press reports of any such reaction by socialists abroad have been lacking.

The ISL letter, which will reach socialist movements in every part of the globe, reads as follows.

DEAR COMRADES:

Milovan Djilas and Vladimir Dedijer have been indicted by the Yugoslav government on the sole charge that they have criticized the Communist Party and bureaucratic regime in that country. This indictment is an outrage which demands the vigorous intervention of all socialist and labor movements.

The Yugoslav government seeks to justify its open and cynical violation of elementary civil liberties on the ground that Djilas and Dedi-

jer are seeking to mobilize bourgeois public opinion and governmental pressure against the regime. This is a specious argument by which they seek to justify their brutal attack on these critics in the eyes of their own people and socialist elements abroad. Its purpose is to further intimidate and crush all internal criticism of the totalitarian regime.

The only "crime" charged against Djilas and Dedijer is that they have criticized the regime from a socialist and democratic

(Turn to last page)

Democratic Party Liberals Collapse As Congress Opens

By GORDON HASKELL

Ever since the Democrats won majorities in both houses of Congress, speculation has been rife on what their relationship would be with Eisenhower and the Republican administration. After an electoral campaign noted for its lack of any clear programmatic differences between the two parties, but also by much bitterness over the "twenty years of treason" slogan raised by high Republican spokesmen, both Eisenhower and the Democratic leaders in Congress were cooing at each other in the dulcet tones of "bipartisanship."

The first test of this era of good intentions was to be the president's State of the Union message, and the Democratic reaction to it. The president met his side of the bargain by a message which, while offering nothing startling in the way of proposals on either the foreign or domestic fields, showed a slight swing away from the businessmen's philosophy of Eisenhower's first two years in office toward a conservative version of Truman's emasculated Fair Deal of 1950.

Eisenhower came out for a dab of public housing, a mite of increase in the minimum wage, a smidgin of federal aid to the schools, a bit of public health aid, and so forth. On foreign policy he

advocated nothing new at all. In a nutshell—he advocated just about what could have been expected if one of the better Southern Democrats had been sitting in the White House.

The reaction from the Southern Democrats who now dominate Congress was generally favorable. Though they did not hail the message as a masterpiece of statesmanship, they contented themselves with a few non-committal remarks and the assertion that they will await the detailed legislative proposals before deciding whether to support, oppose, or modify the president's program on this or that detail.

UNDERGROUND?

The Northern Democratic leaders were just about as uncritical, in public. But the Democratic National Committee, headed by a Stevenson man, issued a "confidential" memorandum to all Democratic congressmen and senators in which the State of the Union message was subjected to a much more critical analysis.

This "confidential" document was, of course, immediately leaked to the press, whereupon the Republicans set up a cry of "foul" while a number of Democratic leaders in Congress made their displeasure known just about as bluntly as they could under the circumstances.

This was indeed a peculiar, even a comical, method of mobilizing the "opposition" to the Republican administration. The leadership of the Democratic Party, even of its liberal wing, appear to be so fearful of attacking the president's program in public that they have to issue their criticism in secret, like an underground opposition in some one-party state. The only thing lacking was anonymity, which would have made the picture perfect.

Of course, the Democratic leadership had good reason, from the point of view of the atmosphere which prevails in their own party, for this "confidential" type of opposition. For it is now clear that a large and powerful section of the party leadership is determined to permit no-

(Turn to last page)

It's a Permanent War Cycle, Says Economist

Just among us businessmen, let's understand that a Permanent War cycle has taken the place of the business cycle. . . .

So Eliot Janeway told a meeting of industrialists the other day.

Janeway is *Newsweek's* consultant on business trends and publisher of his own newsletter *Janeway's Memos*, considered an "expert on defense mobilization."

On January 6 the economist spoke at the monthly luncheon meeting of the Economic Club of Pittsburgh (reported in the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* for the next day), in the course of which he saw a "tremendous new inflation" ahead.

The paper reported:

"In an interview prior to his talk, Mr. Janeway explained that continued defense spending after the Korean war forestalled the recession that many industrial leaders feared.

"The United States is spending about 40 billion dollars on defense," he pointed out.

"This money is not buying specific armament—but is spread over the range of industrial production. It is buying us stand-by protection—it enables us to hold the line. But the money is being spent in this country and abroad, and as a result,

for the first time since industrialization began, we started a major defense pickup on top of an economic boom."

Thus Janeway affirms, like many other frank economists, that present-day U. S. "prosperity" is based on war and preparation for war, on the Permanent War Economy of capitalism.

Janeway also went on to explain a point which bears on the socialist claim that U. S. prosperity is at odds with prosperity for its capitalist allies. "Paradoxically, he [Janeway] explained, Great Britain and Western Europe generally can be expected to suffer from the boom beginning this year, through a shortage of basic products."

And then, in a burst of candor, Janeway linked economic prosperity to war in permanence, for the enlightenment of the newspaper reporters interviewing him. The *Post-Gazette* reported:

"The present boom, he pointed out, calls for a review of past thinking which considered war an interval that disturbed the 'normal' condition of peace.

"It's beginning to look as though there's no such thing as a business cycle, which controls prosperity and depression, but a defense cycle in which brief periods of peace are the interruption."

General Election Coming?

Party Conflicts Will Be Popping

The Year Ahead in British Politics

By BERNARD DIX

LONDON, Jan. 4—As the chimes of Big Ben, striking midnight on December 31, echoed out across Parliament Square they heralded the beginning of a year which may bring important political changes in Britain, and many a politician must have drunk the New Year toast wondering anxiously what the future months have in store for him.

Most political observers here feel confident that this year will bring a general election, and there are various signs which seem to confirm this view.

Almost the last act of the government before Parliament rose for the Christmas recess was to attempt, with almost indecent haste, to push through the House of Commons changes in the electoral boundaries. That these changes, which greatly favor the Tory party, did not go through is no reflection upon the efforts of the government, which certainly tried its hardest.

It was the action of several local councillors from Manchester, who challenged before law the government's decision to alter the Manchester electoral boundaries, which upset the government's timetable. They also upset the calculations of the Tory party which anticipated the changes going through soon enough to become operative in the new electoral registers which are now being prepared—thus assuring the Tories of several easy parliamentary seats.

In addition to this jiggery-pokery with the electoral boundaries there are other aspects of Tory party behavior which seem to indicate that an election is on the way.

The recent announcement by the minister of pensions that old-age, war-disabled, and widows' pensions are to be increased within the next few months could provide useful ammunition to the Conservative Party in an election campaign—this notwithstanding the fact that the proposed increases are hopelessly inadequate and that the workers will be called upon largely to finance them by contributing an additional one shilling a week to the National Insurance Funds.

A further bribe to the electorate, in the shape of tax concessions, is expected from the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he introduces his April budget which, according to present calculations, is likely to show a surplus of some 300 million pounds. This fact received great prominence in the columns of the Tory national press.

LABOR PREPARING

Activity in Labor circles also points to an election this year. While no official forecast has been made by Transport House, headquarters of the BLP, there are many signs that the party leadership considers an election is in the offing.

The *Labor Daily Herald*, in its New Year editorial, told its readers that "A general election is almost certain this year," and it called upon the party members to get the party machine in "fighting trim." It also, following its now traditional role, appealed to trade-unionists not to engage in wildcat strikes "which reduces them in public esteem" and thus undermines Labor's position before the voters.

In the local Labor organizations one hears constant reference to the forthcoming election, and the activities planned for the coming twelve-months nearly always include provisions for an election campaign. In my own local party in Southeast London the agent has even circulated the local ward organizations on the possibility of holding a "Victory Dance" at the Town Hall. One hopes that his confidence in the local electorate will be suitably rewarded!

TORY PLAN

If the expected election does take place this year, then the Conservative Party will have a distinct advantage—which is yet another reason for assuming that it will take place. In addition to the carefully baited hooks previously mentioned there are other tempting tidbits with which the Tories will be able to woo the voters.

They will obviously make use, for example, of the fact that Britain for the past year has been enjoying a boom period. That this is accidentally due to external factors will not feature in Tory propaganda; they will claim that it is due to their wise management of the country's affairs. They are quick to real-

ize that the mere sight of the shops crammed with a wide variety of goods is sufficient to convince many a British housewife, nursing memories of the war-time shortages, that the Tories are the party of plenty. This will undoubtedly pay dividends, for it must be remembered that the women's vote has often been decisive in British elections and could well prove to be so this time—to the discomfort of the Labor Party.

MORALE LOW

A further factor which could possibly assist the Tories is the general air of apathy and uneasiness which is evident in Labor circles—this being particularly true amongst the rank and file. To isolate the origin of this attitude is by no means an easy task for it seems to take on different forms with different members and in different areas. It is possible the apathy will vanish overnight when the election battle begins and the opportunity to have a go at the Tories presents itself; but at the moment the fact remains that party morale seems to have reached a very low level.

Making a risky attempt at generalization, I would say that much of the apathy of the rank and file originates in the lack of determined fighting, spirit shown by the party leadership, particularly in Parliament, during the past year. Looking back over the debates which have taken place in the House of Commons during the last year it is hard to recall any which really captured the imagination of the rank-and-file party worker.

Time and time again debates which provided the opportunity for the Labor

front-bench to hammer the Tories degenerated into almost placid discussions of administrative criticism. It was left to a few Labor back-benchers to go after the Tories in the fashion which inspires the local party worker; and these speeches, of course, receive little mention in the national press.

SOPER'S BOMBHELL

Amongst the left wing of the party the feeling of uneasiness is much more crystallized and expresses itself as dissatisfaction with the current party program on which the next election will be fought. One frequently hears the complaint that the differences between the Labor and Conservative programs are so subtle that it is virtually impossible to explain them to the average worker.

Reynolds News, the Sunday paper published by the Cooperative Movement, voiced this opinion when it said, in an editorial on January 2, that: "Unless we can make it clear that we HAVE a distinctive socialist approach, then we will lose the votes of people who will say: 'There's no difference between the parties, we might as well vote for the Old Man.'" The Old Man in this case is Winston Churchill.

The Reverend Dr. Donald Soper, a Methodist preacher and active socialist, put the matter much more bluntly in the column which he contributes to the *Bevanite Weekly Tribune*. After asking where was "the white-hot repudiation of the hydrogen bomb . . . the incandescent fervor for peace . . . the impassioned outcry against the brutalities and hangings in Kenya" Soper states that he is "sure that Labor will not win the 1955 elections." After this minor bombshell he lets off his blockbuster by stating that Labor will not deserve to win the elections unless it recovers lost ground and "breaks free of this Laodicean indifference."

Dr. Soper is one of the lovable eccentrics of the British Labor movement and as such he can say such things with complete indifference—but there is no doubt that, in his own peculiar fashion, he ex-

pressed sentiments similar to those held by many of the Labor left wing. That the Labor Party is becoming indifferent, passive and conventional is a feeling which is widely held by large sections of the active rank and file.

But if the Labor Party has internal problems the Conservative Party has them also. The big question in the Tory party today is: When is Winston Churchill going to retire and who is going to take his place?

With an election fast approaching this question becomes more and more important for the Tory party, for Churchill is now an old man who is no longer capable, either physically or mentally, of meeting the demands made upon him as prime minister and leader of the Conservative Party. The recent episode concerning his telegram to Field Marshall Montgomery at the end of the war provides a glaring example of his inability to cope with big matters.

EDEN VS. BUTLER

The tolerant attitude adopted by the Labor front-bench to this blunder of Churchill's, and to similar blunders throughout the year, has doubtless done much to assist him in maintaining his position in the Tory party.

It must be mentioned, however, that many Labor back-benchers, particularly Bevan and Mike Foot, have shown themselves as anxious as ever to engage in verbal battle with the old war-horse of the British ruling class.

Of possible successors to Churchill there are but two worthy of any mention; one is Anthony Eden, present foreign secretary, and the other R. A. Butler, present Chancellor of the Exchequer and architect of much of the Tory postwar policy. Of these two, Eden seems to be the favorite and the most likely to be chosen rightful heir by Churchill himself. On the other hand Butler's standing in the Tory party organization is very high and this may ultimately provide the motive force necessary to propel him into the leading role. But whoever succeeds Churchill, the nearness of the election makes it imperative that a move be made soon.

That, then, is how Britain stands at the opening of the New Year: election fever in the air, the Labor Party faced with a growing sense of frustration, and the Tory party preparing to call Churchill's last bow. We can be assured that, whatever else, life will certainly not be dull in Britain during the coming 52 weeks.

LONDON LETTER

British Railwaymen Put the Squeeze on for Raise

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Jan. 5—An interim report of the commission to investigate wages in the railway industry was submitted yesterday to the National Union of Railwaymen and the British Transport Commission, the two parties in the dispute. Their representatives met yesterday, and then separately interviewed Sir Walter Monckton, the Minister of Labor. The report has not been published, but the cabinet is meeting today to discuss it.

The dispute is over the demand submitted a year ago for a 15 per cent rise in railway wages, which was partially met last March. The strike is one of the first big official strikes for a long time, and the National Union of Railwaymen is paying its members strike pay of \$4.50 a week.

At the rate of strike pay, the union can hold out for four weeks, but the Transport Commission cannot. It will lose \$300,000 a week, and as this strike is being held because it cannot afford to raise wages, this further loss would be worse than the increase of wages for which it would take place.

Every day 2,000,000 passengers travel by 24,000 trains, and another 26,000 trains carry goods as well as 650,000 tons of coal; the disruption to the economy would be far greater than these figures suggest.

Of the two other unions whose members work on the railways, the Transport Staff's Salaried Association has instructed its 60,000 members to be as impartial as they can. On the one hand, they have been told to go to work on the days of the strike, but on the other, they have been told not to do any overtime, or in any way prejudice the success of the strike; this is because they also have a claim for higher wages pending.

Besides the long-distance railways, the London underground is also involved in the strike.

The Metropolitan Police and private companies are making preparations for

what is likely to be the greatest traffic jam in history, when London goes to work by road. The parking problem is almost as bad as New York's already.

WORKERS' CASE

Last week the Archbishop of York, who has nothing whatever to do with the strike, put in a plea during his sermon for industrial peace. Jim Campbell of the NUR Executive listened to the Archbishop's plea with indifference. At the headquarters at Custom Road, London, the NUR Executive was working late last night to get out plans for the strike, which is due to begin on Sunday evening.

Their biggest problem was how to get the strike pay to the workers with no railways running. A considerable fall of snow in London has increased the urgency of negotiation, because the alternative use of road transport will be inhibited.

The case of the railway workers, put very ably to the Commission of Enquiry, was this:

(1) The railway fares have risen much less than other prices since before the war.

(2) The railway workers' wages are roughly \$3.50 below the national average. Although it is agreed that they have always been less, the Executive of the union feels that at this time of national prosperity, with the railways nationalized, a square deal should be given to the workers in the industry.

(3) If wage increases cannot be given without an increase of tariffs and fares, resulting in a higher cost of living, the Treasury should subsidize the railways. It could use some of the large profits made during the war on curtailed services. Otherwise, the national economy is being subsidized by the railway workers, and not vice versa, as it should be.

(4) When the railways were nationalized six years ago, the owners were "compensated with shares, the interest of

which is paid for out of railway earnings. The National Union of Railwaymen feels that if the railways are running at a loss, the interest on the shares should be decreased, to share the burden.

SUBSIDIZING THE ECONOMY

The strike and the problem of the railways seems to me an excellent example of the difficulty of a partially nationalized economy.

The Transport Commission plea that it cannot afford an increase is true. It would result in an all-round rise in costs. The railways, the Post Office, the Coal Board, the British Electricity Authority, and other nationalized services do in fact, subsidize the economy, by keeping down the costs of essential services.

Since 1948, when the four great railway companies were amalgamated and nationalized, the number of workers employed in the industry has been decreased from 670,000 to 590,000, which is in itself quite an achievement. Yet every railway worker tells you of continuing gross inefficiency and wastage of labor.

The railwaymen were given an undertaking when the industry was nationalized that every discharged worker would be given an alternative job with equal pay and rank. Often the government could not find such jobs, so that many excess workers were kept on and jobs made for them.

Were this country a socialist one, the industry could be made more efficient with the cooperation of the trade unions, without the men feeling that they would work themselves out of a job. As it is, with nationalization and then rationalization, a primarily capitalist economy has no profitable work to give the railwaymen.

Obviously a national wage structure, with adequate provision for industrial mobility of labor and a guaranteed standard of living, would give the worker the security not to have to "skive" and "scrimshank" to keep himself in work.

Imperialist Brass Knuckles a la Mendes-France

Algeria: Fierce Repression Hits Colony and French Press

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Jan. 5—A recent headline in the New York Times read: "French Reassert Might in Algeria." After two months of continuous "assertion of might," the Algerian rebellion has in no way diminished in strength.

Military operations in the Aurès mountains have stopped with the first snow, and can be resumed only in spring. Meanwhile, the government is concentrating troops in Algeria, and hopes to reconstitute an "Armée d'Afrique" with the battered remnants of the Indochinese Expeditionary Corps.

In the cities, acts of individual terrorism are increasingly frequent. Le Monde admits that "foreign influences" no longer account for a situation which "rather arises from a common frame of mind," which shows, in other words, every sign of being a genuine, homegrown product of colonialist rule. The governor's appeal for the population's co-operation with the police (as in Morocco in 1953) has only met with "reticence, silence, an indifferent or hostile attitude."

The extensive investigations of the police have not produced the slightest evidence to support the government's contention that the nationalist MTLD had organized the rebellion. It appears, on the contrary, that the organizers of the outbreaks in early November (hitherto unheard-of organizations such as the "Comité Révolutionnaire pour l'Unité d'Action," the "Secretariat of the National Liberation Front," etc.), were acting outside and without the knowledge of the traditional nationalist parties.

IRON FIST

Just who these rebels are is not clear. The possibility of police provocation has been mentioned. Manchon, at the F.O. Congress, asked if there were not two parallel police organizations, one in charge of organizing rebellions, the other in charge of repressing them. If such provocation took place, it enabled the government to repress the MTLD immediately after its split, before the victorious revolutionary wing could proceed to organize serious and well-organized resistance.

The 'Dirty War' in Malaya Needs New Jet Bombers...

That "dirty war" of the British in Malaya was supposed to be practically over; the press has announced a couple of times that the Stalinist guerrillas have virtually been cleaned out and all is peace. Instead the news brings a devastating picture of imperialist policy (British this time) and its disastrous consequences.

Two items have to be taken together for the full picture. Item one: Two leading Malay figures have proposed that the government declare a general amnesty for guerrillas in order to bring their mass surrender and breakaway from Stalinist leadership.

The proposal was made by "Tengku Abdul Rahman, president of the United Malays National Organization, and Sir Cheng-lock Tan, leader of the Malayan Chinese Association. The two groups cooperate and are the leading political organizations in the federation. Tengku Abdul Rahman broached the amnesty idea as something that could be acted upon if the alliance of the two organizations won power through the British program for self-government in the federation." (Times, Jan. 9.)

In Malaya, even the pro-independence Laborites are pretty mild stuff. The two conservative native leaders mentioned above are even thinner gruel when it comes to nationalism in the East. But when even these two right-wingish native leaders make a proposal for dealing with the Stalinists by other than purely military means, the British reject it.

The British say "the time for it (general amnesty) has not yet come." What has the time come for?

The other, more likely, possibility is that dissident nationalists had decided to declare war on the government on their own, relying mainly on tactics of individual terrorism, on the Moroccan pattern. In any event, the rebellion took the nationalist leadership as much by surprise as it seemed to take the government.

Notwithstanding these facts, the government's repression has hit the actual organizers of the riots, the reformist split-off of the MTLD, and the MTLD itself with equal impartiality. Among the first arrested were Khouane and Tekhli, leaders of the reformist faction; Moulay Merbah, leader of the revolutionary faction, was held and tortured for days in a vain attempt to make him confess preparations of the revolt.

One hundred forty-five members of the MTLD were arrested in the last week in December; the total number of arrests since the beginning of the revolt exceeds 600.

Even the very reformist UDMA has not been spared: Ferhat Abbas was deprived of the right to speak in the Algerian Assembly, and since then his party has boycotted the Assembly's meetings. The Algerian CP's press has been suppressed, and a few of its leaders have been imprisoned. The colonialist circles demand that it be suppressed altogether.

GAGGING THE PRESS

In France, the Algerian events have led to continuous violations of civil liberties by the Mendès-France government. On November 12, a special issue on Algeria of *Le Libertaire*, organ of the anarchist Fédération Communiste Libertaire, was confiscated; the two December issues of the PCI's *La Vérité* were seized in Algeria.

On December 8, the government

(Continued on page 4)

Tunisia: Guerrillas Revealed As Organized Liberation Army

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Jan. 4—The demobilization of the military resistance movement has created a new situation in the Tunisian regency. First, the Neo-Destour has asserted itself, without question, as the truly representative popular movement in Tunisia. It is clear that the "fellaghas" [nationalist guerrillas] responded to the joint appeal of the Tunisian and French governments only on the basis of the Neo-Destour's authority.

Secondly, the "fellaghas" revealed themselves to be a well-organized, well-disciplined National Liberation Army. Numerous reports in the press show that this army had itself disarmed groups of bandits which had wrongly appropriated the authority of the resistance movement, and had exercised administrative control over certain areas.

The soldiers of the resistance movement returned to their homes in an atmosphere of popular holiday. The Neo-Destour organized public fund collections to enable it to pay out "demobilization compensation." The leaders of the National Liberation Army, among others the farmer Sassi Lassoued and the miner Lahsar Chraiti, were met by cheering crowds.

RISK IN DISARMING

While under arms, the National Liberation Army had revealed itself to be an embryo of a new power and a new government. It had drawn large numbers of hitherto unpolitical people into armed struggle, and had turned them from rebels into revolutionists. Now these resistance fighters have returned to civilian life, where they will merge completely with the political nationalist movement, more so than they could as guerrillas.

Meanwhile the Neo-Destour has taken a risk in ordering the resistance movement to disarm while the French army remains in the country. Its ability to negotiate with the French government on equal terms arose from a relationship of power: the French army on the one side, the National Liberation Army and the organized strength of the UGTT labor federation on the other. Now the leaders of the Tunisian nationalist movement have disarmed themselves voluntarily. At the same time they have demonstrated that the strength of the movement is unconquerable in the long run.

It would seem so far that the French government has taken notice of the first fact only. The negotiations between the Tunisian and French governments have not advanced: despite Mendès-France's promises, the French government refuses to give up its authority over the Tunisian army and police.

The latter question, in particular, is one on which the Tunisian negotiators cannot compromise. They demand that within six months a gradual reorganization of the police should begin, which would put the police power in Tunisian hands at the end of two years. The French government has countered with a proposal extending the two transition periods to two years and eight years respectively.

As to the army, the Tunisian negotiators demand the right to set up an independent armed force of 6,000, and the right to incorporate into it the former resistance fighters. Only such control over the instruments of power would make Tunisian home rule a reality.

STIFFENING UP

The stalling of the French government on this point is therefore bound to give the impression of insincerity, especially if one considers the military repression waged on the Algerian people across the border.

Consequently, a stiffening in the ranks of the Neo-Destour has become inevitable: having staked its future on the outcome of the negotiations, it can no longer continue to make concessions. The UGTT had already expressed dissatisfaction with the attitude of the government.

Perhaps in answer to such criticism, Salah Ben Youssef, secretary-general of the Neo-Destour and a leader of the "hard" wing, issued a statement laying down the party's minimum demands. In this declaration, published in Geneva on January 3, Salah Ben Youssef says that during the past five months the course

of the negotiations has shown that the French government does not intend to honor its promises:

"After using all sorts of pressures, even blackmailing through the threat to break off negotiations, the French government now intends to grant us a purely formal autonomy which would turn us into the administrators of colonialism in Tunisia . . . the Tunisian people will never accept an illusion of autonomy which would bar the way toward complete independence. Only an autonomy establishing an exclusively national public power, exerting undivided authority over the Tunisian territory, will be accepted by our people."

Meaningful autonomy, according to Salah Ben Youssef's declaration, includes at least the following points:

- (1) time limitations on all conventions that restrict Tunisian sovereignty;
- (2) a homogeneous Tunisian government with full powers over all police forces and over a small army;
- (3) transfer of all judiciary powers to the Tunisian government within a reasonable period of time;
- (4) transfer of all education facilities to the Tunisian government;
- (5) freedom for the Tunisian government to establish its own economic and financial policies within the franc zone.

DIFFERENT METHODS

Salah Ben Youssef concluded: "The whole world is a witness to the good will of the Tunisian people. But this good will is not to be confused with cowardice and capitulation. . . . If the French government persists in its refusal to fulfill its commitments, France will assume alone, in the eyes of the world, the responsibility for the tragic consequences that would follow."

In the camp of the settlers and of the colonial interests, different attitudes have arisen. The extremist sections, inspired by fascist weeklies and supported by the reactionary opposition to Mendès-France, have answered the demobilization of the Tunisian resistance with a series of bomb attacks on houses of leading nationalists.

Another group, with greater faith in the reactionary possibilities of parliamentary procedure, has constituted itself as a "Permanent Delegation of the French Collectivity," under the presidency of Colonna, leader of the colonialist lobby in the French Assembly. It intends to intervene on the parliamentary level to prevent the ratification of any Franco-Tunisian agreements, if and when such agreements are signed.

THREAT AND WARNING

A smaller group of Frenchmen, following the example of Moroccan liberals, is organizing a pressure group in opposition to the policies of Colonna and Co. Their program is to support negotiations with the nationalists, and to seek a genuine basis for agreement.

Where does the French government stand? Its spokesman in Tunisia, General Boyer de Latour, is mainly concerned with reassuring the settlers. Commenting on attacks from colonialist circles on the current negotiations, he says: "When one's aim is the same as the aim of those who criticize most, one cannot help but be somewhat astonished. . . ." Then, giving his critics a lesson in statesmanship, he explains: "When one sees a chance to settle a question without use of force one should take that chance, even if tomorrow one must resolve to use other means." (My emphasis—A. G.)

Does the general make veiled threats? If so, he is unwise. The disciplined demobilization of over 2,500 well-trained and well-organized Tunisian resistance fighters might give him a temporary advantage from a military point of view. As a political symptom, however, it is a grave and unmistakable warning.

YOU and SCIENCE

'The Permanent Revolution in Science' Studies Methodology

By CARL DARTON

A book with the title *The Permanent Revolution in Science* (Philosophical Library, 1954) obviously demands consideration. Actually, this work by Richard L. Schanck of the Department of Sociology, Carnegie Institute of Technology, demands serious attention of all students of the philosophy of science, Marxist or otherwise. It outlines a methodology of science especially valuable when considering complex problems which involve growth and development.

Marxists will recognize a frank tribute to dialectical materialism, but in a fresh and healthy manner, in sharp contrast with the idolatrous, sterile output of the Stalinists and others who have paid lip-service to Marx and Engels on science during the past fifty years.

In words which we believe Marx would have approved, Schanck writes:

"Social science and psychology, late upon the scene in the history of the development of science, in the works of Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud jumped directly into viewpoints which are only beginning to be clearly articulated in the fields of physics, biochemistry and biology in our own day, and which were only incipient in natural scientists a century ago. On the other hand, because our interest is in these men as scientists and not as Marxists or Freudians, we can see why it is much easier to clarify the problem of method by tracing its evolution through physical science as it has emerged there, without reference to social science. For in such an enterprise, the question of being a good Freudian, or 'what Marx really meant,' does not arise. When we wish later to examine these men, we can do it in the full stature of a developed philosophy of science which can examine these issues meaningfully."

As pointed out by Schanck, both Marx and Freud have suffered too much from disciples who were enamored of the psychoanalytical or dialectical viewpoints but who had almost no understanding of the scientific consequences of their position. These people usually degenerated into cultists, who followed the master with little knowledge of the methodological issues involved or of what both Marx and Freud were applying, modern scientific method.

EVOLUTION OF METHOD

Let us see how the "new" methodology has evolved in the various sciences.

In physics, from Greek times through Newton, the science of mechanics has been dominant. Laws of nature were explained in terms of force, motion and mass with space and time being treated in a static sense. Such a world was fixed with all development being illusory. While these principles may be correct when applied to the limited fields of original usage they are misleading in describing the complex systems found in modern physics. More fruitful in understanding and controlling complex systems such as atoms and electrons is the new statistical approach where the action of individual particles is not only unpredictable but also meaningless. Unless the mechanical viewpoint is left behind there is no understanding of rays, waves, trends

and probabilities, energy, quanta and the extension of quantitative relationships into quality differences.

In the words of Schanck this means: "The shift in interest from the element as an individual to be distributed with other elements in time and space to the element as society, a system of trends, effects, waves or other stable relationships, may seem to the novice a revolutionary shift in perspective in science. Yet the latter viewpoint has both novel and very old characteristics, for the logic of self-development of an entity is a very old problem, although the new statistical approach makes possible an entirely new mode of attack upon it."

To chemistry, with its systems of reactions proceeding in opposite directions but always tending toward equal velocity in both directions, belongs credit for the concept of dynamic equilibrium. Schanck uses the illustration of ice, soda water and whiskey in a tightly stoppered thermos bottle as an example of a complex system where effects of pressure, temperature and concentration are all interlocked, with action and reaction proceeding simultaneously. Here it is impossible to separate cause and effect, and unless such systems are visualized as a penetration of opposites in a state of dynamic equilibrium, it is impossible to predict and control the results.

DYNAMIC EQUILIBRIUM

It is in the realm of human biology, in the life processes themselves, that the concept of dynamic equilibrium finds even more fruitful application. Such an outlook is absolutely necessary in understanding the complex physiological activities, of the human organism. Homeostasis, metabolism, adjustment, survival are all the result of man's ability to maintain a constant state of dynamic equilibrium.

This concept of the system applies equally well to the psychological aspects of man's existence. Schanck quotes Freud in classical language that illustrates the concept of the dynamic state of the personality:

"Every movement is watched by the Super-Ego, which holds up certain norms

of behavior, without regard to any difficulties coming from the Id and the external world: and if these norms are not acted up to, it punishes the Ego with the feelings of tension which manifest themselves as a sense of inferiority and guilt. In this way, goaded on by the Id, hemmed in by the Super-Ego and rebuffed by reality, the Ego struggles to cope with its economic task of reducing the forces and influences which work in it and upon it to some kind of harmony."

Freud, in the words of Schanck, was a genius only because he was competent in recognizing the application of the new scientific method to personality. His range, however, was little beyond his own narrow field and certain faults in his system can be attributed to his incomplete understanding of the new methodology as applied to science as a whole. A fuller understanding of the concept of dynamic equilibrium would have permitted him to correct some of the errors inherent in his psychology.

CREDIT TO MARX

It is in Karl Marx's application of the new methodology to sociology that dynamic equilibrium found its fullest application. Society is the most complex system of all and its full understanding is impossible without the aid of the best scientific and intellectual tools available to man.

Schanck gives Marx credit for recognizing at least two additional elements in the new methodology: (1) its application to human society with its interlocking and penetrating trends, and (2) the approach of a scientist as a participant in a system or society is legitimately different from that of an observer.

Again to quote Schanck on these two points:

"The limitations of the lay mind in dealing with trends in society is not so much its inability to identify a trend as to deal with several interpenetrating and reciprocal trends at one and the same time. This feat Marx accomplished with the dialectic of Hegel, a new mode of thought designed for exactly this purpose."

And on the second point: "We have pointed out that dynamic equilibrium has

two opposite sides, the one of little or no change ('stasis') at the level of effects and the other of extremely dynamic activity at the level of the elements which contribute through their opposition to the apparent condition of dynamic equilibrium. In sociology, it was obvious to Marx that the static effects were visible only to an outsider. The active participant must see the whole development as one of the continuous unfolding of a story."

We turn now to the chapter titled "The Permanent Revolution and the Problem of Ethics." This is an analysis of the philosophy of Edgar Singer, presumably the "old man" to whom the book is dedicated. The viewpoint here is one with which certainly a socialist cannot argue. This is that a science of ethics is possible, that science can deal with the "ought" of human behavior as well as the "how."

Human history teaches that there is an ideal goal toward which man can strive and by which his progress can be measured. This is the entirely unmythical statement that progress can be defined as the "measure of man's cooperation with man in the conquest of nature." Schanck admits that this ideal is not new but the teachings of science as well as man's best thoughts on the past can give no better answer.

UP TO DATE

The final chapter of the book is an account of efforts of scientists in the United States to consolidate the new methodology into the "Institute of Experimental Method." Its objective is best given in the words of Engels (from the introduction to *Anti-Duhring*):

"As soon as each special science is required to make clear its position in the totality of things and knowledge as a whole, a special science (that is, philosophy) dealing with the totality is superfluous. What still independently remains of all earlier philosophy is the study of thought and its laws—formal logic and dialectics. Everything else is absorbed in the positive science of nature and history."

To a socialist interested in science this is a valuable book. It would seem to be a rather belated tribute to the contributions of Marx and Engels to the methodology of science.

However, it is not meant primarily as a tribute. Rather, it is a re-evaluation and clarification of modern science's methodology. Marxists should not begrudge the fact that the terminology is not that of classic dialectics but the assimilation of the meaning of Marx and Hegel into 20th-century language. This makes the study all the more valuable and we should seek to emulate it, not only in the philosophy of science, but in all fields of socialist thought.

Algeria: Fierce Repression — —

(Continued from page 3)

brought charges against Gilles Martinet, editor of *France-Observateur*, supposedly for revealing military secrets in an article on Indochina, written five months earlier. These charges, coming at the present time, are also a part of the government's action to silence opposition on the North African issues.

On December 21 a joint meeting of the PCI and the FCL in Algeria, under the chairmanship of Daniel Guérin, was prohibited; finally, on December 23, the government brought charges against the PCI itself, on the basis of a declaration of the PCI's Political Bureau on Algeria, published in No. 343 of *La Vérité*.

In all these cases, as in the MTL's suppression, the government's legal basis is Article 80 (Paragraph 1) of the Penal Code, which makes it a crime "to threaten the integrity of the French territory, or to subvert from the authority of France a part of the territories over which this authority exerts itself."

Commented *La Vérité*: "Article 80 is no doubt very powerful, but it does not have the magic power to transform a whole people into a crowd of slaves without will or strength. . . . Go and apply Article 80 to the fighters in the Aurès mountains: To do this, one would have to first go and get them where they are, and it does not seem to be an easy task."

The arbitrary attacks on civil liberties by the government have already met with widespread protest, among others from professional organizations of journalists and from the SP Federation of the Seine (Paris) led by Marceau Pivert.

The genuinely anti-colonialist positions of small groups such as the PCI, the FCL, and *Révolution Proletarienne* only emphasize the capitulation of the large working-class organizations before the government's policy.

The CP, although unalterably opposed to any movement it can't control, can no

longer afford to say that "those who demand independence for Algeria are the conscious or unconscious agents of another imperialism". (*L'Humanité*, June 30, 1945.) Today, as a concession to public opinion and to its own loss of influence, the CP raises platonic protests in the Assembly and publishes platonic resolutions in *L'Humanité*; meanwhile it does not do anything and it won't. This is neither unusual nor unexpected.

SP SPECTACLE

This time, however, the Stalinist shadow-boxing has paled into insignificance compared to the spectacle the SP has put before us. Who else but Naegelen should be delegated to take the floor in the Assembly and explain the "socialist conception of the problem"? Here is what the SP's "North African expert" had to say:

"The Socialist Party has always attempted to reconcile the interests of the working classes with the superior interests of the nation and of peace. . . . To lose North Africa . . . would mean to lose in a short time the whole of Africa, then the French Union; it would mean to reduce France to the rank of a secondary power and even of a vassal power. Not only is our prestige at stake, but also our national independence. These are considerations. We have never thought that we should maintain ourselves there by force. . . . Let us not doubt this: if we committed the folly to leave this Mediterranean coast, others would take our place immediately, who would not know the populations that live there as well as we know them, for having worked, suffered, shed our blood with them; if we left, even those who tend to oppose us now would quickly regret our departure." (*Le Populaire*, Dec. 13, 1954.)

In all fairness, let us point out that these are the worst passages of Naegelen's speech. They were followed by the usual appeal to raise the Algerian peo-

ple's living standard instead of repressing it by military force, as Naegelen himself did in 1945.

After him, Verdier of the SP called for negotiations with the nationalists in Morocco, and Ben Bhamed, an Arab SP deputy from Algeria, took the floor to thank the government for having repressed only part of the Algerian people instead of the whole.

LIEUTENANTS OF IMPERIALISM

What remains is a sickening exhibition of subservience to colonialism, the more patronizing and hypocritical forms of paternalism, militarist and chauvinist clichés. It is in keeping with the SP's National Committee resolution demanding the return of the Expeditionary Corps from Indochina, so it can be gradually transferred "to regions of the French Union where its presence would be more useful."

The SP has been expelling leading members recently for breaking party discipline on the issue of German rearmament. While we do not intend to go here into the motives of the "undisciplined," it is clear that opposition to German rearmament in itself is in no way incompatible with socialist principles. Chauvinism, colonialism, imperialism, militarism—all these things are. We modestly suggest therefore that the SP's national Committee, and in particular Naegelen and Guy Mollet, consider expelling themselves for advocating imperialist ideologies, in opposition to the SP's traditions and program, in opposition to the socialist rank and file, and in opposition to the interests of the French and North African workers.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION —

\$2 a year does it!



LABOR ACTION

January 17, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 3

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

Young
Socialist

CHALLENGE

January 17, 1955

Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

Young Socialist Educational Conference In Chicago a Successful Step Forward

By M. M. BLOOM

Approximately 50 members and friends of the Young Socialist League, including young people from New York, Pittsburgh, Antioch and Oberlin, participated in the Educational Conference sponsored by the Chicago unit of the Young Socialist League in that city on the last two days of 1954.

Four regular conference sessions, social events, highlighted by a New Year's Eve party, and informal "bull-sessions" crowded the busy and fruitful few days. From many different points of view the conference was an outstanding success for the YSL.

This was the second Educational Conference held by the YSL or its branches. (The first had taken place in New York City at the end of last June.) The Chicago comrades performed an excellent job in organizing the conference, providing housing facilities for those from other localities, and in general creating an atmosphere that assured a successful gathering. The conference sessions themselves were held at the Reynolds Club of the University of Chicago, in an atmosphere conducive to stimulating discussion.

What would have been one of the informative highpoints of the conference never materialized. We are referring to the debate between a spokesman for the YSL and a representative of the Socialist Workers Party which the Chicago YSL had proposed. The YSL challenged the SWP to debate any one of a number of questions relating to Stalinist Russia or to the nature of the Communist Parties. Unfortunately the SWP saw fit to turn down the verbal and written challenges made to them, thus eliminating the possibility of the conference hearing a confrontation of views between self-styled "orthodox Trotskyism" and Third Camp socialism.

The conference sessions consisted of four discussions of the politics and problems of socialism today: "Socialism and the Labor Movement," led by Gerry McDermott; "The Fallacy of Lesser-Evilism," which Comrade Don Harris conducted; "Socialism in Colonial Areas," and "Tasks and Perspectives of the YSL," led by Gordon Haskell, assistant editor of LABOR ACTION, and by Max Martin, national chairman of the YSL, respectively.

Socialism and Labor

Comrade McDermott began the opening session of the conference by discussing the reasons for the emphasis which socialists place upon the labor movement in line with the socialist analysis of the working class as the class which in emancipating itself thereby emancipates all of society.

He examined, one by one, the other classes in capitalist society showing the role played by each, and then took up the arguments offered by those who have lost their faith in the ability of the working class to put an end to capitalism and construct a social order of peace, freedom and plenty. He analyzed the conditions of existence for the workers which force the workers to struggle against those very conditions.

He next pointed out that the conditions of production under capitalism prepare the workers for the struggle to create a socialist society. The modern proletariat is concentrated in urban centers, and in the factory works under conditions of centralization; the workers learn cooperation and class solidarity through their daily experiences. They acquire productive techniques and culture and learn that they need democracy in order to struggle for higher wages and better working conditions.

Comrade McDermott then discussed contemporary trade unions, depicting the

YSL attitude toward them, as contrasted with such sectarian views as those held by the Socialist Labor Party. Despite the gangsterism and bureaucratism to be found in many unions, they are organizations of the working class which, well or badly, boldly or timidly, defend the interests of the workers. Moreover, they are schools in which the workers learn later to struggle for socialism.

He concluded his talk with a discussion of the role of socialists in the unions. There are two kinds of experts in the unions, he said, the political ones and technical ones. Expertness in technical matters is necessary, but more important, socialists have to be political experts.

They have to know how to orient themselves to the complex of problems facing the labor movement — the Guaranteed Annual Wage, automation, the shorter work-week, CIO-AFL merger—as well as the problems of society as a whole. Having political knowledge, they will be able to play a role in the coming developments in the American working class.

The discussion following Comrade McDermott's talk ranged over a whole series of questions including the problems of the unions in a period of permanent war economy, prospects for an independent labor party, and the role of Stalinism in the labor movement. The attitudes of the unions toward American foreign policy and the relation of the trade unions to politics and political action were also examined.

Fallacy of "Lesser-Evilism"

Comrade Harris opened the session on the "Fallacy of Lesser Evilism" by reviewing the history of the American socialist movement. He pointed out that socialists in this country had never been able to achieve that union between socialism and the labor movement which is a precondition for the successful struggle for a socialist society, due to a combination of sectarianism by the socialist, and objective circumstances. Some socialists in this country in the 19th century regarded the socialist movement and the unions as two separate arms of the working class which were to be kept distinct from each other.

He next examined the attitudes of the labor movement toward politics, pointing out that the unions had never been entirely aloof from political life. Even in their most primitive days, the unions had participated in politics, of the "reward your friends and punish your enemies" kind. In our own time, the unions have moved toward all-out participation in politics, both the CIO and AFL having created political machines of their own. These machines of the workers, however, are placed at the service of one of the bourgeois parties, the Democratic Party.

All of the historic tendencies, however, are pushing the labor movement in the direction of a break with the Democrats and toward the formation of its own party. Most trade union leaders, he said, know very well that the interests of the workers are not being forwarded by the Democratic Party; not one piece of progressive social legislation has emerged from "labor's successes at the polls." The idea of choosing the "lesser evil" acts as a brake upon the development of a labor party and overcomes the knowledge of the

self-defeating nature of supporting the Trumans and Stevensons which exists in the labor movement.

Many militants in the unions draw back from the idea of a labor party because they think that withdrawal from the Democratic Party will deprive labor of a voice and an influence in the government. In actuality, the reverse is true; for the knowledge that the unions will urge the workers to vote for the Democrats, come what may, enables this party to ignore the needs of the workers entirely.

Comrade Harris concluded his remarks by examining the prognosis for the nature of the labor party after it comes into being. He pointed out that at its inception, it would undoubtedly be a reformist party, not as advanced even as the British Labor Party is. Nevertheless it would represent a long step forward for the American working class and would offer socialists the opportunity to work as left-wing members of it for the adoption of a socialist program.

Most of the discussion at this session centered around the question of struggles inside the Democratic Party between trade-unionists on the one hand and the Fair Deal party machine on the other, and the relation between these and labor's future break with bourgeois politics. Some comrades felt that where such a struggle, in a Democratic Party primary election, for example, meaningfully involved a split between labor and the other elements in the Democratic Party, socialists should support the labor candidates. They reasoned that the final break of the unions would come about through such conflicts inside the Democratic Party and that such struggles intensified the antagonisms between the unions and the Fair Deal.

Other comrades disagreed and felt that socialist support to labor candidates in bourgeois party primaries was not permissible. They argued that the development of a labor party would not occur in this fashion, or that even if it would, for socialists to support candidates in the Democratic Party primaries involved an abandonment of principles.

Stalinism And Colonialism

Opening the discussion of "Socialism in the Colonial Areas," Gordon Haskell analyzed the nature of the colonial countries in terms of their state of economic development, class composition, and major problems. These latter consist of the need for independence, the solving of the agrarian problem, and the industrialization of the economies so as to provide for material advances for the masses of people and the creation of modern countries.

We have witnessed, he said, the upsurge of Asia, its entrance on to the stage of world history, its struggles to put an end to imperialist domination and exploitation. Africa, he continued, is only a step behind.

He pointed out that the complex of problems facing the colonial masses cannot be separated into component parts, that the solution to all of the problems facing the colonial countries lies in the social revolution which wins independence from the foreign imperialism, puts an end to the old feudal relations on the land and begins the struggle for socialism. Just as "socialism in one country" was impossible for Russia, so too must the solution for any given colonial country be bound up with socialist victory on an international scale.

He discussed next the appeal of Stalinism in the colonial areas of the world; the anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist nature of Stalinism, in the absence of a genuinely liberating alternative, appears to millions in the colonies

as their only road out. This view, however, is deceptive: the victory of Stalinism brings independence from the old imperialist domination but substitutes for it a new one, the integration of the country into the Russian Stalinist empire.

The peasants are liberated from the old relations on the land and are then converted into state serfs of the Stalinist ruling class. To the old imperialisms and their Stalinist rivals for power there must be counterposed, he concluded, genuine movements of the colonial workers and peasants struggling for the creation of a society of socialist freedom.

This session of the conference produced the greatest amount of discussion; so much so that the conference decided to use some of the time from the remaining session on "Tasks and Perspectives of the YSL" for a continuation of this point of the agenda. Questions concerning the application of the concept of the Permanent Revolution to current colonial problems were raised.

Most of the discussion, however, dealt with the role of Stalinism in such countries as China and Indochina. Questions concerning the existence of "progressive" aspects in Stalinism in these and other colonial areas were raised and discussed at great length.

Problems for The YSL

Max Martin introduced the last session of the conference, "Tasks and Perspectives of the YSL," by speaking about the role of socialist youth organizations in general. He pointed out that these consisted of transmitting the socialist heritage from generation to generation, the education of youth in socialist ideas, the recruiting of young people to the general socialist movement and participation in the class struggles among youth. He then discussed the application of these general tasks to our period in which the socialist movement is weak and isolated from the working class and labor movement, and to the YSL specifically.

Comrade Martin concluded his remarks by speaking about the present campus orientation of the YSL and its future long-range working-class orientation, and the relation between the two. The discussion at this session dealt with these questions as well as with some more specific problems of the YSL, both nationally and locally in Chicago.

In general, the discussion at all sessions was both lively and stimulating. For the comrades of the Chicago unit and the comrades from other localities who went to Chicago for the conference, it was an outstanding educational event. The exchange of information and ideas and the clarification of views as well as the personal contact between YSLers, from various places and the chance to talk over common problems facing socialists today, contributed to the success of the conference.

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

Max Shachtman

A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!

\$1.00

Cloth \$2.00

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

THE MEN WHO RUN THE DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS

By H. W. BENSON

Win, lose, or draw in any lawsuit, the lawyers come out ahead, on both sides. No matter what political party wins what election, the lawyers come out on top. 1954 was no different.

In the newly elected Congress, 60 senators (out of 96) and 244 representatives (out of 435) are members of the bar. This gives them a clear majority followed by the next largest group . . . businessmen, who add up to 28 in the Senate and 127 in the House.

Not one member of Congress is listed as a worker. This allays the fears of trade-union leaders who shrink from forming a labor party lest America be stratified along class lines and be dominated by some class, perhaps (horrors!) even labor.

Meanwhile, they must be content with domination by businessmen and their spokesmen, lawyers.

If they must be lawyers, at least they're Democrats: such is the doleful consolation of liberals and labor rejoicing with restraint at the 1954 victory of the Democratic Party. But when we take a closer look at what the shift in congressional control means in practice, we get an idea of how doubtful the consolation really is.

The sad story can be concentrated and summed up in one simple statement: control of Congress now passes into the hands of reactionary Southern Democrats.

Southern Democrats seem to have two big advantages, they live long and they have little opposition. They accumulate seniority and inherit committee chairmanships as they approach senility. The party leaders in Congress are from the South. Out of 34 committees, Southerners hold the chairmanship in 22.

Change in Tune

Up to yesterday—that is, before the '54 elections—organized labor denounced the Republican-reactionary Democratic coalition which controlled Congress and called for a crusade by genuine liberals against the coalition. Now, as the liberals in the Democratic Party capitulate to its right wing in the name of party harmony and unity, we hear no more about the "coalition." At the very moment when the Democratic Party right wing, above all of the South, moves into control, union leaders ignore the past and refer vaguely to Southern "liberalism."

The recent CIO convention roundly criticized the Republican administration. But not a word against their old adversary: the reactionary Democrats.

Let us look at the record of the dominant section of the Democratic Party as reported by labor. We have a handy guide, a publication of the AFL Labor's League for Political Education, "Voting Records of Senators and Representatives 1947 through 1954 (Preliminary)."

And bear in mind that what is recorded is not what the congressman should have fought to bring to the floor, but merely how they voted on what did come up for a vote.

We select as most significant the votes of the congressmen in question on matters which the AFL lists under "labor." Specifically, the AFL records ten House rollcalls under this heading. Five dealt with the Taft-Hartley Law; two with wetback labor; and one each with portal-to-portal pay, civil service, and minimum wages.

Here are the leaders of the Democratic Party in action.

Senate Majority Leader: Lyndon B. Johnson

Texas. Somehow he got the reputation of a "middle-of-the-roader." He is also chairman of the Democratic Policy Committee. He voted in seven rollcalls on labor matters. An almost perfect record: 6 times out of 7 against labor.

House Majority Leader: Sam Rayburn

Also of Texas. William S. White calls him "almost too liberal" to be a true Southern Dem-

ocrat. Out of three rollcalls (not recorded on the other 7) he voted against labor twice.

The New Chairmen

"The chairmanships of House committees, often called the citadels of congressional power, return to the conservative South as Democrats take control of the 84th Congress," writes John D. Morris in the *New York Times*. Meet some of your new chairmen:

House Rules Committee: Howard D. Smith

This committee has the power to bottle up legislation which it dislikes. Smith of Virginia "can be expected to use his new power to resist House action on any legislation that he deems to have a socialistic flavor. Public housing is among such measures that he will have an opportunity to fight this year," says Morris. He is the author of the Smith Act and co-sponsor of the anti-strike Smith-Connally Act during the last war.

This banker-lawyer-farmer voted 8 times out of 9 against labor.

House Ways and Means: Jere Cooper

From Tennessee. Chairman of the Democratic Committee on Committees with a decisive voice on the appointment of Democrats on all committees. Accumulated a record as a supporter of the New Deal and Fair Deal. Perhaps he is one of the newly fabricated Southern liberals.

But by the AFL records he voted 7 times out of 10 against labor.

House Armed Services: Carl Vinson

From Georgia. Almost perfect record: Against labor 9 out of 10 times.

House Foreign Affairs: James P. Richard

From South Carolina. Supposed to be a convinced "internationalist." Voted 7 times out of 8 against labor.

House Education and Labor: Graham A. Barden

From North Carolina. "In legislative philosophy," says Morris of the *Times*, "few are more conservative." An almost perfect record marred by a failure to vote in one rollcall: 9 out of 9 against labor.

Just the man to sift through bills on labor legislation and decide what to submit to the House.

House Veterans: Olin E. Teague

Texas. He opposed "the excessive demands for benefits of some organized veterans." Meanwhile, he voted 9 times out of 10 against labor.

House Post Office and Civil Service: Tom Murray

Tennessee. Voted 7 out of 10 times against labor. Perhaps his other 3 votes entitle him to the award "nouveau liberal."

Leaders in the Senate

And now, meet some of your new Democratic chairmen in the Senate. But first a little digression to break up the monotony. The labor movement swallowed hard when John J. Sparkman of Alabama was nominated for the vice-presidency in 1952 and decided to make the best of a bad situation. They bestowed upon him the now cheap degree of "liberal" and solved that vexing difficulty. Sparkman voted only twice out of 9 times against labor, which makes him a real friend. Of course, in these two rollcalls, he did vote for the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Law and against the labor-backed bill on minimum wages, but these things can't be pressed too hard lest we find ourselves with no liberals at all. This week, Sparkman told our innocent young people on the television program "Youth Wants to Know" that Eisenhower would have made a great president if only he had run on the Democratic ticket. He is entitled to his opinion, at least until some new bills are passed;

we note only that this is a man who headed the Democratic ticket in 1952 and presumably should be preparing to bolster its campaign against Eisenhower in 1956.

But if the AFL and CIO can make him a liberal, why can't he make one out of Eisenhower?

From 1947 through May 1954, still according to the AFL, the Senate took 10 rollcalls on labor questions: 6 on the Taft-Hartley Law and one each on portal-to-portal pay, minimum wages, civil service, and wetback labor. Here are some of our new Senate friends at work:

Senate Armed Services Committee: Chairman Richard Russell

Represents Georgia. Seven votes out of seven against labor. Another man whose record is marred only by failure to vote the other 3 times.

Banking and Currency: J. W. Fulbright

Arkansas. This is the Fulbright who alone voted against the appropriations to the McCarthy committee. Nevertheless, we record the fact that on labor questions he voted 8 times out of 9 against labor, a fitting performance for a Southern senator.

Finance: Harry F. Byrd

Virginia. The leader of the reactionary Southern bloc. It would seem supererogatory to cite his record except for this: he becomes a committee chairman because his party, the Democrats, won the elections in 1954. Nine out of nine against labor. Slipped up on the tenth vote when he was not recorded. Probably will never forgive himself. Every vote for the Democratic Party became, in the strange context of our two-party system, a vote to install Byrd over the Senate Finance Committee.

Foreign Relations: Walter F. George

Georgia. Supposed to be "cautious" on foreign spending. But runs away with himself on labor. Voted 9 out of 10 times against labor. What happened the tenth time? No one can be perfect.

Education and Labor: Lister Hill

Alabama. Voted with labor 10 times out of 10. How did he get in?

Agriculture: Allen J. Ellender

Louisiana. 8 out of 10 against labor.

Government Operations: John McClellan

Arkansas. The man who replaces McCarthy as chairman of this committee. His record on labor almost equals that of the man he eliminates. McClellan voted 9 out of 10 times against labor. (McCarthy voted against labor 9 out of 9.)

Post Office and Civil Service: Olin Johnston

South Carolina. Another exception like Lister Hill.

Inner Sanctum

Last year, when his party was in the minority, Paul Douglas, representing Illinois in the Senate, was asked at a UAW conference by columnist Bob Allen what his party intended to do about the Indochina crisis. Douglas wriggled and squirmed until Allen forced him to admit that he did not know what the party's attitude was, that its leaders in Congress made no effort to inform the band of dwindling liberals or even to consult with it.

Now the party is the majority. Its policy will still be decided by a closed caucus of the most conservative Southerners.

William S. White writes in the *New York Times* that the Southerner "is the Democratic boss in both chambers of the new Congress. . . . In short, from his lofty seats of power . . . the Southern Democrat will run an Eighty-fourth Congress. . . ." Douglas and his friends, even the few less conservative Southerners, will never know what happened.

For the conservative Southerner, White tells us, "is remarkably clannish and his unofficial caucuses, from which non-typical Southerners are excluded by means as airy as a cloud but as cold as sleet, are like nothing so much as the far-spaced reunions of a large family of highly individualistic members who are nevertheless bound by the one bond."

We suggest that this family emblazon on its shield the motto: "10 out of 10 against labor."

PRO AND CON: DISCUSSION *Fourth Round*
Israel, Zionism, and the Arab Question

To the Editor:

The discussion which started between Hal Draper and myself on the question of Israel is running the risk of continuing forever. I had hoped to let it rest, but Hal Draper's last reply in LABOR ACTION for Dec. 13 obliges me once again to make some clarifications, for I see that the question is still far from clear.

Draper reproaches me for not making a distinction between "immigration" and "colonization." In the case of Palestine, massive immigration necessarily ends in colonization; first of all, on account of the Zionist propaganda; but also and above all, because everywhere in the world where two ethnic groups come up against each other, the one which is better developed technologically, and therefore is the stronger, is led to dominate over the other. We've seen that in North Africa, for example, the most insignificant French official, a letter-carrier or an ordinary worker come over from Europe, even if he had had no prejudices against the Arabs before crossing the Mediterranean, quickly becomes a racist, and feels much more solidarity with the colonial administration than with his class brothers of the native population. How could it be otherwise in Palestine? Among the immigrants, there are very few consistent internationalists. On the contrary, those among the Jews who are consistent internationalists generally stay in their countries of origin. Thus

colonialism develops by itself, and turns not only against the Arabs but also against the Arabs but also against the oriental Jews.

Draper reproaches me next for not feeling the tragedy of the persecuted Jewish people. I can assure him that I felt this tragedy as much as any European socialist during the last war. But in any case immigration into Palestine is no solution to this situation. On the contrary, at the time when the crushing of Nazism and fascism had permitted many European Jews to live normally again in Europe, the development of immigration into Palestine created a new wave of anti-Jewish feeling in the East, in the countries which up to then had been sheltered from Nazi propaganda. That had the most disastrous consequences, turning against the Jews themselves. That is why those who can live in their countries of origin must be encouraged to stay there, and to seek a solution in abandoning their ancestral prejudices and fusing with the people in whose midst they live; those who unfortunately are in search of a haven must find it in some country, and the role of socialists is to struggle to struggle to open the doors of the U. S., France, England, etc., to them.

Finally, Draper found a contradiction in my last letter, for I spoke of "limitation" and then of "banning" this immigration. And I willingly recognize that on this point I did not ex-

press myself with sufficient clarity. In my opinion, for a satisfactory solution of the Palestinian problem to be found (and it is high time), it is necessary to stop immigration as quickly as possible. Every new arrival of immigrants makes an agreement more difficult, more improbable. Later, only an all-Palestine government will be able to decide if the country can absorb new arrivals. But I used the word "limitation" in one sentence: "But he (Draper) does not say a word about the limitation of Jewish immigration into Israel." In my thinking, I was considering this not from my point of view but from Draper's, believing (rightly, as his reply proves) that he could more easily accept limitation than a banning of immigration. I was wrong in not making the sentence clearer by writing: "But he does not even take a position for the limitations of Jewish immigration into Israel." (In his reply, Draper replied to this question clearly.)

I believe it would be useless to go back to other points discussed; all readers of LABOR ACTION have, I think, understood my position and Draper's. What I wish is that I have made them understand how much the existence of the state of Israel is an obstacle to the development of the Arab masses toward socialism.

J. GALLIENNE

Damascus, Syria, Jan. 3.

While it is inadvisable (but not useless) to go back to all the points originally raised by Comrade Gallienne, I do want to remind him (in view of his concentration on the immigration question) that this exchange started with a letter of Gallienne's in which he solidarized himself or seemed to be solidarizing himself with the articles of Clovis Maksoud, attacking our reply to Maksoud and making no criticism of Maksoud himself.

Maksoud had gone far beyond any demand merely for banning Jewish immigration. He had proposed and envisioned what would be a mass deportation of Jews from Palestine (see LA, Aug. 16).

Now Comrade Gallienne—who inveighs against our proposal for serious limitation but not a ban on Jewish immigration, and who devotes himself once again to pressing his viewpoint on this aspect of the general question—was not sufficiently stirred by Maksoud's point of view even to mention his dissent with it, or with any other part of Maksoud's anti-Israel article, in the course of his attack on our reply.

Perhaps he overlooked it. I assume from his subsequent letters that he himself would not favor deportations. We also found out from Gallienne's second letter that he would oppose any armed action against Israel. I am pointing out that although Gallienne at first seemed to solidarize himself with the Maksoud line, he has fortunately moved some distance away from it in the course of his three letters.

(2) "Draper reproaches me next for not feeling the tragedy of the persecuted Jewish people," writes Gallienne. I did not. I had mentioned in parentheses that the post-war plight of the Jews in Europe is "a problem which, I am afraid, plays no role in Gallienne's considerations."

Gallienne quite unnecessarily protests that he "feels" for their plight. But simultaneously he proves that this plays no role whatsoever in his political thinking on the subject. In fact, he makes some statements that are simply astounding.

He writes: "at the time when the crushing of Nazism and fascism had permitted many European Jews to live normally again in Europe," immigration into Palestine intensified Arab hostility. It sounds just as if Gallienne thinks that the end of the war solved the plight of uprooted masses of Jews in Europe.

He says "many European Jews" could again live normally: how many? The post-war Anglo-American Commission of inquiry confirmed the fact that there were something like 100,000 destitute refugees for whom there was no visible space in Europe or on this planet. Later came persecution also in the Stalinist sphere. Besides, in what parts of Eastern Europe or Germany or Austria (most of Europe) can the former Jewish inhabitants who managed to survive pick up again a "normal" life, economically or otherwise?

Gallienne's one-sided focus on the Arab side of the problem blinds his thinking to the other half, in spite of impeccable feelings on the subject.

Now secondly, link this up with Gallienne's argument in the same passage that Jews who are internationalists generally stay in their country of origin, hence the nationalism of the Jews who do immigrate into Israel. . . .

True of Zionist "pioneers,"—but what has this to do with the post-war influx of which he is speaking? Thousands and thousands of Jews had to get out of Europe, or at any rate were moved to do so by the burning ground behind them, not by any motive comparable even to that of a French official who moves to North Africa.

Gallienne's generalization about internationalism is true—but irrelevant precisely to the post-war plight of the Jews who formed the bulk of the post-war influx to Israel.

Thirdly, while of course as anti-Zionists we, like most socialists, urge Jews to live and fight inside their own countries, we must raise an eyebrow at Comrade Gallienne's unfortunate expression about "ancestral prejudices" and his insistence that Jews must "fuse" with the people of their country.

Our program on Palestine, as we see it, is an attempt to develop for today a consistent and principled anti-Zionist position which takes into consideration that it is not only the Arabs who have a right to justice. Gallienne offers definitive evidence in his letter that he sees clearly only the Arab side of the picture, just as the typical Zionist focuses only on the interests of the Jews.

(3) "Draper reproaches me," writes Gallienne, "for not making a distinction between 'immigration' and 'colonization.'" He forgets to add: the reproach is for not making this distinction in developing his own policy, that is, in developing a socialist policy. This consideration is still completely absent in his present letter.

All he discusses is how immigration and colonialism commonly go together in the thinking of non-socialists, indeed in the thinking of (sophisticated or naive) imperialists. This isn't exactly on the point! At any rate, it has nothing to do with our point, as we explained it.

On "limitation" versus "ban" on immigration: Gallienne admits that "later, only an all-Palestine government will be able to decide if the country can still absorb new arrivals." That is, he does not necessarily propose to a future all-Palestine government that it ban immigration. Well then, to whom now is he proposing the ban which he insists on as against our "limitation"? (To the Israelis perhaps?)

The fact is that insistence on a "banning" proposal as against our program for limitation does not make political sense—except on the basis of the perspective that such a ban will eventually be achieved and enforced by Arab power over Israel, a situation that can be realized only by war, which Gallienne is against.

The "all-Palestine government," presumably, will be constituted by peaceful agreement of Arabs and Israelis: at that point Gallienne will have to propose our program, and not his! Before this point, his "ban" proposal is directed to no one; before this point, on the other hand, our "limitation" program already makes sense as an integral part of a revolutionary program for Israeli-Arab unity through federation.

Hal DRAPER

LABOR SCOPE

MORE ON THE CASE OF THE 14 AT SPERRY

In our Dec. 6 issue, we carried an informational article on the case of 14 workers at Sperry's Lake Success plant who were fired as "security risks" and who are being defended by the IUE-CIO. That article was based on a write-up in Fortune magazine.

Below is a follow-up on the Sperry story from a column by Murray Kempton, N. Y. Post columnist, Jan. 5.—Ed.

For the production worker of moderate skills, there are few better places to work on Long Island than the sprawling Sperry Gyroscope plant at Lake Success. Sperry has a strong CIO union and its going rate is, with one exception, the best in the electronics industry.

It is their past good luck of working at Sperry which has compounded the dreary fate of 14 of its hands who have been fired since last January. All are still looking for steady jobs. They have no special skills; they have to explain to each prospective employer why they left jobs at premium rates where they had an average of 10 years' seniority.

Their prospective employers can only draw one conclusion. It happens to be the correct one. These men are out of jobs because they were fired from Sperry as security risks.

So far, no employer has seen fit to jump that hurdle and hire them. In recent months, the local U. S. Employment Service office has ceased even referring them to openings.

Who are these pariahs? They have all been put in the same bag, but they are not, of course, all the same men. None are Communists; you do not have to be a Communist to be a security risk. But, if the notion of security means anything at all, it should help to be an anti-Communist.

ANTI-CP RECORD

The Sperry workers may be said to have had one chance in their lives to face up to the Communist problem. Until 1949, they were members of the United Electrical Workers, a union under pro-Communist control. The Sperry local began fighting the UE's national leaders very early; when the CIO expelled UE in 1949, they voted overwhelmingly to stay with the CIO.

At least 11 of the 14 men the Defense Dept. has refused to clear at Sperry were active leaders of the fight against the Communists in UE and in the local's adherence to the CIO's International Union of Electrical Workers. They were not passive rank-and-filers; some of them were union shop stewards; others were members of the local executive board.

One of the men fired after he lost his clearance was in charge of distributing

leaflets against the UE. Another sat on the IUE screening committee set up to pass upon applications for membership to the new local after the CIO took over, and voted to bar 30 applicants upon suspicion of pro-communism.

A third, Daniel J. Lenihan, was Sperry's representative on the UE Members for Democratic Action, an anti-Communist caucus which functioned in the late Forties. A fourth, with as positive a record, was refused clearance because he was alleged to be associated with a Communist still working in the plant.

At the time of their discharge, 11 of these 14 orphans were doing work which could in no way be described as sensitive or involving security information. When the Defense Dept. denied them access to classified work, the union asked that they be transferred to non-sensitive work, and the company answered that there was no such thing as non-sensitive work in the plant.

WHAT'S THE CRIME?

After something of a court fight, the CIO took Sperry to arbitration last summer. Joseph Rosenfarb, the arbitrator, was hoping to have a decision last November, by which time this was already the longest arbitration in the history of man.

Meanwhile, the discharged men wait and have lost all reason to look elsewhere; and Irving Abrahamson, their lawyer, does his best to clear them with the Defense Dept. Abramson, an old CIO Commie-baiter and a member of the World War II Enemy Alien Security Board, could hardly be called insensitive to national safety; yesterday he confessed himself a man harassed by shadows.

These are men who have committed no crime. It is no crime to be a security risk. You can cross that shadow line if you have a close relative in the Soviet Union or if you were once convicted of assault and battery. But, once you cross it, you are a subversive. The system did not contemplate economic capital punishment. But that is what the system has produced, and that is where a country goes when it so fears of its own safety that it forgets the least of its citizens.

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.

READ ABOUT SOCIALISM

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

Socialism: the Hope of Humanity10
by Max Shachtman

Marxism in the U. S.35
by Leon Trotsky

Plenty for All: The Meaning of Socialism25
by Ernest Erber

The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism10
(LA Special Issue)

Independent Socialist Press
 114 West 14 Street, New York City

Liberals Collapse — —

(Continued from page 1)

ing to hurt party unity. And the safest way to maintain that unity is to capitulate to the Southern Democrats, who in turn find that they are separated by little, if anything, from the position of Eisenhower.

This mood was underlined by a "struggle" which took place among the "liberal" Democratic senators. Senator Lehman of New York suggested once again that now is the time to put an end to the cloture rule which permits Senate filibusters against civil rights legislation. He was opposed by all of them, led by Humphrey of Minnesota and Morse of Oregon who are still considered leading liberals, despite their role in the "anti-Red" legislation of last year.

Humphrey opposed him on the ground that nothing will come of an effort to amend the Senate rules, and that anyway it would divide the party. For even introducing the idea to his colleagues the New York Post congratulates Lehman as a man who places principle over expediency.

A PEEP OUT OF LABOR

Since what we have before us is a picture of miserable spinelessness among the liberals superimposed on a broader canvas on which the Democrats are indistinguishable from the Eisenhower Republicans, it is only fair to note a clashing splash of color on the extreme "left" of the Democratic Party. The labor leaders who did so much to get this "common people's" party back into Congressional control spoke out against the Eisenhower program in fairly distinct accents.

Both Meany of the American Federation of Labor, and Reuther of the Congress of Industrial Organizations condemned the proposal for a 90-cent minimum wage as being far too low. They attacked the "weakness" of the proposals on amending the Taft-Hartley Law, and Reuther went so far as to say that Eisenhower's message "offers no program for realizing the tremendous potential of our advancing technology and productive capacity in terms of adequate housing, better schools and other projects for the people." Meany said that "obviously the president in his anxiety to remain in the middle of the road has failed to realize that roads are made for movement, not stagnation."

But these voices are not in the inner councils of the Democratic Party, and even if the labor leaders would like to see the Democrats taking a stiffer stand in opposition, they have made it amply clear that they have no intention of disturbing party unity by throwing the very real weight they have against the dominant policy of conciliation.

COWARDLY OPPOSITION

Now, when everything has been said about the Democratic policy which makes it hard to tell one party from the other without an official seating chart, the fact remains that there is going to be an election in two years, and that the Democrats hope to take over the whole government at that time. Surely they must recognize the danger of coming to the election without any record of serious opposition on the basis of which to ask the people to turn Eisenhower out and replace him with a good Democrat?

The Southern leadership in Congress is in no hurry to make such a record. As they see it, 1956 is still along way off, and all kinds of things can happen before then. In the meantime, they have a president whose program is quite acceptable to them. A bit of an economic downturn

in 1956 could well make the difference in the public mind. They could then run on the memory that things were better when the Democrats ran the government, without committing themselves to much in the way of a program.

For the labor movement, and for the Northern Democrats, who have a real live Republican Party to contend with, the matter is not so simple. Unemployment continues at a high rate and shows a tendency to increase despite the business upturn. The flight of industry to the low-wage South presents a major problem to many unions and communities in the North. The speedup and a generally tough attitude in negotiations by capital is an ever-present problem, as is the big new drive for automation with its threat of a further rise in unemployment.

Thus the labor movement is bound to

become increasingly restive under the congressional policy of no opposition and very little criticism. And the Stevenson wing of the party, with its greater sensitivity to the demands of the workers and the needs of the city population in the North, and with its eye on the fight for party control at the next convention, is forced to seek a little more active opposition to Eisenhower than is desired by their Southern brethren in Congress.

These pressures will assert themselves in one way or another as the 84th Congress runs its course. But American liberalism is at such a low ebb, and the labor leadership has taken its role of political subservience in the Democratic Party so seriously, that it appears the two-party system will be reduced to as low a level of meaningless as human efforts can reduce it.

Not in the Headlines

Slap to the Right

The report of the House Un-American Activities Committee charging that "neo-Fascist" and "hate" groups in the United States were breeding "subversion" was scored by the American Civil Liberties Union as a violation of due process of law and free speech.

ACLU executive director Patrick Murphy Malin sent a letter to Rep. Harold H. Velde, chairman of the House Committee, noting that the groups named in the report did not have a hearing at which they could defend themselves against the charges.

"The ACLU, as a non-partisan, private organization dedicated to the promotion of the Bill of Rights, has steadfastly maintained that persons or groups have a right to be heard by congressional committees reporting on their activities. We regret that this has not been done for those concerned in the investigation of the 'hate' groups . . . and submit that such denial to a hearing is contrary to the Committee's rules promulgated on July 15, 1953. . . ."

The ACLU spokesman argued further that the inquiry into the "hate" groups was improper because "it should not be the function of congressional investigations to inquire into political beliefs and associations. It is essential to the health of the democratic process that free men be guaranteed the right to maintain their political views and associations free from governmental inquiry. It is this personal guarantee which makes our society fundamentally different from that of a totalitarian society. Accordingly, we urge you not to investigate any area of public opinion . . . no matter how repugnant are the views expressed by these groups."

The letter concluded that if there is evidence that groups are engaged in real subversive activities, not merely propaganda, Congress could then properly investigate such activities.

Subversive Piano-Dealer

The Case of the Second Hand Piano Dealer may yet become famous. The issue in the case of William Shonick is whether business men may be denied licenses purely on political grounds.

A teacher who lost his job after an FBI informer named him as a Communist, Shonick has been a second-hand piano dealer here for three years. Police

conceded that he had complied with all regulations but this year denied him his annual renewal of license.

The factual grounds cited were like those in a loyalty case: that he was present at a public meeting against discrimination addressed by Paul Robeson in 1949, that he had attended a public meeting in 1951 to defend victims of the Smith Act, that he went to a private party to raise funds for the defense of a federal employee accused of false statement, and that he had pleaded the Fifth last year when asked if he were a Communist.

The police officer who recommended that his license not be renewed made an interesting witness. He said he didn't think anybody should be penalized for pleading the Fifth and he also volunteered that he didn't think a man's political ideology had anything to do with trade in second-hand pianos. He claimed, however, that denial of the license was required by one of the findings in the preamble to the new Anti-Communist Control Law. This says that "unlike other parties" the Communist party recognizes "no constitutional or statutory limitation" on its conduct. Ergo, a man named as a Communist could not be certified as of that law-abiding character required of licensees.

—I. F. Stone's Weekly

Even the Legion

The American Legion Magazine has attacked the government's security program.

The Legion's editors weren't defending the right to dissent. They were wrought up because of federal government policy, verified in various departments, to fire an employee even if only a charge is brought against him, quite apart from evidence.

The cases cited by the magazine were not political. Typical was the case of a man who had been charged in court with assault, and another once charged with immoral conduct, who were fired by their agencies, which (said the magazine) were not interested in whether the charge was true or false. The fact of the charge itself was enough.

Back to Middle Ages

"TEL-AVIV—The mayor of Tel-Aviv issued strict orders prohibiting female employees in the city office from reporting to work in slacks (instead of in skirts). The order was issued on the strength of the prohibition in the Bible (Deuteronomy 22:5) that a woman should not wear the garment of a man. Heretofore, many female workers wore slacks, to keep warm in the unheated office rooms. The mayor issued the order under pressure from the Orthodox deputy mayor who insisted that it was an abomination, according to the Torah, for men and women to wear each other's garments."

—Der Yid, Dec. 10, N. Y. (Zionist, Orthodox-Jewish)

Defense of Djilas — —

(Continued from page 1)

standpoint. Even socialists who believe, as we do not, in the possible future democratic intentions of the Yugoslav regime should not permit such opinions to stand in the way of the most clear-cut and vigorous condemnation of this cynical outrage.

A world-wide socialist protest can apply the maximum pressure to the Yugoslav government to prevent the trial and conviction of Djilas and Dedijer which are otherwise inevitable. Democratic socialist and labor movements in all countries are under a solemn obligation to condemn this violation of

civil liberties in Yugoslavia, just as we would condemn all such violations in Russia or the U. S.

We are confident that socialist and labor movements all over the world will do their duty in defending these two victims of totalitarianism. In the name of the Independent Socialist League of the United States we urge that your organization act immediately to prevent further reprisals against them.

Fraternally,
Max SHACHTMAN
National Chairman
Albert GATES
Secretary

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

YOU'RE INVITED

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