

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**THE H-BOMB-MAKERS  
MOVE TO EXPEL BEVAN**

... page 3

**AFTER KIBYA, GAZA:  
Israel Suffers Another Defeat**

... page 6

MARCH 21, 1955

FIVE CENTS

**SPOT-  
LIGHT**

## Battle of the Mythologists

The Yalta myths are all over the news again—both of them.

State Department has been surreptitiously handing out transcripts of the talks at the notorious Yalta conference, to congressmen, while explaining that Churchill objects to making the whole thing public. It seems it would be embarrassing, among other reasons because of the hard things the participants had to say about the Germans, whom all of them are now wooing like mad. There are hints that if certain minority groups read what Roosevelt had to say about them, the Democrats would lose some urban votes.

The N. Y. Post (March 15) editorially demands that the thing be published so that people can judge for themselves about the "Yalta legend." The legend, according to the Post, is that everything that has happened in the world since the war, cold war and all, is the evil result of Yalta.

Stated so, it is indeed a legend, and perhaps some believe it in that form.

In contrast, the Post states its own understanding of history:

"A very respectable body of historians argues, however, that it is not the Yalta agreements but Russian violation of them—as on the issue of free elections for Poland—that shaped much of the later disaster. They further contend that we would never have been able to rally Western Europe for subsequent resistance to Communist aggression if we had not made the supreme effort for post-war collaboration symbolized by the Yalta conclave."

Well, if the right-wing "devil theory" of Yalta is a legend, then this liberalistic rewriting of history is a hoax.

Churchill's history has preserved for humanity the very document in which the big three imperialists arithmetically—with figures in percentages—divided up "spheres of influence" among the powers; that is, divided up the loot.

It may well be, of course, that the Russians went further than expected in outright control of those territories that were put under its wing; but this argues only that Roosevelt and even Churchill were naive country boys taken for a ride at the conference, just as the right-wingers say. It is incredible that even a liberal editor should forget that even then Russia was a totalitarian despotism, not a Great Democracy Embarked on a Grand Crusade—even if we understand how a liberal editor can insist on believing that the two democratic paladins at the Yalta bargain counter were Noble Knights of the Holy Grail.

[As we go to press, the text of the Yalta documents has just been published.—Ed.]

## Anyone Seen Sidney Hook Lately?

The New York Board of Education, by the time this sees print, is supposed to decide whether to compel all teachers to become informers on their fellows, or lose their jobs. It will rule on whether ex-CPers must squeal on anyone else

(Continued on page 6)

# A.D.A. CONVENTION: Liberals Need a Fighting Program In Defense of Democracy

## On a Foreign Policy To Defeat Stalinism

By HAL DRAPER

As Americans for Democratic Action assemble for their convention, there is great uneasiness among all liberals over the disastrous effects of U. S. foreign policy on the interests of the fight against Stalinist imperialism.

Since the last convention of ADA, the Stalinist camp has scored a big coup in Indochina.

Between that convention and the one before it, the Korean war ended, without bringing peace and with the consciousness of most peoples of the world that the Stalinist totalitarians had more than held their own there.

And between the last-mentioned convention and the end of World War II, the whole relation of forces in the world had been turned topsy-turvy by the victory of Stalinism in China.

Is there anyone in the world who has failed to understand that it is the Russian-Stalinist imperialist war camp that is winning the cold war—the war that is going on now?

Is there a liberal who can fail to ask: **WHAT'S WRONG? How can the most oppressive and brutal dictatorship in history win the allegiance, or at least the support, or at least the toleration, of millions of people while the U. S. (which, the fat boys complain, is emptying its pockets in global charity) is reaping more and more anti-Americanism? How can such things happen, if the standard American image of the world has any resemblance to reality?**

Or is it enough to drive one to agree with the Peglerites that those dumb furiners (namely, everybody else in the world) are just too stupid to appreciate us Lady Bountiful Americans, who also are the only ones to understand the Menace of Communism? Or is this Stalinism such a very cunning conspiracy that it wins the minds of whole peoples by hocus-pocus sleight-of-hand?

That something is basically wrong is a necessary starting-point. Without it, well-intentioned generalizations in the ADA platform will be so many futile platitudes—for example, platitudes about world leadership, imaginative economic policies, and best wishes for self-determination.

We submit to the ADA convention delegates that everything that is basically wrong with U. S. foreign policy—the foreign policy of the Truman administration included, since Eisenhower's is not fundamentally different—can be seen, in model, in the Formosa issue as it is exploding today.

Just as it could be seen in the issue of Indochina last year—Korea the year before that. . . .

And we submit that so far ADA has been riding along with the administra-

tion on precisely that line which represents the "something" that is basically wrong.

## WHY STALINISM WINS

"To govern is to choose." All policy means to make a series of choices. The American foreign policy of Truman-Acheson and Eisenhower-Dulles has also been a series of choices.

Americans of all persuasions could and did talk perfectly sincerely about sympathy with "the Asian revolution," with self-determination, with colonial freedom, and other good things. But when the real world presented its choices, liberals were never asked to mark an X in a box labeled "freedom" as against another box labeled "colonialism."

In Indochina (to take the last-but-one example) liberals had no doubts about their stand on independence for Vietnam from French imperialism. But the real world never presented the issue of foreign policy to us that simply. For France—being a stubbornly colonialist-imperialist state whose leaders thought (mistakenly, according to liberalism) that their capitalist system needed colonial profits—held on to Indochina with sharp claws.

And the actual issue presented to Americans was this: Should the U. S. support this France's war; or should it break with its French ally, go over its head, and do what it could to stimulate the Indochinese people to an independent struggle which would also be its best insurance against Stalinist subversion and capture?

Most Americans, liberals included, be-moaned France's colonialist policy—and went along. They are still going along, as Indochina is sliding to disaster, even now.

The Stalinists won because they live on the crimes of the Western imperialists, not because they themselves awake such love in the breasts of people who are menaced by their embrace.

## LOOK AT FORMOSA

The same thing, essentially, happened in Korea.

The same thing happened on the mainland of China.

And still the liberals cannot break with the habit of doing precisely that which the Stalinists need, if they are to capture the rest of the uncommitted world.

The U. S. is doing it again around the smoldering firecracker of Formosa.

It is desperately hanging on to support of a hated and bloody dictatorial butcher, Chiang Kai-shek, who in the course of a couple of decades convinced the Chinese people that they had nothing to lose if the Stalinist dictators took over.

And unfortunately, though half-heartedly, so is ADA, if we are to judge by the recent editorial in the ADA World, "Formosa Firsters," which reiterates the platform's insistence on war (it is implied if necessary) in defense of Chiang

(Turn to last page)

## On Civil Liberties And Political Action

By GORDON HASKELL

Americans for Democratic Action are gathering for their 8th annual convention in Washington, D. C., on the weekend of March 18. The delegates will face a number of momentous issues in both foreign and domestic policy. And the way in which they come to grips with them will not only reflect the state of American liberalism today, but can do much to set the political tone for its development in the near future.

As a liberal organization, ADA accepts the basic premises of the American socio-economic system. Its purpose is to reform American capitalism, to achieve its goals of full employment, a rising standard of living for all, an end to racial and religious discrimination, and free and untrammelled democracy within the framework of capitalism.

As socialists, we of LABOR ACTION are convinced that the social ends, to so many of which both ADA and we are dedicated, cannot be achieved within the institutional framework which ADA accepts. That is a question, however, which can be argued on other occasions. At the moment we would like to address ourselves to a number of problems which confront ADA quite independently of that broader question.

The domestic policy statement adopted by the last ADA convention was headed by a discussion of the all-American attack on civil liberties. The prominent position assigned to this issue shows that ADA was alive to the danger to American democracy involved in the legislative investigations, administrative procedures and legal enactments all of which have been justified on the ground that since the security of the nation is endangered by the world Communist movement, any action taken against it or its organized representatives in this country is permissible, whether or not such action also whittles away at or even completely reverses the legal and political traditions of American democracy.

## TIME TO STOP RETREAT

At the moment there appears to be something of a lull in the fury of the witch-hunt. McCarthy is silent, and the cry rises on many sides for a review and re-evaluation of the administrative procedures and laws in this area of the past few years. If the liberal and labor movement reacts to this development with a feeling of relief and complacency, however, a golden opportunity may be lost to strike a real and telling blow at the reactionary web which has been spun over the whole structure of American liberties.

In assessing the reasons for the fantastic success of McCarthy and all that

(Turn to last page)

# Pittsburgh CIO Threatens Break with Demo Machine

By GERRY McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, Mar. 13 — Conflict between Pittsburgh's Democratic Party machine and the labor movement has reached a new pitch. This development occurred when Anthony Federoff, CIO regional director and president of the Steel City Industrial Union Council, announced that he was putting the city administration "on probation" for the next two years.

If the administration does not meet labor's demands by that time, Federoff declared, he will oppose the mayor and council in 1957. This is taken to mean that the labor movement would enter a slate of candidates of their own in the Democratic primary.

For a few days, it appeared that the conflict would be even sharper. Federoff had taken out petitions to run for a Democratic nomination for City Council. This would have pitted him directly against the machine slate. Federoff's action came suddenly, and perhaps for that reason, Mayor David Lawrence, leader of the machine, was able to persuade Federoff to back down.

Nevertheless, there were two significant things about Federoff's candidacy. For one thing, he is a spokesman for the more conservative forces within the CIO. He is generally associated with Dave McDonald and the Steelworkers. For a man like Federoff to break with the Democrats shows how bitter is the conflict between the two.

The second significant thing about Federoff's abbreviated campaign was his program. Federoff planned to run on a program which would have seriously threatened the Democrats, a program designed to appeal to wide sections of the city's population.

His primary attack was on the recently enacted city wage tax. But he also condemned the general deterioration of city service which has been the result of the mayor's preoccupation with the "Pittsburgh renaissance."

In plain words, the "Pittsburgh renaissance" has been a program to rehabilitate the vast Mellon interests in Pittsburgh. The ordinary citizens have gained in the process to a certain extent, but the gain has come at the expense of progress in housing, police work, schools, mass transportation, the recreation program, street maintenance, and the like. And it is being paid for to a disproportionate extent by labor.

Supposedly, Federoff withdrew from the campaign because the mayor promised to embrace Federoff's program. If Federoff believed the mayor's promise, he is a naive man, for the mayor had also promised never to impose a wage tax down to the very minute that he whipped it through his rubber-stamp council.

There may well be another reason why Federoff backed down. It may well have been that, without a political party, Federoff could not get on the ballot in time. It is a notorious fact that election machinery is set up to favor the two old parties. Filing requirements, the circulation of petitions well in advance, legal technicalities, all these are designed to maintain the Democratic-Republican monopoly.

In the final analysis, labor leaders are either going to have to get themselves a party of their own, or they are going to have to get out of politics. And for the labor movement to abandon politics today would be like putting its head on the chopping-block.

# Auto's Big Two Willing to Talk To UAW on Annual Wage Plan

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Mar. 13—Further evidence of the powerful pressure that the United Auto Workers (CIO) is putting on the major corporations for its 1955 package of demands, including the guaranteed annual wage, was shown this week when both Ford and General Motors agreed to meet with the union in "exploratory" talks before legally required to do so under existing contracts.

Undoubtedly, they hope to exert a moderating influence on the UAW leadership in its proposals and program for the forthcoming 15th UAW national convention late in March. The auto companies obviously don't want Walter Reuther to get the union all steamed up, thus providing for a stiffer compromise settlement than the companies would like to give.

For the auto corporations know something that the pundits, view-with-alarm boys, and paid mouthpieces forget; and that is the power of the auto workers if they really get riled up. The history of the UAW has not been forgotten by Ford and GM.

It remains to be seen what kind of success either the union or corporations

have in these preliminary talks. The UAW convention will give an indication along that line.

Meanwhile, the UAW filed proper notice with government officials on their bargaining demands on Ford, thus making public the open secret that Ford is target No. 1 in 1955. The UAW had a choice of filing either at GM, whose contract expires on May 29, or at Ford where the contract ends on June 1. The implication of the Ford notice is obvious.

Until the admission by the corporations that they were meeting in advance with the UAW, the auto industry position was one of resolute silence, as if the UAW's program did not exist. This about-face comes at a time when many other industry spokesmen have been screaming for the auto industry to stand firm and not give the UAW anything which will inspire other unions to battle more vigorously in 1955.

From now until a new contract is signed, it may be expected that many moves, including "unauthorized strikes," will plague the auto barons, who have been living in relative peace and enjoying fabulous prosperity for the past five years.

## ON THE JIM CROW FRONT

# Racist Violence in Chicago... Bank Boycott in New York City

By SCOTT ARDEN

Racist violence flared again at Chicago's stormy Trumbull Park housing project.

In the first case a mob stoned three Negro tenants, all of whom were injured, one to the extent of requiring hospital attention.

Frank Brown, the spokesman for the three, reported that as they were walking to a nearby drugstore they passed about five men standing on a street corner who called them "niggers" and hurled other racially insulting remarks. No "incident" occurred, however.

As they returned home a little later, two policemen warned them that if they took the same route they would be "clouted." Brown, the Chicago *Defender* reports, said the trio asked the officers to escort them. The police refused and walked away.

A crowd of about 30 men was waiting on the street when the three returned. After they passed the mob they were struck by a shower of rocks. They returned the fire to hold off the advancing mob and then fled. In running, one of them bumped a woman passer-by (wife), who fell.

A policeman overtook them and ordered them to go to the police command post where, according to Brown, the police tried to get the woman to say she had been assaulted. She refused.

The police then told them that they "had no business on the street" and one of the officers who had refused to escort them claimed that he had offered to drive them home and that they had refused.

None of the mob was arrested, of course. One need be surprised only that the cops could not successfully arrange their more usual frameup of the Negro victims.

Transportation and protection were offered, though reluctantly, in the second case. Another Trumbull tenant, Herbert Upson, attended a local church. During the service a hysterically inclined white woman seated in front of him turned and saw him. She promptly fainted.

When he left the church a mob had gathered and the police escorted him home. Unfortunately the efficiency of the police is in question in this instance also. They didn't, it would seem, escort the woman to the nearest hospital for the mentally deranged.

Shortly after these events Elizabeth Wood, former executive secretary of the Chicago Housing Authority, was presented with a plaque, signed by 50 prominent Chicagoans, describing her as "fearless in the fight for principle" and commending her for displaying "sensitivity to human relations" and having given "creative leadership in administering the low-cost housing program."

Miss Wood, responsible for breaking the Jim Crow rule at Trumbull Park, was fired from her job as head of the CHA in retaliation for her militant desegregation policy in public housing. Trumbull Park now houses 27 Negro families; only a few years ago it was lily-white.

## N. Y. BANK BOYCOTT

New York's congressman Adam Clayton Powell called upon Negro groups and

individuals to draw their money from local banks and redeposit it in either the Tri-State Bank of Memphis or the Carver Federal Savings and Loan Association in New York.

Describing the "continued refusal of these banks in Harlem to lend any money for mortgages and improvement of property in this area" as "economic lynching" he introduced the "bank-where-you-can-borrow" proposal.

Madison Jones, representing the NAACP (which is not yet directly involved in the bank boycott move), stated that the Carver Bank would soon transfer \$10,000 of its funds to the Tri-State Bank, and gave a plug for the NAA's important campaign to relay funds to this Memphis bank in order to counteract the economic pressure on Mississippi Negroes created by the white "citizens councils."

These "councils," composed of "respectable businessmen," are staging a widespread campaign to cut off credit, foreclose mortgages, and in other ways exert extreme financial pressure on militant Negroes in the South.

Friends of LABOR ACTION who have funds, especially those who bank by mail normally, can help defeat this reactionary clique by transferring their accounts to the Tri-State Bank, which is financially thoroughly sound (by all capitalist standards). (Comrade Gates informs us that checks drawn on the Tri-State Bank will be particularly welcome in the current Independent Socialist League Fund Drive.)

In another New York boycott, incensed by the cold shoulder given to Negroes by the radio-television industry, the Urban League, NAACP and other Negro organizations sponsored a two-hour boycott in an effort to convince the networks that obvious discrimination will not be taken lying down.

Odell Clarke, of the NAA, stated: "In a typical New York scene on television not a single Negro is found. If TV shows a subway scene there is not a single Negro in that subway. When bus drivers, doctors and policemen are portrayed, no Negroes—and no Puerto Ricans—can be seen."

Noting that the campaign for jobs is a "big fight with an awful lot of money stacked against us," Clark pointed out that Negroes were among the purchasers of all the products advertised on radio and television.

The aim is primarily jobs for Negro performers, technicians and clerical workers—and the task of the boycott is to impress the networks and the general public with the determination of Negroes to get these jobs.

New York readers can aid in this drive by sending letters and postcards to CBS and NBC supporting integration, and by participating in future boycott action which will be announced in the daily press.

Comrades and friends in other areas can help by writing their local stations and by cooperating with similar boycott campaigns in their cities.

## PLUS AND MINUS

After the well-publicized Jim Crow case of the Republican Lincoln Day dinner, Miami took a second slap in the face when it was announced that Lena Horne had canceled an engagement at a local night-spot, when her reservation at another Miami hotel was "canceled." On the other side of the ledger, the New York *Times* reports that discrimination against Negroes in Western hotels has decreased markedly in the last five years.

Based on the observations of W. M. Barbour, western field director for the National Urban League, the article indicated that this improvement is particularly noticeable in the larger hotels of big cities in Oregon, Colorado, Washington and California, with small towns, motels and trailer camps remaining the most conspicuous strongholds of prejudice.

Large areas of Utah, Nevada and Southern Arizona, however, still practice discrimination almost as severe as that of Deep Dixie.

While "the standard rule" for Negroes traveling is still to make advance reservations, Barbour is quoted as saying "there is no question that the Negro traveling in the West is considerably better off than he was ten or even five years ago."

Along with the Negro community we applaud this advance—while at the same

(Continued on page 4)

## ISL FUND DRIVE

# It's the Big Cities That Are Still Holding Us Back

By ALBERT GATES  
Fund Drive Director

There was a big let-down in the drive this past week, when we recorded the lowest contributions in five weeks. The total received was less than \$600. We remain below the \$4000 mark at a time when we should be nearing the halfway point in the campaign.

The biggest reason why we fell down so badly in this past week is that the two largest centers, New York and Chicago, failed to contribute one penny. This, together with the fact that areas like Los Angeles and Buffalo still have to make their first showing, is holding us back.

A glance at the standings will show that there are still too many places below the 50% mark. Of the eighteen quotas, thirteen are below 50%, and six have yet to make their first contribution.

Those are the areas which have to pick up, fast, if we are to make our way and reach the national quota. The New York branch did very well in the first few weeks, but has fallen off pretty bad in recent days. It hasn't yet crossed 40%.

Streator and St. Louis still remain the only areas which have completed a quota, and Pittsburgh is within striking distance. But the rest are still far behind.

We should like to think that it is only the Shachtman tour that is holding up some of our friends. But we will find out soon enough. If we run true to form, there ought to be a number of receipts in the next two weeks.

We are counting on a real push in that period. By the first week in April, every area should be past the halfway mark, and half of these over the three-quarter mark. That is the way we will complete our quota.

## FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

Branch	Quota	Paid	%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,050</b>	<b>\$2730.50</b>	<b>37.1</b>
St. Louis	25	25	100
Streator	25	25	100
Pittsburgh	125	85	68
Detroit	200	110	55
Chicago	2,000	1017	50.8
Cleveland	150	65	43.3
Natl Office	1,500	625	41.6
Seattle	150	60	40
N. Y. City	3,800	1489.50	39.1
Philadelphia	250	81	32.4
Bay Area	500	100	20
Newark	400	48	12
Los Angeles	450	0	0
Buffalo	250	0	0
Indiana	75	0	0
Akron	50	0	0
Reading	50	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0

**BRITAIN** RIGHT-WING WRECKING-CREW AT WORK IN THE LABOR PARTY

# THE H-BOMB-MAKERS MOVE TO EXPEL BEVAN

By **BERNARD DIX**

LONDON, March 6—The announcement by the British government just over a fortnight ago that it is to proceed with the manufacture of the H-bomb has set off a series of political chain-reactions which are exploding with increasing magnitude throughout the entire orbit of British politics. Heated debates and discussions are now taking place all over Britain between Tories and Laborites; between right and left-wing Laborites; and among the left forces within the Labor Party itself.

Within a few short days the top has been blown right off British politics and we are in the midst of a violent clash which may drastically alter the entire political setup in Britain.

**The detonator which caused this explosion was the government White Paper Statement on Defense, 1955, which it issued on February 17, and which made public the government's decision to produce thermonuclear weapons along with the means of delivering them.**

In making this announcement the government pointed out that both America and Russia are making these weapons and went on to say: "The United Kingdom also has the ability to produce such weapons. After fully considering all the implications of this step, the government have thought it their duty to proceed with their development and production. . . . If we do not use the full weight of our nuclear power Europe can hardly be protected from invasion and occupation. . . . We must not flinch from the necessity to use these weapons. For in the knowledge of our resolve lies the best hope, and it is a real hope, that it may never be put to the test."

With these words the Tory government committed Britain 100 per cent to H-bomb diplomacy and set the scene for the political conflict which now rages.

## TOEING THE H-LINE

Reaction to this statement was swift and immediately filled the headlines of the press. It was also a fairly unanimous reaction. With a reluctant dragging of the feet in a few cases, the propagandists of the bourgeoisie fell into line with the government's policy; explaining to the British public that the decision to produce the H-bomb was a distasteful but vitally necessary measure. Any points of criticism of the White Paper were not concerned with the fundamentals but with incidentals—and took the form of sniping at minor defense proposals contained in the document.

This has also been the general form of official Labor attitude to the Tory defense program for some time—an attitude which accepts the necessity for an arms program of the present magnitude until universal disarmament can be achieved but at the same time criticizes the Tories for their inefficient administration of the program.

The line which the Parliamentary Labor Party was to take in the House of Commons was indicated by an article written by John Strachey, chairman of the Defense Services Group of the Parliamentary Labor Party, which appeared in the *Labor Daily Herald* on February 23. This article was in the main an attack upon the Tories for failing to provide a positive lead for world disarmament, which, claimed Strachey, "is the only way to save the human race." But, while advocating a policy of world disarmament, Strachey stated:

"We cannot scrap our own defense program, of which the heart is, today, the development of our own nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, until we succeed in getting world-wide disarmament. To do so would merely make Britain's voice for peace an impotent crying in the wilderness."

In other words—negotiation through strength, of the mixture as before only a stronger mixture by virtue of the addition of thermonuclear weapons.

Strachey's article came as no surprise for it was merely the logical continuation of the policy which was framed by the Labor government when it was in power and which led to the development of the British A-bomb; but what did come as a surprise was the article by two Bevanite MPs—Dick Crossman and George Wigg—

*The first article by Bernard Dix details the development of the policy crisis in the BLP, written before the announcement of the move to expel Bevan. The second article, by David Alexander, picks up the events of the past week. As we go to press, it is reported that the Parliamentary Labor Party has already voted to withdraw the Whip from Bevan.—Ed.*

which appeared in the *New Statesman and Nation* some days later. The article, entitled "The Dilemma of the H-Bomb," was a lengthy one which made an analysis of the government's defense proposals and then came to certain conclusions on the basis of this analysis. Some of these conclusions were startling and, because of their implications, merit careful consideration.

## CROSSMAN CROSSES

According to Crossman and Wigg there are now three possible lines of approach for Britain, which they list as follows:

"(1) To maintain our existing policy unchanged and merely to add to our armory of weapons the H-bomb and the means to deliver it."

"(2) To withdraw from NATO into an armed neutrality."

"(3) To remain a member of NATO and seek to develop a diplomacy and defense policy related to the realities which face us."

The first of these alternatives is rejected by Crossman and Wigg because the addition of "a few British nuclear weapons and V-bombers would not add significantly to the American deterrent and would merely waste our resources." If this policy is to be pursued at all, suggest the authors of the article, then the obvious step is the complete integration of British military and productive forces into the American war machine. This, they conclude, would involve "the final loss of British independence" and is therefore unacceptable.

The second suggested alternative is considered by Crossman and Wigg to be one into which Britain may well find itself forced in the future by American disruption of the "Western alliance"; but, as a calculated step, they consider this a dangerous policy because "it is difficult to believe that, if NATO were run by a Washington-Bonn Axis, without the restraining influence of Britain, the world would be a safer place, or that the chances of high-level talks and of world disarmament would be increased by the abdication of power which our neutrality would involve." This alternative is therefore rejected also.

Finally Crossman and Wigg consider their third alternative and, as it is the only other one which they are apparently capable of seeing, they are forced to accept it. They say: "On balance, therefore, we believe that Britain should remain a member of NATO, and make one supreme effort, as a member of it and as the closest ally of the United States, to find a basis for peaceful coexistence."

From this point the two proceed to elaborate just what this policy involves for Britain and for the Labor Party, pointing out that it is impossible for Britain to remain in NATO without accepting the employment of nuclear weapons by British aircraft serving with SHAPE. This, they state, is justified if it produces the required results and if a future Labor government could use NATO as an instrument for securing peaceful coexistence; "a Labor govern-

ment bent on high-level disarmament talks will probably carry more weight in the Kremlin if it possesses the H-bomb."

The final perspectives of Crossman and Wigg are clearly illustrated in the concluding paragraph of their article which states: "Ultimately the only way of achieving security for Britain is by means of an international settlement, including a solution of the German problem. The concept of a nuclear neutralization of a united Germany, from which all occupation forces have been withdrawn, provides a possible basis of East-West agreement. Such an agreement is an essential to any disarmament conference."

## HISTORIC DEBATE

As can be imagined this article did not find favor with a wide section of the Labor left. Indeed many thought that they must have misread the article, so strange did the arguments of this pair appear. But no—they were quite clear, as evidenced when the two write a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* on March 1 and once again reiterated their arguments that "Britain should remain a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization but should retain some strategic independence by developing her own nuclear weapons."

Thus the Tory government's White Paper precipitated a defection within the Labor left. Just how deep was this defection was illustrated later when the Defense Debate took place in the House of Commons.

This debate took place on March 1 and 2 before a packed House; it was one which will be long remembered in the history of the British Parliament and even longer in the history of the Labor Party. The main speaker for the government was the prima donna of the Tory party, Winston Churchill. He sang his aria with all the skill and craftsmanship which comes from years of playing a leading role on the stage of British and world politics. All of his mastery of debating technique was displayed as he addressed the Commons.

He began by outlining the present division of the world as he saw it and relating it to past history. From here he developed the thesis that the H-bomb is necessary as a deterrent to possible aggression and as such should be possessed by Britain. "There are," he said, "big industrial and administrative targets behind the Iron Curtain and any effective deterrent policy must have the power to paralyze them at the outset or shortly afterwards."

Following Churchill came the first Labor speaker, Emmanuel Shinwell, who moved the Opposition amendment; as this clearly indicates the official position of the Labor Party it merits quoting in full:

"That this House regrets that the Statement on Defense, 1955, while recognizing that thermonuclear weapons have effected a revolution in the character of warfare, and that until effective world disarmament has been achieved it is necessary as a deterrent to aggression to rely on the threat of using thermonuclear weapons, fails to make proposals for the reorganization of Her Majesty's Forces and of Civil Defense, to indicate what future defense expenditure may be called for, or to explain the grave and admitted deficiencies in weapons with which Her Majesty's



Forces are at present furnished, in spite of the expenditure of some 4,000 million pounds for defense purposes over the past three years."

Hardly had Shinwell sat down when the first signs of rebellion appeared from the Labor benches as George Pargiter, Labor member for Southall, rose to state that he did not support either the Tory or Labor position on the manufacture of the H-bomb. He said: "I have gone pretty far down the slippery slope to hell in the acquiescence I have given to the manufacture of the atom bomb. It has got to stop somewhere." He announced his intentions of abstaining from voting either for the Tory or Labor positions and appealed to others to join him in order to demonstrate the feeling of the Commons.

## BEVAN DEMANDS ANSWER

It was, however, when Aneurin Bevan spoke some time later that the rebellion became crystallized. In a speech which once again proved that he was as much a master of oratory as Churchill, Bevan outlined his position on the H-bomb.

"I myself cannot see," he said, "that there is any logical difference between the hydrogen bomb and the atom bomb. Nor can I see any moral difference between the two. They are both weapons of imprecision. Nor can I see any difference between the two of them and saturation-bombing, which is also indiscriminate slaughter of human beings."

Having thus endeavored to explain his position Bevan then let loose his firecracker: "I want the Opposition leaders to answer me," he said, "do they mean that nuclear weapons will be used with the support of the British Labor movement against any sort of aggression?" If this was Attlee's interpretation of the Labor position, said Bevan, then he did not intend to vote for it.

Clement Attlee was not in the House when Bevan posed this question and when he eventually arrived to make the speech in winding up for the Labor Opposition Bevan rose once again and asked him whether the Labor amendment associated the Labor Party with the view that thermonuclear weapons would be used in the event of hostilities even though it had not been used by those who committed the initial act of aggression. Attlee replied by stating that he based himself on the general thesis that deterrence by the possession of thermonuclear weapons was the best way to prevent another war.

This answer apparently failed to satisfy Bevan and he indicated as much; but no further statement was forthcoming from Attlee, and, after a final speech for the government, the House then divided. It was at this point that the extent of the three-way rift within the Parliamentary Labor Party became apparent.

A total of 57 Labor members deliberately remained in their seats and refrained from supporting the official Labor amendment. Besides Bevan the entire editorial board of the Bevanite weekly *Tribune*, Jenny Lee, Mike Foot and J. P. W. Mallalieu, also abstained.

So too did the six MPs who have only just been readmitted to the Parliamentary Labor Party following their expulsion for voting against German rearmament. The pacifists, the "ethicalists," and a whole variety of others joined in demonstrating their opposition to the policies of both parties. (Readers of LABOR ACTION may be interested to learn that Fenner Brockway, who recently spoke before a YSL audience in Chicago, also abstained from voting.)

But it was those who voted with the official Labor line that really caused the surprise. They included a number of the well-known Bevanites such as John Freeman and Harold Wilson, both of whom had resigned from the Labor government with Bevan; Leslie Hale, a well-known Bevanite propagandist; and, of course, Dick Crossman and George Wigg, the authors of the article in the *New Statesman and Nation*. All together, eight who have previously



ATLEE

(Continued on page 7)

# AFTER KIBYA, GAZA: Israel Suffers Another Defeat

By AL FINDLEY

Fighting on the Arab-Israel border is once more on the front pages, this time involving the Egyptian and Israeli troops. At least 37 Arabs and 8 Jewish soldiers died, and there were also a number of civilian deaths.

There is no doubt in the mind of this writer that Egypt is right in its charge that in the immediate issue the guilt for the main battle and for the deaths in the Gaza fighting falls on Israel. The attack on the army post in Gaza was deliberate and planned and had little or no connection with the series of other border incidents.

At the same time, there is also no doubt in my mind that Israel is correct in laying the basic cause to the state of war that the Egyptian rulers perpetuate and to the continued tensions and border incidents.

The act was a show of strength by Israel that was planned as both a retaliatory act and a "bold" move in the game of power politics. In this case the term power politics should be taken literally. The attack on Gaza took place a few days after the return of David Ben-Gurion to the post of defense minister, and it bears his trade mark. The so-called moderate and diplomatically oriented Sharett probably refused to carry out this "bold" plan unless the chief himself took direct responsibility, and this he did.

Ben-Gurion retired from the government a while back for many reasons, not the least of which was the Kibya incident, when Israeli troops attacked an Arab village and indiscriminately killed men, women and children. The Kibya outrage organized and carried out by Ben-Gurion turned out to be the greatest defeat for Israel on the diplomatic front and, more important, drastically undermined support for Israel in world public opinion and aroused tremendous indignation among the Arab masses. Many of the Jewish Zionist writers who defended the Kibya massacre at the time it occurred later agreed with such an analysis and decried the tremendous harm that it had done.

Ben-Gurion retired to Sdeh Boker under the cloud of Kibya, and has emerged in the "glory" of Gaza.

## BEN-GURION RIDES

It is true that Gaza is not Kibya, in the sense that no indiscriminate massacre was involved, that the main target was a military one; and it is also true that the Israelis undoubtedly considered themselves provoked by Egypt's execution of two Jews (whose crime was probably only that they were Zionists) as well as by continued border incidents; but even if this is said, the real question is this: Outside of satisfying some emotional need for revenge, what will such acts of retaliation accomplish even from the narrower point of view of Israel's interests?

In general, retaliation, whether by Jews or Arabs, it is claimed, will "teach the enemy a lesson" and so stop the border incidents. The history of Arab-Jewish relations has long ago disproved this theory. Outside of satisfying ideas of "honor," it has accomplished nothing. For a solution to the Arab-Jewish strife, we must look elsewhere.

In the Gaza incident, there were other and broader motives involved. Ben-Gurion probably reasoned that with the current breakup of the Arab League, a show of strength, a hammer-blow followed by negotiations, could open the path to a peace settlement. A second and more important motive may have been the gamble that, by repeating the 1945-48 policy of "strength," he would prove to the West that it must reckon with Israel if it is to stabilize and organize the Near East into its camp against Russia.

What have been the actual results of the Gaza event?

It has not had the planned effect on the Egyptian rulers, and above all it has not increased the desire for peace among the Arab people. The contrary has happened. It has aroused the Arab rank and file and embittered them more than was necessary. The bloody riots that took place in Gaza as a result of the Israeli attack were not manipulated from above but were a spontaneous reaction.

Without popular grass-roots pressure, no Arab government has any desire for peace with Israel. The Israeli government, instead of acting to create such sentiment, has played into the hands of the Arab rulers, and has given them propaganda weapons to smother the weak sentiments for peace that do exist. No Arab government, precisely because all of them are so unstable, will now dare to move toward peace with Israel.

## POLICY A DUD

The hope that a show of strength would force the West to include Israel in their military plans also backfired. Israel has some cards to play to counter the Arabs' numbers, strategic position, and oil, in the game of power politics; but not enough. It needs the support of public opinion to sway the scales to its side. Until now Israel had a lot of public sympathy, but the government is fast destroying its fund of good will.

The result has been that a deputy assistant secretary of the State Department was able to destroy any hopes of the Israeli politicians for military help by citing nothing more than "Arab re-

lations" and "tension" as a bar to the Israeli government's diplomatic aims.

Israel's current diplomatic aim is either a new and stronger guarantee of its borders by each of the Big Three, or inclusion in a Western-sponsored military alliance. This shows how far its foreign policy has changed in the last few years.

The state started out with a policy of complete independence from either of the imperialist blocs; then it shifted to a policy of cooperation with the Western camp but was against identification with any bloc; then it went on to greater and greater integration with the West; and now it is on its hands and knees begging and pleading to be taken in as an ally by the unwilling big powers.

While Israel's foreign policy has changed, the basic premise on which it was built remains the same, namely, orientation toward reliance on the big powers. This was true from the start. The Israeli leaders had no perspective of composing their differences with the inhabitants of their region but looked to the outside for support.

At first they hoped for support from both the Stalinist and capitalist powers. As the cold war developed, two groups (Hashomer Hatzair and Achduth Avodah) began looking to the Russians, while the other parties moved toward Washington.

The Russians soon disappointed their supporters and, by wooing the Arabs and attacking the Zionists, drove the majority of Jews over to the Western camp's side. Only pro-Stalinist doctrinaire rigidity kept the Hashomer and Achduth Avodah loyal to Russia (to some extent). The double game of the Western powers aroused misgivings among their supporters, but, having no hope for an alternative policy, they kept throwing themselves into the arms of the West, only to be rebuffed and to feel doubly isolated.

It is true that the way to peace between Israel and the Arabs is a long and hard one, and there are no easy answers; but reliance on the big powers has already proved that it will not lead to peace. The only realistic alternative left is a radical turn in the direction of cultivating the peoples of the region and especially the Arab peoples, and to seek allies from among them, to build a desire for peace among the people.

Such a peace is absolutely necessary for both the physical existence and the well-being of Israel and for the rise in the standard of living of the Arab masses and the development of progressive movements in their midst.

## Jim Crow Front — —

(Continued from page 2)

time we point out that, musically speaking, the tempo would be a lot faster if the orchestra was changed.

## WHO'S "UNEMPLOYABLE"?

Governor Stratton of Illinois was told last week that an increase in residence requirements would have little effect in lowering the state's public assistance rolls.

The director of Cook County's (i.e., Chicago's) department of welfare, R. M. Hilliard, said in a letter to the governor that such a "quack remedy" would only "make people suffer, create needless administrative expense and confusion, invite fraud and throw an unbearable financial load on the private charitable agencies for the state."

This letter was written in response to Stratton's recent statement indicating that he may recommend an increase in the residence requirement (from one to three years) before a person may become eligible for public aid in the state.

The controversy arose out of the Illinois Public Aid Commission's announcement of a 10 per cent cut in relief aid: a brutal blow to people already living on a bare subsistence level.

Alvin Rose, Chicago Welfare Commissioner, blamed migrants from Southern states for the large city relief roll and placed heavy emphasis on a claim that Negroes comprise 75 per cent of the 56,000 on relief in Chicago as of the 1st of March.

Rose flew to Puerto Rico last year in an effort to halt Puerto Rican migration

to the city. His mission was based on a similar claim.

Stratton and Rose both have said that the migrants are mostly "unemployable" (due to alleged illiteracy and lack of skill), and Rose claimed that this particularly applies to the Negro migrants.

Hilliard agreed that the relief problem is serious, but he said an increase in residence requirements would not help matters. Further, he added, New York with no residence requirements increased its caseload by only 15 per cent last year—as opposed to Chicago's increase of 86 per cent despite the one-year residence law already in effect.

The "unemployable" slander was answered by Hilliard's statement that the average person stays on relief in Chicago for only four months. Moreover, he added, the tide of immigration from the South would not be halted or retarded by the proposed change.

We would suggest to Stratton that the mass Negro migration to Northern industrial centers is one of the major facts of life in the U. S. today, and the migrants come seeking better jobs and more freedom to live as human beings—not relief. Logic impels us to think that Stratton perhaps favors setting up "reservations" of Negroes in the South.

For his reactionary purposes he does well to stick to discussing "unemployables"; he can thus temporarily avoid discussing unemployment, a problem which the social system he represents cannot permanently solve and which may find its "relief" in a very special form of "public assistance."

## SHACHTMAN TOUR

### OBERLIN

By TIM WOHLFORTH

OBERLIN, O., Mar. 10—Max Shachtman spoke at Oberlin College today on "Peace Through Coexistence?" to a large and lively audience of 75 students, of all political complexions, including some ROTC members.

Shachtman started by pointing out the significance of Germany to the necessary unification of Europe. This unification, which must come, could occur either under reactionary auspices, as in the two world wars, or under progressive auspices, that is, under the leadership of the working class.

The ISL national chairman then turned to the subject of Stalinist Russia, to discuss the role it would play in the possible unification of Germany. He pointed out the basic weakness of the regime, as illustrated by the flimsiness of its economic and political foundations. He underlined the unpopularity of the regime as shown by its need for police methods to maintain itself and by the unprecedented number of desertions to the enemy in World War II.

Because of these internal weaknesses the Stalinists need peace, peace based on the present imperialist division of the world, not a peace based on the right of self-determination of the world's peoples. The latter would be a death-blow to the regime, as the Stalinists themselves deny this right to the masses they rule.

Coming back to Germany, he showed that Russia does not want German reunification, for she herself has confiscated large sections of German territory directly or through satellites. Furthermore, the emergence of a united socialist Germany would make the Russian Stalinist regime politically shaky.

Turning to the U. S., he called attention to the anti-democratic role Washington is playing in the world today. The U. S. policy of denying self-determination is not only morally and politically reactionary, but it is suicidal. The world's peoples will not fight for "American freedom"; they will fight only for their own freedom. The U. S. tells them we must deprive them of their freedom in order to defend our freedom. This kind of open chauvinism only drives them into the arms of the Stalinists. This is why America is losing the cold war.

During the question period, several students tried to defend American foreign policy. In final analysis each of them ended up with a purely chauvinistic rationalization for American imperialism: We need the bases! This rationalization did not satisfy the audience and did not even seem to satisfy its proponents.

One student felt the colonial peoples were politically "sophisticated" enough to govern themselves; he felt the Communists would take over the minute independence was given. Shachtman asked him the fundamental democratic question: "Who shall decide when they are politically sophisticated?"

The student was unable to answer. Sitting next to him was a student from a colonial country, who pointed out to his "politically sophisticated friend" that all of his statements on the colonial areas and their ability to govern themselves were completely untrue.

Thus the audience were able to judge the merits of this "Standard American Version" of chauvinism, and expressed their choice of the democratic alternative by giving Shachtman a tremendous ovation.

## READING, Pa.

READING, Pa., Mar. 5—A small but attentive audience of workers heard Max Shachtman, ISL national chairman, discuss the politics of the world struggle between Russian and American imperialism, at the Labor Lyceum.

Shachtman stressed Germany's importance as "key to the European situation" and Russia's fear of a socialist Germany, the reactionary foreign policy which the American camp tries to counterpose to Russia's threat, and the need for a Third Camp.

## 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.



**LABOR ACTION**

March 21, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 12

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

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## Calif. Students Plan Statewide Conference on Civil Liberties

At the beginning of this year, a group of California students issued a call for the holding of a California Civil Liberties Conference for students. This call was the outcome of a series of local events, such as the affair of the Daily Bruin at UCLA, reported in last week's CHALLENGE, and local discussions of the civil-liberties situation. The Youth Committee of the Fellowship of Reconciliation was one of the groups which took the initiative in calling a conference.

A temporary Steering Committee, with Martin McReynolds, former editor of the Bruin and currently editor of the Observer, as chairman, sent out the call. Subsequently two Steering Committees, one for Northern California and one for Southern California, were instituted.

The following article is a report of the planning session for the conference which was held in Los Angeles on February 5. The conference will take place on the weekend of April 22-24, also in Los Angeles.—Ed.

By JACK WALKER

Representatives from eight California campuses met in a successful planning session at Mt. Hollywood Congregational Church in Los Angeles on Feb. 5, to prepare for a state-wide conference on civil liberties to be held in Los Angeles on the weekend of April 22-24.

Approximately 30 youths participated in the discussions, panel sessions and question periods following the speakers' talks. Reports were heard on the campus civil-liberties picture at the University of California at Berkeley, UCLA, Pomona, Occidental, Caltech, Whittier, LACC and Loyola.

From these reports it seems that there are two basic situations existing on the various campuses: On the larger campuses (UC and UCLA in particular) where there had been radical political activity in the past, there was a general feeling that civil liberties had definitely been under attack and curtailment for several years. On the smaller campuses, such as Whittier and Pomona, there did not seem to be any pressing civil-liberties issues on the local campus level. However, even on the smaller campuses civil-liberties problems existed, although there has not been any fighting going on over them.

For instance, at Caltech: the YMCA must sign a loyalty oath for tax-exemption purposes, and is threatened by a new California law that would prevent "subversives" from using its facilities for meetings.

At LACC: Teachers can't participate in political campaigning and they have objected strongly to this. No political posters are permitted on bulletin boards and no political discussion takes place in the newspapers.

At Occidental: the ROTC loyalty oath is compulsory and ROTC is compulsory. At Loyola: There is a compulsory

ROTC loyalty oath and ROTC is compulsory except for conscientious objectors who may be released from taking ROTC. (It appears that a Jesuit college is more liberal than UC or UCLA, which will expel anyone who refuses to take ROTC.) At Pomona: (in contrast) ROTC is voluntary and political and religious groups are allowed on campus. But only the Young Republicans and Young Democrats have taken advantage of this. Likewise for Claremont and Scripps Colleges.

Even in the smaller colleges, though, the students were aware of the general problem of civil liberties on the larger campuses and in the general community, and wanted to discuss these problems to know their exact dimensions and forms. They felt it would be more profitable and more natural for themselves to set up discussion groups, rather than specifically civil-liberties groups, which were not felt to be needed because of the absence of immediate issues in their campus community. They would find out, by exercising their civil liberties in this manner, just what the real limits were in their areas.

As a result of the discussion in the panel which considered "Plans for setting up local groups for student action on civil liberties," there emerged a framework to encompass this problem of inter-campus differences. The panel report—accepted by the planning session—called for the creation of a united front in California of various political, religious, pacifist and civil-liberties groups, which could unite on a principled civil-liberties program though perhaps nothing else.

These groups, which might include Y committees, Young Republicans, Young Socialists, etc., could exchange information through a clearing committee and have individual group members meet in regional get-togethers, but would not be bound to any central decisions or organization.

### ACLU SUPPORTS

The importance of this decision becomes evident when the question of who would be allowed to vote on committees and platforms at the April conference was raised. One liberal, who had been sucked in by a Stalinist front-group before, wanted to limit voting to persons invited to the conference, with others being "observers" only. This measure, although designed against Stalinist infiltration, had the negative effect of limiting participation in the conference for "first" and "second class" citizens, and would thereby tend to weaken the conference.

But, since there would be no central discipline emerging from the conference, members from individual groups (no groups as groups will officially attend the conference) could report Stalinist maneuvers to their organizations which could then refuse to cooperate with a Stalinist leadership or program. Additional deterrents to infiltration will lie in the expected large student turnout plus the political awareness of the civil-libertarians participating in planning the conference. If the civil-libertarians did lose control of the meeting, they could always adjourn to another meeting place and continue their business there.

Since a principled civil-liberties position would be the only thing binding these groups together, it becomes especially important for such a programmatic statement to emerge from the conference. This had been resisted earlier by some people on the ground that any conference statement would tend to limit in advance the willingness of sponsors signing their names to a call for the conference.

Young Socialists had pointed out that this statement was necessary in order to do post-conference organizing, so that groups would know with whom they were cooperating. In this regard, it would be worthwhile to lose a few sponsors, rather than make the conference a one-shot

(Continued on page 7)

### CHICAGO

## Again the Campus Girds To Defeat Broyles Bills

By DEBBIE MEIER and M. M. BLOOM

State Senator Broyles has again presented the Illinois State Legislature with his bills to encroach still further upon political and civil liberties of the citizens. And in opposition to this witchhunting legislation, the students of the University of Chicago have once again organized an All-Campus Civil Liberties Committee to fight for its defeat.

The ACCLC, formed at the call of the university Student Government, is the third of its kind in the last five years. It has been called into being each time by the introduction of these notorious Broyles bills, which in one or another form have been proposed several times in the past period.

They were defeated the first time, vetoed by former Governor Adlai Stevenson the following time, and vetoed by Governor Stratton the last time. In each case, a widespread protest movement in which college and university students and faculty, via the ACCLC, played an important role was instrumental in bringing about the defeat.

In their present form there are two bills. Law No. 58 imposes a long, comprehensive, and fantastically complex loyalty oath for all employees of the state, or subdivisions thereof, or organizations obtaining appropriations from the state, etc. Law No. 59 declares the Communist Party and all other "subversive" organizations illegal and likewise membership therein. It goes on to list by name all of the organizations on the attorney general's "subversive" list, as unlawful.

Section 3 of this bill declares that "knowing" membership in a "subversive" organization after the date of its enactment is punishable by a fine of "not more than five thousand dollars" or imprisonment "for not less than one year or more than five years, or both." Section 4 provides that those convicted under the previous section are to be deprived of their rights to hold or run for public office and to vote.

These provisions and the enactment into law of the "list" of over 260 organizations, membership in any of which becomes a crime, are the most vicious aspects of the bills. The "list," an "accomplishment" of the Truman administration which was taken over intact by the Eisenhower regime, was presumably drawn up as a guide for federal employment. It was concocted without any semblance of hearings or other aspects of due process for the listed groups. It also slanders democratic-socialist opponents of Stalinism as "Communist." Despite the fact that the Supreme Court has ruled it to be merely an opinion without legal status, it increasingly is used as a basis for the persecution of people with unpopular political opinions.

And now it is to be the basis on which people can be sent to jail for 5 years.

### TWO WINGS

Whether or not the Broyles bills will be adopted this time is not certain, but their chances unfortunately look better. For one thing, the national and state political climate for democratic rights has deteriorated still further since 1953. Moreover, the bills, sponsored by 26 members of the State Senate and already approved by the Senate committees, have supposedly been watered down to meet the objections which Governor Stratton had last time.

This supposed dilution is strictly phony. The only change from the 1953 version is the deletion of a provision to create an Illinois Seditious Activities Investigating Committee. A great concession, indeed! The American scene is today so cluttered up with investigators, public and private, that a new enterprise in this overworked field would have slim pickings at best. The proponents of these witchhunting measures can rely on others to do the work of uncovering "subversives" for them to persecute under the Broyles bills.

The ACCLC held its first meeting at the

beginning of February, not long after the introduction of the measures into the legislature. Over 100 representatives of 80 different campus organizations—student clubs, student government department clubs, dormitory councils, fraternity houses, etc.—gathered to plan the opposition to the bills.

From the beginning it was obvious that the problem would be not that some student groups supported the Broyles bills, since none do, nor that the programmatic statement of the ACCLC would be incorrect, since despite some deficiencies it is not bad on the whole; but rather that there would be opposition on the part of the conservative students to an all-out, thoroughgoing, militant fight against the bills, and that there would be great pressure for conducting a timid, "respectable" and platonic campaign.

At its very first meeting the ACCLC divided itself into left and right wings over this question and by the second and third meetings the respective strengths of the two groups were settled. The right wing, composed of fraternity representatives and delegates from the Independent Students League (dominant campus political party), had a core of about 45 votes. The left, composed of members of the Student Representative Party (the other campus political party) and some of the student organizations could count on 20-25 votes. An additional 20-30 votes fluctuated.

### PLAN FOR ACTION

The Chicago Young-Socialist League issued a call for the carrying on of a vigorous struggle and pointed out that the greatest danger lay in the possibility of the ACCLC conducting a merely nominal campaign. The YSL put out an issue of "From The Left," its irregularly issued organ, devoted exclusively to the Broyles bills. It presented a seven-point program, which it called upon the ACCLC to adopt.

The YSL proposed: (1) Uncompromising opposition to both bills. (2) A mass rally on campus sponsored by ACCLC. (3) Educational activity by all represented organizations at their own meetings. (4) A campaign to obtain letters from leading faculty members and a petition and postcard campaign on campus. (5) Sending delegations to the legislature and the governor. (6) Setting up an All-State Campus Civil Liberties Committee composed of groups from various universities and colleges. (7) The establishing of contact with off-campus organizations and particularly with trade unions.

In addition, the YSL pointed out that the success of such a program and the defeat of the Broyles bills would not be enough. It stated its opposition to the dissolution of the ACCLC after the fight on the Broyles bills was over and called for the transformation of the ACCLC into a permanent body for the defense of civil liberties.

That the right wing would prevail was a foregone conclusion, given today's atmosphere. What could not be entirely predicted, and what was therefore disheartening, was the fight waged in ACCLC by the left. The struggle could have been an excellent opportunity for the left to wage an educational campaign which could have had a good effect on the "middle-of-the-roads" and uncommitted representatives. Instead, the left conducted a spiritless, idea-less, tepid fight in which

(Continued on page 7)

### THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

## BRAZIL The Electoral Race Gets Under Way

# Janio Wants to Be President

By BRASILEIRO

RIO DE JANEIRO, Mar. 7—After the death by suicide of President Getulio Vargas, the former opposition took over the government, but the "Getulist" camp remained a strong political factor. The elections in the constituent states of the republic further weakened the position of Getulism, especially because of the defeat suffered by Jango Goulart, who was Vargas' former labor minister and a power in the Vargas party (PTB). But Getulism has been able to reorganize its strength and present a candidate for the presidency of the country.

The candidate that has been put forward by the Vargas forces—whose organization is the PTB, Brazilian "Labor Party," *Partido Trabalhista*—is Juscelino Kubitschek, the present governor of the state of Minas Gerais. However, the candidacy was not officially presented by the PTB but by the PSD (which stands for Partido Socialdemocrata, which is not social-democratic or socialist).

The PSD was founded by ex-president Dutra, but Dutra himself has declared that he has nothing to do with the Kubitschek candidacy. However, a majority of the PSD has backed Kubitschek, and at the moment he is the only candidate in the field for the presidency of Brazil. The self-styled "democratic" camp, led by the UDN ("National Democratic Union"), has begun to fight Kubitschek's candidacy, because, says the UDN, he represents the same political tendency as did Vargas. But up to this time the opposition has not been able to counter Kubitschek with a candidate of its own who is of national stature, for the "brigadeiro" Eduardo Gomes refuses to run, after his defeat in the previous election.

In this situation there has been growing a tendency toward a new coup d'état on the part of the army, and toward the installation of an army-sponsored and army-supported dictatorship. But the idea of a military dictatorship, it seems, has not found as much support among the people as it has in the political parties and in the press. And so the generals have declared that they only want to guarantee free elections and the constitution.

The new rallying center of the military camp might be General Juarez Tavora, chief of the president's military staff, who could count on the support of the "democratic" rightist camp. But his candidacy has no prospect of success if it is not put on a "popular" basis, that is, associated with a popular figure, capable of defeating the Getulist camp and the Kubitschek appeal.

### QUADROS' AIMS

Now the opposition's eyes have turned to the man who was elected governor of the state of Sao Paulo, Janio Quadros, the man who defeated the candidates of the right-wing UDN and the powerful Adhemar de Barros. After a trip to Europe and the U. S., Quadros has launched his state administration.

Quadros won the Sao Paulo election as the candidate of the Socialist Party, on the crest of a powerful popular wave. He is a new political figure in Brazil who is beginning to achieve national importance.

He has belonged to the Christian Democratic Party, and his program is "honest government," a slogan cordially supported by masses who are tired of the political corruption of the old parties. He started his administration in Sao Paulo with a raise in bus tickets and draconic firings of state officials. In spite of these unpopular steps, he is counting on the strong support of the masses, who hope that "honest government" means "honest government in the interests of the poor."

An old liberal politician, Octavio Nogueira, made a try at lining "Janio" up behind the military banner of General Tavora, thus putting together an anti-Getulist formula for the rightist "democratic" camp. But "Janio's" position has been evasive; that is, at this time he is against General Tavora's candidacy.

He is also opposed to the candidacy of Kubitschek. But up to this point he has avoided clarifying his position; first, because he is afraid of the "generals," who are the biggest political power in Brazil today; and second, because he has lost control of the city of Sao Paulo, capital of the state and an industrial center; and he is afraid that he has lost a good deal of his popular support.

He is waiting for new elections to the Sao Paulo municipal government, and for clarification of the national scene. He is also waiting for a weakening in the position of the "generals," and he is waiting for the army and the UDN to undermine Kubitschek's candidacy and in this way open the door for him to run for the presidential spot himself.

**Janio Quadros is very well aware that now is the only chance he will have to run for the presidency before the masses get disillusioned with his administration in Sao Paulo and his political career ends with the steam going out of his provincial administration.**

The present political problem in Brazil is not only the choice presented between the Getulist camp and the traditional "liberal"-capitalist camp. The masses are tired not only of the traditional capitalist policy but also of Getulist populist demagoguery; this is the only explanation of Vargas' defeat and tragic death. But neither the army nor the UDN dare to affront the masses on the public electoral field, knowing their own weakness.

In this situation, the candidate of the old Getulist populism (who this time is Kubitschek) could possibly win a ma-

majority; hence the tendency toward a coup d'état, for the army is not willing to see its victory over Vargas canceled. But such a victory for Kubitschek is very problematic indeed, not only because of the military and liberal opposition but primarily because of the people's disillusionment with Vargas' policies.

At the present time the political situation is very difficult and dangerous for the interests of burgeoning Brazilian capitalism, because of the crisis in coffee, which is the crisis of the whole Brazilian economy, because of the rise in prices and the cost of living and the discontent of the masses. So the political problem of the moment in Brazil is to offer a new edition of the old populism, that is, a new simulacrum of popular government; one which is not burdened by responsibility for the discredited Vargas policies; one which can promise the workers and peasants a "new style" program in their interests; and "honest government," even an anti-capitalist government in the interests of the workers and peasants; a program of urgent political and social reform; a policy in favor of the poor.

### FEEL OF THE MASSES

**These spontaneous and popular feelings among the masses do in fact require a democratic socialist government, though the masses have no clear consciousness of their aspirations. But Janio Quadros and his friends have an advantage over the Getulists and over the pro-capitalist liberals in that they understand this situation much better and appreciate the political needs of the times. They have a**

## SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

they once knew as a Stalinist. This stoolpigeonry is supposed to make such teachers certified-pure and morally fit to shape the impressionable minds of youngsters.

A large number of groups have spoken out against this Compulsory Stoolpigeonry for teachers, including the teachers' unions. There is a name, however, that keeps coming to mind as we have awaited the board's decision and read about the protests coming in from liberal and even not-so-liberal groups.

The name is Professor Sidney Hook, who has achieved a national reputation as ideologist for the witchhunters who want to purge the schools of Stalinist teachers on the cry of "Heresy, Yes—Conspiracy, No." Every once in a while, Hook goes through the ritual of coming out against "excesses" in the witchhunt. Nobody can doubt that he is really against "excesses." But what bothers us is that here is a big "excess" going on right under Professor Hook's nose, in his home town, in his own field of education in his home town.

Surely (we say to ourselves) a little intervention by Hook—say, in a form even milder than a thunderous blast—against this disgraceful step being considered by the New York Board of Education would be of considerable effect, in view of Hook's ideological influence. Has he spoken out?

There is a report, which we gladly pass on, that if you can personally locate Professor Hook and ask him bluntly what his view is on the Compulsory Stoolpigeon question, he will candidly tell you he's against. We think that's fine, and that it completely refutes the pessimists who claim that this country has already gone to the dogs.

**The only question it leaves unanswered is, why doesn't Hook follow the example of some other candid people and speak up in public, where everybody can hear him, even the Board of Education?**

Come, come, Professor Hook, don't be modest—speak up, man, nobody'll bite you.

### This Is Freedom Too

This reminds us of another teacher issue we'd forgotten about, dating back to last month. In Springfield, Mo., a former minister was fired from his job as a high school science teacher because (it was alleged) in answering students' questions he vouchsafed the opinion that God is "only an imaginary being."

The local superintendent of schools said bluntly: "There is no place in the

school system for an agnostic or an atheist."

**We wonder how many ministers, priests and rabbis, or other devout supporters of the various churches, will come to the defense of Leslie Hill's right to religious freedom.**

For surely it is a question of religious freedom to have a right to teach regardless of one's views on religion.

We, as socialists, for example, would be ready to fight vigorously in defense of (say) a Catholic who is fired as science teacher because he has a notion, which he does not conceal from his students, about the dogmas of his church—provided that his religious views do not interfere with his general competency as a teacher.

As a matter of fact, there was recently a case (in Israel, to be sure) of a woman who was fired from the school system because of conversion to Christianity. This was a gross violation of democracy, specifically of religious freedom.

It is also a violation of religious freedom when Leslie Hill is deprived of the right to have his own views about God. But we are afraid that most of the ardent defenders of religious freedom are capable of recognizing such a violation only within the framework of their own theism.

### Democrats, Democrats

As LABOR ACTION readers were informed, the ISL sent out messages to socialist groups all over the world asking them to protect the persecution of Djilas and Dedijer by the Yugoslav Titoist regime. As our articles have amply explained, the attitude of the social-democratic parties has been a shameful one on this score, and of course there was little reason to expect a startling response.

The following reply from the Norwegian social-democratic youth organization will perhaps give you the "feel" of bureaucratic obtuseness in the social-democracy, as it prattles about Yugoslav democracy, while the two courageous exponents of Yugoslav democracy were being arraigned as criminals. Here it is (with the English anglicized):

"Dear Comrades:

"We received your circular regarding

**Don't miss a single week of  
LABOR ACTION  
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!**

better feel of the amorphous mass desire for a populist policy which will not be a Getulist nor a rightist-liberal affair.

Thus Janio's slogan of "honest government" has a certain correspondence with the aspirations of the masses, even though his "honest government" means another capitalist government, while the people want a socialist, though a "moderate" government.

The bourgeoisie and the army fear the return of the Vargas camp to power but they also fear the new popular wave which is represented (or rather misrepresented) by Janio Quadros. They would like to play Janio's popularity against the Vargas forces and against the Kubitschek candidacy, and so subordinate Janio's career to their own interests. This is what is signified by the attempt to get up a ticket with Janio Quadros subordinated as vice-presidential candidate to the banner of General Tavora.

But Janio has a good nose for politics and he wants to work for his own account, for his own candidacy: *aut Caesar aut nihil*. He feels that his hour has come because of the popular sentiment for a new populist-type government.

Here are the roots of the present indecisiveness in the current Brazilian political situation.

The Brazilian Socialist Party is smoothing Janio Quadros' way to the presidency by backing his "honest government" slogan and fostering the illusions of the workers and peasants that Janio's regime would mean a negation of the Vargas administration, that it would be a progressive, democratic and pro-socialist government. I think it is the duty of socialists to tell the truth to the workers and peasants, and not to strengthen their spontaneous illusions about Janio's "honest government." I think the honest socialist elements in the Socialist Party are using wishful thinking instead of an appreciation of the real situation in Brazil. But this is a discussion for another article.

the reprisals against Milovan Djilas and Vladimir Dedijer.

"It is our opinion that this is a problem on which there are many points of view. In any case, we think that it is—in relation to many other questions in Europe, the U.S. and Asia—a very small question.

"In our organization we seek—through social-democracy—to give the Yugoslav development inspiration toward democracy and freedom. In our organization we feel that this is the best way to show the people in Yugoslavia the right way to go.

"On this background we think there is no point to make such a protest as you propose in your letter.

"Fraternally yours,

For *Arbeidernes Ungdomsfylking*,  
Ivar MATHISEN  
Rolf HANSEN."

We should mention that "to give the Yugoslav development inspiration toward democracy and freedom," the Socialist International bulletin *S. I. Information* took notice of the case of Djilas only by—guess what? Printing the attack on him by the hatchetman Kardelj!

It is "a very small question" for these righteous social-democrats, who long ago learned that all the evils of the world are due to the ineradicably undemocratic impulses of the evil Bawlsheviks.

### SHACHTMAN TOUR

**MAX SHACHTMAN**

National Chairman, ISL

on

**"Peace Through  
'Coexistence'?"**

LOS ANGELES

FRIDAY, MARCH 25

8 p.m.

Case Hotel (6th floor)

11th & Broadway  
(Downtown L. A.)

Adm.: 85¢

Students: 35¢

S. F. BAY AREA

TUESDAY, MARCH 29

8 p.m.

Finnish Brotherhood Hall  
1970 Chestnut Street

BERKELEY

# The Move to Expel Bevan — —

(Continued from page 3)

supported Bevan failed to do so on this occasion. The defection thus becoming glaringly apparent.

From this point onwards the situation has continued to develop in two directions—on one hand, inside the left between the Bevanites and Crossmanites, and on the other between the right and left wings of the Labor Party.

The defection of Crossman was the subject of an article in the current issue of the Bevanite weekly *Tribune*, entitled "Dick Crossman's Bombshell," written by Bob Edwards, the editor. Edwards expresses his opposition to the Crossman-Wigg line and states that the manufacture of British H-bombs will not reduce our dependence on America and, as neither Wigg nor Crossman favors withdrawal from NATO, it would mean that Britain would have to be wiped out in the event of a thermonuclear war.

Edwards states that he is NOT (in bold capitals) in favor of Britain making the H-bomb; thus he himself goes a step further than Bevan has done so far. Barbara Castle, another prominent Bevanite MP, also engages in debate with Crossman and Wigg in a letter in the current issue of *New Statesman and Nation*.

## STORM BLOWS UP

Barbara Castle likewise appears to go further than Bevan on this issue for she too appears to take the line that the Labor Party should oppose British manufacture of the H-bomb, although she qualifies her opposition by saying "refuse to add our quota of H-bombs in support of a diplomacy that believes we can get peace by frightening each other to death." This

## Broyles — —

(Continued from page 5)

for one month a great deal of shadow-boxing over tertiary questions and petty details was carried on.

Four hectic, tedious meetings were carried on during this month, meetings lasting 7 to 8 hours, during which the representatives discussed: the rules for ACCLC meetings; who was entitled to how many representatives; and the organization of ACCLC itself. In this month, the ACCLC right wing succeeded in pushing through a motion severely limiting the activity on the Broyles bills which constituent organizations could carry on independently, and elected a solidly right-wing Steering Committee.

It was only at its fourth meeting that the committee got around to adopting a programmatic statement on the bills and a program of action with which to combat them. The ACCLC declared itself in opposition to the Broyles bills and adopted a statement pointing out the dangers to students and teachers contained in them. While good on the whole, this statement is couched in very mild language and is vague on the question of defending the rights of members of the Communist Party. It also contains no mention of the attorney general's subversive list nor of the whole concept which is at the base of the bills, that of illegalizing political organizations.

The program of action adopted consisted of four points: (1) campus rally; (2) educational activity and publicity; (3) petition campaign; (4) sending a delegation of 7 ACCLC members to Springfield to testify and lobby against the bills. But the other two proposals of action made by the YSL, the formation of an All-State Committee and the entering into liaison with civic and trade-union organizations, were defeated.

Thus a fairly good program and plan of action have been adopted. But it took over a month to do so, a month which could have been spent in arousing and educating the student body as a whole on the issues involved as well as beginning the campaign against the Broyles bills in the community at large. Moreover, given the attitudes of the ACCLC leadership, there is no guarantee that this program will finally be begun. Indeed, there is good reason to suspect that it may just remain a pious wish.

It is clear that those campus groups which wish to conduct a spirited campaign of education and activity will have to press for it. Given the will to do so, these students can bring the issues involved in this particular piece of legislation—and in all of the inroads into democracy abroad in the land to the entire campus; a real fight by the students can be an important factor to defeat the Broyles bills.

view seems to be the logical extension of Bevan's and one which may ultimately be advanced by the Bevanites generally.

While this debate develops within the left itself there is the bigger, and at the moment more important, storm blowing up between the right and left. A meeting of the Parliamentary Labor Party has been called for next week in order to discuss what disciplinary measures should be taken against those who rebelled against the party Whips (voting discipline) during the Defense debate.

It is rumored that two resolutions will be placed before the meeting; the first will merely censure those who defied the Whip but the second will call for the withdrawal of the Whip from Bevan—this means his expulsion from the Parliamentary Labor Party. Whatever truth there may be in these rumors it is certain that the hounds are baying for blood—preferably the blood of Bevan.

George Brown, Labor member for Belper and a vocal mouthpiece of the right wing, said at a meeting in his constituency yesterday that "we must clear up the question of the party leader." He said that Attlee's lead on vital issues had been publicly repudiated in a most humiliating and damaging way "by a man who seems determined never to accept a majority decision unless he has been allowed to make it."

Another vocal member of the right wing, Sir Hartley Shawcross, also attacked those who rebelled against the party line. He alleged that "some so-called left-wing members" had carefully staged a concerted abstention from the voting at the end of the debate. This statement brought a rebuke from Bevanite Tom Driberg in *Reynolds News* today when he accused Shawcross of issuing "quasi-judicial" pronouncements which prejudged an issue which would be dealt with at the forthcoming meeting of the Parliamentary Labor Party—a point which should suitably impress itself upon the academic mind of lawyer Shawcross!

It is here that the matter now stands and it would appear, apart from any surprise move, that future developments must wait until the meeting of the Parliamentary Labor Party in three days time, when the attitude of the right wing will be fully determined.

But, whatever may happen then, it is obvious that this latest explosion calls for some careful thinking and determined action by the Labor left. If the present debate inside the left with the Crossman-Wing policy is continued, it can undoubtedly lead to a much sounder position being adopted by the Bevanites as a whole—because in any discussion on fundamentals the fallacy of much of their present policy can hardly fail to be exposed. Thus the defection of Crossman may unwittingly be the motive force for a development of the Bevanite political line.

## Calif. Students Plan — —

(Continued from page 5)

event with no organizational consequences to show after months of planning. With the introduction of the united-front concept and a little argument these earlier objections did not get pressed in the final planning session meeting that ratified the results of the panel reports.

The planning session reiterated the desire of its members to get out-of-state contacts who will accept their program as a basis for their groups' activities, or individuals who would be interested in forming groups on such a civil-liberties basis. (More information can be secured about this by writing to Gordon Smith, Box 265, Occidental College, Los Angeles 41, or Martin McReynolds, 9121 S. Dalton St., Los Angeles. These people are part of the Southern Steering Committee which is helping to plan the April conference.)

An important element in the success of this planning session was the generous and wholehearted support of the Southern California American Civil Liberties Union, two of whose officers appeared at the session: Dr. Robert Pettengill, the head of the Southern California ACLU, and Paul Jacobs, a member of the Executive Committee and former CIO oil workers' union official.

Jacobs' speech in the morning helped set the tone of the day by reminding the students that their efforts were an important part of forcing the "reverse swing of the pendulum" in civil liberties

But this is only true insofar as those of the Labor left who understand the immediate necessity for a Third Camp policy advance their ideas in an endeavor to influence the situation which has now arisen and point out how easy it is to stray into the position which Crossman and Wigg now find themselves. They must, beyond all, point out that the list of three alternative policies advanced by Crossman and Wigg excludes the real Third Camp position which alone can provide the solution to the present confusion.

## Attlee Yielded to Scalp-Hungry Right

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Mar. 9—It was only a matter of time before Bevan's differences with the official leadership of the Labor Party came to a head. Bernard Dix has given you an account of the events leading up to Bevan's vote on defense.

On Monday a meeting of the "Shadow Cabinet," i.e., the leaping committee of the Parliamentary Labor Party, was held. It included Attlee, Morrison, Gaitskell, Dalton, Robens, Shinwell, as well as Lord Shepherd (chief Labor Whip in the House of Lords) and Earl Jowett (leader of the Labor peers).

The only "Bevanite" member of the Shadow Cabinet—Harold Wilson—was also there, but he was in no position to defend Bevan, as he had voted with Attlee over the use of the hydrogen bomb in last week's debate on defense.

At first, Attlee made a weak attempt to keep the party together, he was against precipitate action which might be embarrassing electorally. However, Hugh Gaitskell, Alfred Robens and other right-wingers pressed him to exert his authority. They were clearly gunning for Bevan.

They argued that he had previously defied party authority on military matters, had spoken in the constituencies against the official leadership and had encouraged *Tribune* to publish his heterodox views.

When Attlee saw that the majority of the committee were out to expel Bevan, he acceded to their pressure. He agreed to a resolution that Bevan should be reported to the National Executive of the Labor Party, and that the parliamentary party whip should be withdrawn from him.

This would mean that he would sit as an independent, and that at the next election an official Labor Party candidate would stand against him in his constituency at Ebbw Vale in industrial Wales.

Fortunately or unfortunately, Bevan has been confined to bed with influenza all this week. A meeting of the whole

Parliamentary Party was deferred until next week, and he will probably have the opportunity of defending himself then.

A likely rumor—which cannot at present be confirmed—has circulated to the effect that if the whole Parliamentary Party does not agree with its committee's decision on Bevan's expulsion, the Shadow Cabinet will all resign together. This is serious talk, and if it is true, means that unless he apologizes and toes the line, Bevan will almost definitely be expelled. The body which has this power, the National Executive, is due to meet on March 23.

What is happening to the other 61 Labor MPs who voted with him in the H-bomb debate? A letter of rebuke is being sent to each of them, as the Parliamentary Party does not have sufficient strength to throw them all out.

The results of Bevan's expulsion—if no compromise is reached—would be far-reaching. The six members of the National Executive of the party representing the local constituencies are all but one Bevanites. The other 22 members of the Executive represent trade unions, co-operatives and special sections of the Labor movement.

## DANGER OF SPLIT

If these six members of the Executive were to resign, or even become disaffected, the Labor Party would be left without a national electoral apparatus. This is a reflection of the fact that most of those who are in the party and take an active part at times other than elections, are generally Bevanites.

The official leadership knows this only too well. The Conservative Party and the Tory press knows it even better. There are many indications that the Tories might spring an election on the country at the height of such an internal struggle in the Labor Party. Thus even the time-servers of this group are most anxious to patch up their differences, as they may cost them power.

Furthermore, an independent Bevanite group would be extremely dangerous to the Labor Party in Parliament. It might well include the most articulate members of the journalistic group, like Michael Foot, Ian Mikardo, Tom Driberg, Richard Crossman, as well as Bevan himself. It could well bring the country's attention to some most important facts about war policy and the economy, upon which official Labor and Tories have found so much agreement.

However, it is likely that if Bevan is expelled, the right wing would attempt, perhaps successfully, to isolate him. Unless his body of supporters both in Parliament and the constituencies stands behind him, he would be a lone figure in Parliament, with nothing more than nuisance value. On the other hand, if they all stand behind him, he will be severely rebuked, but not expelled, and his position and influence will be enhanced. I think that some compromise formula will be reached, as such a disaffection would do neither Bevan nor the right wing any good.

Meanwhile a once-left-wing "Keep Left" group, now called "the Keep Calm" group, including Crossman and Strachey, are lobbying both wings for a compromise.

In passing, it might be mentioned that Bevan has been expelled once before, when he supported Cripps on the Popular Front dispute in 1939. He has also been threatened before, especially during the war when Shinwell and he said that they thought the British tanks then in use were out of date.

## Let's See, Where Did We Hear That Before . . . ?

New U. S. Ambassador to Spain John Davis Lodge, sailing for Madrid on March 10, told reporters that U. S.'s common interest with Franco Spain in "resisting the Communist menace and gaining a less precarious peace is infinitely more important than any matters on which we may disagree."

You don't even mention infinitely unimportant things like fascism nowadays. Matter of taste, like somebody said.

Read the  
**NEW INTERNATIONAL**  
America's leading Marxist review

# ADA: Civil Liberties

(Continued from page 1)

is symbolized by his name, American liberalism has much to account for. While the basic civil and political liberties of the nation were under attack, the characteristic (though not invariable) reaction of the bulk of the liberal organizations and their spokesmen was to seek to blunt the attack by accepting many of its premises. In the process, liberalism found itself defending laws and actions which it had initially condemned as attacks on civil liberties.

(Example: During the last presidential campaign Adlai Stevenson and Truman "countered" the Republican charge of "twenty years of treason" by boasting of the number of Stalinists convicted under the Smith Act by the Truman administration. But when the Smith Act was passed, it was widely condemned by liberals and the labor movement as a reactionary law.)

In the realm of academic freedom, as well as in many others, there has been a characteristic retreat from liberal principles. A few educational institutions have taken the courageous stand that they will judge their teachers solely on the basis of competence as demonstrated in their work. They have taken the position that when the competence of a teacher is brought into question on political grounds by a legislative hearing, or by any other means, neither refusal to testify under the First or Fifth Amendments, nor even admission of Communist Party membership, will be considered sufficient grounds for dismissal. They have demanded the same kind of positive evidence that a teacher's competence has been affected by his politics as they require if his competence were questioned on any other grounds.

## OPEN QUESTION

But these institutions have been rare exceptions. In most cases the schools and colleges have found it safer to swim with the current. They have been encouraged in this attitude by the fact that the bulk of the liberal movement has either accepted the demonstrably spurious argument that Stalinist affiliation is of itself incompatible with competence, or have simply sought to avert the fury of the McCarthyite attack by playing "safe" on the issue—regardless of what this does to academic freedom.

The same retreat from principle has marked the whole liberal movement's refusal to attack the transformation of the FBI into a "democratic" version of a thought-police. A mountain of evidence has accumulated during the past fifteen years that the FBI has far overstepped the bounds of a federal police agency.

It now has agents planted not only in the Communist Party, but in every liberal and radical organization. It has repeatedly sought to intimidate persons into joining such organizations as informers. Its idea of "derogatory" information ranges from the "charge" of interracial social gatherings to the religious views of those they investigate. J. Edgar Hoover has made it amply clear that he regards "pinkos" and "intellectuals" as objects of suspicion not far removed from Russian spies. Yet, to the liberal movement, he and the monster he administers have been as sacred cows.

The tendency to retreat from principle in the area of civil liberties was finally capped at the end of the last Congress when ADA leader Hubert Humphrey led the assault on civil liberties in the form of his "anti-Communist"ism of that frenzied session is too fresh to need retelling.

But the question still remains open: Will the ADA take a stand repudiating this action of one of its leaders, or will it stifle its aversion to it under a cloak marked "political expediency"?

## ALTERNATIVE TO DEMS

And this brings us to another aspect of the role of ADA in America as a po-

litical expression of the liberal movement. This lull in the witchhunt should be a time for liberalism to go on the offensive, to seek not only to trim off some of the most obviously oppressive features of the loyalty program, of the Taft-Hartley Act, etc., but to demand a complete reversal in the trend, to demand "enlarging full freedom of thought, expression, and inquiry," rather than the liberalization of some of the measures which have restricted them.

But how can this be done within the political framework which ADA has accepted for itself? Can ADA perform the function of a crusading liberal organization, can it take the offensive for full civil liberties without running into the problem of its relationship with the political leaders and the political party to which it has tied its destiny?

We do not doubt that many ADAers were sickened by Humphrey's role in the closing days of the last Congress. We do not doubt that many were none too happy with Adlai Stevenson's "we too" response to the McCarthyite attack during the last presidential campaign. But as long as ADA is in practice firmly tied to the Democratic Party (despite its ritualistic claim to "non-partisanship"), what alternative did they have but to swallow their uneasiness or mortification and keep plugging ahead in the battle with the Republicans?

Not so long ago there was much talk in liberal circles about a "political realignment" which would consolidate the labor and liberal forces in one party and the conservative and reactionaries in the other. The "loyalty oath" push at the last Democratic convention appeared to be a move toward either disciplining or ousting the most reactionary sections of the Southern Democrats from the party.

## A ROAD FOR ADA

As the Democrats have grown hungry for patronage and power during the Eisenhower administration, the talk of "political realignment" has been fading. Stevenson and his Democratic national chairmen have been making open overtures to the Southern wing of the party the object of which is obviously to re-solidify it on a basis acceptable to them.

# ADA: Foreign Policy

(Continued from page 1)

on Formosa, though not Quemoy or the Matsus.

But the U. S. position on defending Chiang's occupation of Formosa is not only self-defeating but monstrously untenable.

President Eisenhower a couple of weeks ago, asked whether the U. S. would support Chiang's invasion of the mainland, answered, "The U. S. is not going to be a party to an aggressive war."—But this is a reply which condemns all he does. For if Chiang becomes an aggressor in the eyes of Washington by trying to go back to "his" country, the country which he purports to represent in the UN by Washington's own insistence, then this whole fiction of "Nationalist China" becomes a farce and a laughing-stock for all people who can think of it amusedly without remembering about H-bombs.

Right at this moment, a Finnish tanker is en route to China with oil. Knowledge demands that the U. S. fleet attack it, if necessary. But his provocative policy is repudiated by calmer heads. The "calm heads" insist that Chiang's ships should be allowed to sink or capture it.

But while the "calm heads" in this country, the ones who are against preventive war, etc., sic Chiang on to make war on Chinese shipping, they indignantly demand that the Chinese government must not harm a hair of Chiang's troops on Formosa.

These same statesmen insist that Formosa is a part of Chiang's legitimate domain, being part of "Nationalist China," but at the same time they deny that the struggle between Mao and Chiang is a civil war in which they are intervening as outside meddlers.

They deploy their armed might under the nose of a foreign government (the one in Peiping), wheel their jet planes through its skies, patrol its coasts, check up its harbors, urge assaults on its shipping—and then they expect the rest of the world (the "dumb furriners") to get hopping with indignation at the CHINESE aggressors!

They made a choice. They hold their nose at Chiang, but their choice is to

The Democratic victory in the last election has once again returned the Southern Democrats to their position of power on the congressional committees, and even a Democratic presidential victory next year, though it could well increase the weight of the Fair Deal wing, would hardly insure the passage of any significant portion of ADA's program by Congress.

In these circumstances, ADA is once again faced with the question of what role it will seek to play in American politics.

On the one hand, it can keep its principles in its platform, while in practice bowing to the apparent dictates of "practical politics." This means keeping silent on the actions of its office-holding leaders when they violate the platform, "going along" with the demand for Democratic Party unity on terms dictated by the South, "accommodating" its principles to the hope of victory in the elections. Above all, it means sacrificing the hope of a political realignment which could give real meaning to American politics (and to the goals of ADA) in favor of a political victory, not so much of ADA's friends, but of the Democratic Party as a whole in the next election.

The other road is to make ADA into a real ideological force in American politics. Its chief objective in the coming period would be to hold up a standard of liberal democracy in all spheres of American life. Its political function would be to concentrate the forces of the liberal and labor movements around a program which would offer a clear alternative to the reaction of the Republicans and the conservatism of the bulk of the powerful Democrats.

This road holds out little of the illusion of power which is inherent in the first one. But it contains much more of the real substance of what power liberals can muster on the American scene today. On it, the ADA could be transformed from the vote-catching handmaiden of a Democratic Party whose leaders treat it with contempt into a rallying-ground for an independent political movement which could express the progressive aspirations of the bulk of the American people.

hold his alliance at the price of alienating every democratic sentiment in the world, and pushing all uncommitted peoples into the arms of the Stalinists (who are not at present conducting fleet maneuvers off the coast of California).

## ADA MUST CHOOSE TOO

And how about the ADA?

We do not doubt the ADA's detestation for Chiang's politics. But when the real world presents its alternatives, which way does ADA fall?

Does it present an alternative DEMOCRATIC FOREIGN POLICY against the disastrous policy of the last two administrations, or is it fair to say that it has gone along with the American Party Line albeit with reservations and some heart-burning?

We do not press here our view that U. S. foreign policy cannot be democratized or purged of its imperialist bias under this system. The important thing is that ADAers, of course, think it can, and want to do so.

Go ahead and try it! This is what the ADA has failed to do: to differentiate itself from the American Party Line in foreign policy.

Too often liberals have bent over backward to solidarize themselves with what Washington is doing in the mistaken idea that this is necessary for "national unity" in the face of the enemy. (Whereby they give the impression of monolithism at home in the face of their friends.)

An ADA program which clearly and militantly counterposed a democratic foreign policy to the going policy of State could be the starting point for a massive political offensive against the appeals of Stalinism. We believe in "co-existing" with Stalinism in order to destroy it, not to appease it. We believe that political warfare against Stalinism is the only way in which we can beat back its menace without destroying the world in war.

For this, a basic change in U. S. foreign policy is necessary. Are there people in ADA who can break with the policy of appeasing the pro-imperialists at home?

## 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

## 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

## SUBSCRIBERS—ATTENTION!

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

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

19-12

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

RENEW NOW!