

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 8, 1956

FIVE CENTS

STEELWORKERS VS. DAVE McDONALD

... page 2

DOES TEXTILE SHOW AUTO'S FUTURE?

... page 2

A PROGRESSIVE EDITOR SEES RUSSIA

... page 3

4-Page Young Socialist Challenge

Four pages, instead of the usual one page, of this issue of LABOR ACTION, are devoted to the *Young Socialist Challenge*. This has crowded some articles out of LABOR ACTION—see them next week.

VOTE SOCIALIST IN '56!

The national election this year once again presents the American people with no real choice between the two parties of capitalism. This year more than ever, the differences between them are of no basic importance.

On all of the vital questions of the day—war and foreign policy, civil liberties and democracy, labor's interests and trade-union needs, economic policy, and above all on the country's burning issue, civil rights and the great struggle of the Negro people in the South—both parties make it very clear that the people can expect no great change no matter which one wins office in November. The area disputed between the party standard-bearers is on inessential detail, or is on who can best administer the bipartisan policies which they share.

We the people have no more choice than this because the labor movement has not given the lead for workers and their liberal allies to quit acting as a kite-tail to the Democratic Party and to strike out on their own on the road of independent labor politics, in an independent Labor Party.

True, the now-united labor

movement — potentially the new giant of American politics—is participating in the 1956 election more intensely than ever, through its Committee on Political Education. It has given official endorsement to the Stevenson-Kefauver ticket of the Democrats.

We welcome one thing about this: the labor movement realizes, as in 1952, that it cannot abstain from political action and political commitment. It must try to defend

its interests and win its needs on the political field as on the economic, because the workers are a distinct class with distinct class interests.

The entrance of the labor movement into the election campaign as a labor movement—which means, the mobilization of the workers as a class—expresses this elementary truth, even though not with crystal-clear consciousness.

Moreover, labor's desire to oust the incumbent Republican Party is, we know, based on its hostility to the reactionary anti-working-class character of that openly big-business party, and not on any personal antagonism to its candidate Eisenhower; indeed, its hostility exists in spite of the well-advertised personal popularity which Eisenhower enjoys. This is an indicator of growing political consciousness and alarm at the advance of reaction in this country.

THWARTED

But these healthy sentiments are steered inside the framework of the Democratic Party and so vitiated.

Tying labor's support to the Democrats ensures that its aspirations will be thwarted, for a Democratic Party administration will not and cannot satisfy labor's program.

This is most dramatically proved in this election in connection with the heroic struggle of the Negro people to end the Jim Crow system of discrimination, exploitation and oppression and to win complete equality.

The Democratic convention was able to adopt a shameful civil-rights plank, which was a thorough surrender to the Southern racists, and to do so with only a farcical "debate," in no small part because the official labor movement was already so entirely committed to it in advance, and in particular to its candidate Adlai Stevenson. Thus the Democratic leaders could feel, rightly, that they

FBI-Stoolie Scandal in Pa. May Outdo Matusow Case

By GERRY McDERMOTT

Pittsburgh, Sept. 29

The lid has been blown off a Department of Justice scandal here, which, when the full story unfolds, could put the Harvey Matusow case in the shade.

It involves a justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, the notorious witchhunter Michael A. Mussmanno. It involves members of the Democratic Party, high in Congress. And it involves the whole FBI informant system and the Smith Act trials of Communist Party leaders.

The case broke in Washington on September 28 when the solicitor general of the United States, J. Lee Rankin, asked the Supreme Court to return a Smith Act case to the federal district court in Pittsburgh. The case involved the conviction of two Pittsburgh Stalinist leaders under the Smith Act—James Dolsen and Benjamin Carathers. The Supreme Court was due to hear their appeal next month.

The government has asked that the Supreme Court return the case to a lower court because the government now admits that its star witness in the case, a paid FBI informer named Joseph Mazzei, is a liar.

The United States attorney for Pittsburgh, D. Malcomb Anderson, has tried to make the best of a bad situation by saying that the government acted in the interest of "fair play," but the obvious reason for the government move was that it feared the Supreme Court would rule against it when it heard Mazzei's record.

The principal figure in the case, Joseph Mazzei, is as unsavory a character as one could find among the near-psycho-

tics who infested the Stalinist movement not too long ago. He was a prominent and well-known member of the CP in Pittsburgh from 1942 to 1953, during which time he was also manager of a local movie house which showed Russian and other foreign movies.

He now claims that he was an agent for the FBI all of this time, although the consensus of opinion in Pittsburgh radical circles is that he is just another Stalinist hack who got scared. The local FBI at present very obviously wishes he would disappear along with his unsavory record. But he won't—he is a living reminder of the police-spy system.

INFORMER'S RECORD

The government's petition to the Supreme Court maintains that it still believes Mazzei told the truth in the Smith Act trial. However, they want the case returned to the original trial court because "the government has serious reason to doubt" other testimony given by Mazzei in his career as an informer and "expert witness."

Here is the testimony that the government itself questions:

(1) On June 18, 1953 Mazzei told the

(Continued on page 3)

NEW YORK

LABOR ACTION FORUM

THURSDAY, OCT. 11, at 8:30

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE CANDIDATES

The Record of Evasion And Betrayal in This Election

Speaker:

MAX MARTIN

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

had labor "in their pocket"; it was the reactionaries that had to be appeased.

So the Dixie Klan-ocrats got all they could have hoped for. They have their guarantee that a Democratic president will not touch their segregation system, not only in the party platform, but also in the knowledge that a Democratic Party victory means, as usual, a stranglehold by Southern reactionaries over the powerful standing committees of Congress.

To be sure, even if stronger phrases had been thrown into the platform, nothing more could have been expected than in 1948, when stronger phrases were put in to lure Negro votes, and then 100 per cent forgotten in the "Fair Deal" administration that followed.

NO CHAMPION

But this year, at least, a strong civil-rights plank could have given encouragement to embattled fighters for racial democracy in Montgomery, in Tallahassee, throughout the South, as well as in Harlem and Trumbull Park and Central Avenue, north and west. Instead, the forces that have been heartened have been the Citizens Council hoodlums in Clinton, in Sturgis, in Texan cities, and elsewhere, to stage their demonstrations of lynch spirit against the

(Turn to last page)

In Los Angeles . . .

In Los Angeles, the way to find out about Independent Socialism is to drop a line to the Independent Socialist League, at 8939 1/2 Santa Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles 46. We'd like to hear from you.

Steelworkers' Convention Sees McDonald on the Pan

By EMIL MODIC

David McDonald's variety of unionism is far from popular in the United Steelworkers. That is the lesson of the recently concluded Los Angeles convention of the union, which saw McDonald win a dues increase amid near-riotous charges of rigged voting, and then lose on a proposition to reduce the autonomy of Canadian locals.

The convention was spiced by the charge from McDonald that the opposition were "Trotskyite troublemakers."

The administration asked for and won a dues increase from \$3 a year to \$5 a year. Out of this the union staff of a thousand people will get a wage increase, up to and including McDonald, whose pay was upped from \$40,000 a year to \$50,000 a year, despite the blunt charges from some delegates that he didn't need it.

McDonald protested half-heartedly against the raise. It was defended largely on the basis that it would add to the "prestige" of the union.

McDonald was in the chair when the dues increase passed by a show of hands after one of the stormiest sessions in the union's history. McDonald then rejected a roll-call vote, despite a chorus of boos.

"Now please, you are all steel workers—men of dignity," McDonald shouted. "You will not boo, you will not cat-call." McDonald then threatened to have the boosers thrown out of the hall bodily. Just how this would fit in with the dignity of the proceedings was not explained.

D. C. Rarick, president of Local 2227 of U. S. Steel's Irwin Works, the largest works in the Pittsburgh area, openly charged that the vote was rigged and that he was denied the opportunity to speak against the motion. He pointed out that in a hand vote a delegate from a small fabricating local was equal to a delegate from a big local who carried ten times as many votes.

Before the vote was taken, McDonald had accused his opponents of being "Trotskyites": "This is a group of Trotskyites who always have created dissension. They get elected as delegates by opposing the International at their locals. They fought Phil Murray and they fight today anywhere and any place. Nothing pleases them—they are just trouble-makers." This was McDonald's explanation.

NOT POPULAR

As is well known, there were large numbers of Stalinists on the Steelworker staff in the early days of the union. This must be where McDonald learned the trick of yelling "Trotskyite" at anyone who "gets elected as delegates by opposing the International." If militant socialists were really in the leadership of as many locals as McDonald claimed, the convention would have been even more interesting than it was.

As it was, locals in the Pittsburgh area accused of being "Trotskyites" and "trouble-makers" publicly demanded a retraction and apology from McDonald—which was not forthcoming—and the matter had front-page headlines for several days in Pittsburgh.

Aside from the weight of the administration machine, the dues increase probably passed because half of it—two dollars and a half—will be retained by the local. It will pay for a lot of lost time.

Neither the dues increase nor the pay hike for McDonald is popular with the membership. International representatives have been ducking meetings of locals in the Pittsburgh area since the convention.

On another matter McDonald lost. The largest single center of militant opposition to McDonald comes from the 80,000 Canadian members of the union. McDonald proposed that the elected post of Canadian director of the union be abolished and replaced by an appointed official to be chosen by him. The Canadian delegates pointed out that this would look like American domination of their locals, and would hurt the growth of the union in Canada. The change was voted down.

Another interesting change was made in the constitution. Previously, the International could assess members \$2 a year if a majority of the membership ap-

proved. Under the new measure, which was adopted, all members may be assessed \$5 a year, and not after a referendum of the membership but after a vote by the executive board of the union.

HOW TO TRUST TRUSTEES

Some delegates were curious as to how this plan for a huge war chest fitted in with McDonald's trusteeship notions and his publicly expressed hope that this summer's steel strike was the last ever. McDonald explained this handily:

"There are those who say: 'How can you support this theory of mutual trusteeship, McDonald, when you are forced to call a strike in the year 1956?' Well, the answer to that is very simple. In the year 1956, it was necessary for the labor trustees in the great American steel industry to call to task the management trustees and force them through the means of a strike to live up to their mutual trusteeship."

The assessment, then, is to help keep the other trustees a little more trustworthy....

The rest of the convention was pretty dull. During the "guest speaker" sessions, the sergeant-at-arms had to stop the sale of beer in the convention hall canteen in order to keep the hall from being emptied. Steel workers from Pittsburgh, where stringent smoke control has virtually abolished smog, complained about the air pollution in Los Angeles.

Incidentally, the *AFL-CIO News*' account of the convention bore about as little resemblance to the actual proceedings as possible. When will the labor movement extend freedom of the press to its own publications?

LONDON LETTER The Tory Convention

They're Grumbling at Eden

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Sept. 29

To the outside observer the rank and file of the British Tory party appear to consist, in the main, of horse-faced women, effeminate university students and colorless folk from the middle-class suburbs who thrive on the whist drives and other social functions arranged by the local Tory organizations. Once a year representatives of this odd collection gather for what passes as the annual conference of the Tory party.

That means for the most part that they sit in silent adoration while their leaders parade before them like peacocks at the height of the mating season. At well-chosen intervals they burst into applause after the leaders have delivered pep-talks designed to convince the world at large, and the Tory party in particular, that all is well with the affairs of the Tory government.

This year's conference is scheduled to take place at Llandudno, in Wales, in ten days' time. Like previous conferences it will be an elaborately stage-managed affair with only a faint semblance of democratic process. For the Tory conference has no power to frame policies or to draw up election platforms; it is merely a sounding-board at which the Tory leadership makes an endeavor to gauge the temper of its supporters.

This year, however, it looks as though the Tory leaders are going to have their hands full trying to keep their rank and file in check.

The list of resolutions released by the Tory Central Office this week shows that the disagreements at government level are matched by a growing discontent with government policies by the Tory rank and file. The record number of nearly 400 resolutions contain many examples of the cracks which are now running through the Tory organization. A quick skim through the agenda will reveal the mood.

The biggest beef is against the ever-rising cost of living which has marked the post-war period of Tory rule in Britain.

Sowerby Tories view "with great concern the continuous rise in living costs

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Sept. 30

Seldom has the union movement issued a more crushing indictment of the nature and workings of capitalism than the report made public last week by the Textile Workers Union on the crisis confronting over 1,000,000 workers, who are "condemned to an ever-declining standard of living."

What gives this revelation such urgency is that a similar condition exists for a large body of workers employed in America's richest profit-maker, the auto industry.

In this field, capitalism, working inexorably toward a concentration of wealth and control, has forced most small auto companies and many big suppliers out of business, with over 100,000 seniority employees floating around like flotsam and jetsam with no prospect of ever regaining work in the field where once the powerful United Auto Workers union protected them.

And while the UAW has just come up with a shorter work-week as the No. 1 objective for the 1958 negotiations, and also for a lower retirement age, the fact is that the devastating ups and downs of auto production and fluctuations in

Next week: A report on the settlement of the important packing-house strike—received too late for this issue.—Ed.

Does Textile Show Auto The Image of Its Future?

employment are playing havoc with the lives of the auto workers.

To be sure, the situation isn't like that described in the Textile industry: "Countless mills have been used as pawns in the elaborate game of financial manipulation. Dozens of communities have been turned into depressed areas; tens of thousands of workers have been stranded by management failures. Low wages and less work have gone hand in hand; insecurity has been poverty's handmaiden."

But it is still a shock to realize that, among the many large plants in the Detroit area, Hudson is silent; Packard is gone; Midland Steel is dead; Motor Products is a memory; Chrysler is down to half size.

And Chevrolet announces that with only 82,000 employees it will produce 2,000,000 cars and trucks in 1958. Here is automation leaping with giant strides in a vital industry.

FEAR EXPLOSION

No matter what the extollers of American capitalism and the believers in small reforms may say, if the fabulous auto industry can provide little security and much anxiety for its workers, what can be expected from the textile industry, no matter what the program of the Textile Workers Union may be? With wages of \$1.25 an hour, what does a 30-hour week with 40-hour pay mean there?

It seems difficult to believe, yet it is true: less than 25 per cent of the textile workers in America are organized. What kind of situation this breeds is explained by the union report: "We do not want an explosion. We speak for conservatism in the best sense of the word. We want to relieve, to mitigate—yes, for the time being even to compromise—in order to forestall the methods of desperation which may otherwise be applied."

If the jungle law of the richest industry in America can't do anything but destroy the small and the weak, what hope is there for the prayers of the worried leaders of the Textile Union?

What are the obstacles to even elementary protection for the textile workers by unionization? Employers who "mock the Bill of Rights, scorned the accepted tenets of decent human conduct and enlisted the worst form of racial, national and religious bigotry."

When peak auto production is reached this winter, 100,000 auto workers will still be unemployed. Maybe the auto barons aren't quite as crude as the above-described textile employers, but their disdain and contempt for the workers and their living conditions are alike.

All of which suggests that pressures from the exploited workers in vital industries are far greater than one reads about in the press. This hardly foreshadows an era of class peace and good will, phrases that fill the airwaves and speeches of the cult-of-the-satisfied with American capitalism.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION — \$1 a year for Student Subs



LABOR ACTION

October 8, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 41

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

(Continued on page 3)

Progressive Editor Tells What He Saw in Russia

By GEORGE HANLEY

The September issue of the monthly *Progressive* carries a 30,000-word report by editor Morris H. Rubin on his recent trip through Russia.

Part I deals with "The New Mood" of the Stalinist bureaucracy, that is, greater relaxation of internal tensions. He attributes this to the use of Stalin as a scapegoat for past grievances, and a substantial increase in the production of consumer goods added to a tangible cut in prices.

Furthermore, there has been a relaxation in the tyranny of the MVD and reform of the bureaucracy to a wider diffusion of power, because "they [the top brass of the party] sensed that the strain was becoming intolerable for people who had been marched like a ragged, impoverished army—industrializing and collectivizing and fighting wars—for more than three decades."

Rubin further explains de-Stalinization as a result of the fear of the elite of further loss of power and perquisites under "a continuation of Stalinist principles and methods."

Rubin repeatedly encounters a "horror of war everywhere I went among the people." But he notes: "if talk on war and peace were part of almost every conversation I had with Russians, discussion of internal politics and personalities was a rare occurrence.... When I asked one engineer... how much he knew of and how he reacted to the program of de-Stalinization, he shrugged and said, 'I have little time for politics,' and then he changed the subject.... Actually, many Russians did not know even then—late spring and early summer—the extent and violence of Khrushchev's exposure of Stalin."

Rubin is astonished that many memorials to Stalin still stand. When he asked Muscovites why, he got the official party line:

"The foreign press has sensationalized and misnamed what you call de-Stalinization. Stalin did many great things for our country, most notably the building of a modern, industrial society in a country that had been unbelievably backward. But in his later years he became too egocentric... too harsh and dictatorial... under the influence of the wicked Beria.... We are trying to rectify these mistakes now."

LABOR'S LOT

Part II deals with Russian life, and here Rubin details much that is widely enough known and still true: the shortages of goods, lack of housing, insufficiencies in diet, absence of comforts; the jammed conditions in all schools; the control of education by the ruling party, the systematic indoctrination of the children, etc.

As far as wages are concerned, "the average wage rate for all Soviet workers is 750 rubles per month (\$75)." Rubin discovers at one factory he visits that while the average wage for workers is \$90-\$100 a month, the manager makes a base pay of \$700 plus bonuses!

"The work-week here is forty-six hours, eight on week-days and six on Saturday. This is the uniform Soviet work-week.... The labor organization is virtually a company union... there is no right to strike, for this is unlawful; no right to agitate for a shorter week, for the policy is fixed

in the Kremlin; no right to demand higher wages, for these rates are fixed by the ministry."

At the side of this average of \$75 a month, Rubin lists the high prices for staple commodities, for example, "milk was going at 50 cents a quart... butter at \$1.28 per pound... cheese at \$1.17 per pound... from \$120-\$150 for a cheap, drab suit of clothes... a pair of women's hose was selling for \$2., and a simple cotton dress for \$30. All purchases require cash on the barrel-head."

Regarding anti-Semitism, Rubin says, after describing "the terror to which they [The Jews] were subjected from 1948 until the death of Stalin," that "it was impossible to tell to just what extent anti-Semitism exists today, because the Jewish people" have been intimidated from talking to strangers about their life there. American Jews are prevented from attending synagogues, and are asked not to talk to members of the congregations. Many leading Jewish figures that were murdered in Stalin's purges have not been publicly rehabilitated, although pensions have been restored to their families. Rubin senses that "the Jews of Russia are adjusting slowly to the new moderation; many still fear a revival of anti-Semitism."

On the collective farms, Rubin finds that life is "hard and drab for the peasant. His income is low; he is often snarled in a great deal of red tape; his opportunities to obtain consumer goods like clothes, furniture, and appliances are greatly limited." He notes a general resentment against the compulsory quotas and bureaucratic "assignments" for individuals to special areas of farm duty.

RULING CLASS

On the question of "classes," the author feels that "for all its professed dedication to the ideal of the classless society, the Soviet system has spawned its own aristocracy: its members are the leading scientists, actors, top military brass, and major factory managers. Some of them are millionaires.... I found it impossible to form any accurate estimate of how numerous a group this elite is. One rough estimate by a seasoned correspondent placed the total at between ten to twenty million persons, or five to ten per cent of the population."

"I acquired the impression," Rubin concludes from his "talks with a number of intellectuals among the elite, that they have become a conservative force in Soviet society. I encountered no revolutionary fervor among them, but rather what struck me as a longing for stability and security, a desire to settle down to a predictable pattern of life."

He tells of how these intellectuals "with pay, perquisites, and privileges far beyond the reach of the worker" continue to insist that they are living in a "classless society" with "no need for publications or parties to express criticism and fight for reform."

At the close of his report, the author "came away with the conviction that to the local at 527-A North 8 Street, whatever may be the ultimate rewards in national security and long-range progress, this generation of Russians has paid a staggering price for its government's emphasis on heavy industry. This ruthless drive has enabled the Soviet Union to vault over several centuries of industrial revolution in several decades, so that today she is the second greatest industrial power in the world."

He sums up the prospect as he sees it as follows: "There is nothing to indicate that the men in the Kremlin propose to modify the system itself so that it could not again spawn a madman-dictator, who would make cruel playthings of the police and the courts, cow a nation of 200,000,000 human beings, and have himself acclaimed a god even as he enslaved and murdered millions of citizens. The stark fact persists that while many of the instruments of Stalin's police state have been dismantled, they have not been destroyed. They could be reassembled tomorrow, or next year, or five years from now. The new relaxation was not won by the people of Russia at the ballot box or in revolution; they were given release from tension by rulers who can revoke it as quickly as they invoked it."

Stoolie Scandal — —

(Continued from page 1)

McCarthy subcommittee that Pittsburgh Communists were planning to "liquidate" Senator McCarthy. Mazzei also testified that the Communist Party in Pittsburgh conducted classes in making bombs.

(2) On November 14, 1952 Mazzei pleaded guilty in Pittsburgh to charges of adultery and bastardy after admitting he had fathered the child of a Pittsburgh waitress. This was before he had come out in the open as an FBI informer. After he came out in the open, he asked that the court set aside his plea of guilty on the grounds that he had pleaded guilty at the request of the FBI. He claimed that the waitress in question was a Communist agent assigned to spy on the eating habits of Judge Michael A. Musmanno, and that the bastardy charge against him was a Communist plot. The waitress denied that she was a Communist, but testified that Mazzei claimed he could not marry her because he was too busy with important undercover work for the FBI. A representative of the Pittsburgh office of the FBI testified under oath that the FBI had not instructed him to plead guilty to the bastardy case.

(3) The government petition to the Supreme Court states that at an unidentified secret proceeding in November 1953 Mazzei named a high government official as a Communist. The government now doubts the credibility of this sworn testimony.

(4) In July 1956 Mazzei testified under oath that he had participated in a Communist Party plan for an armed invasion of the United States through Miami, Florida. The government does not believe this, according to its petition.

(5) In the same case Mazzei testified that the FBI got him into the army so he could watch a Communist in the army. The government says he was drafted, and that the FBI had nothing to do with it.

(6) Again in the same case, he testified under oath that the government paid him up to \$1000 a month expense money. The FBI says it gave him only \$172.05 in expense money over a period of 11 years.

MUSMANNO STORY

(7) The last incident is as interesting as it is complicated.

It began when John Mullen, mayor of Clairton, Pennsylvania, and director of the Political Action Committee of the United Steelworkers of America, brought bribery charges against two members of the Clairton city council. The two councilmen were charged with taking a bribe from a coal operator to vote to sell certain city lands to the coal operator at a low price. The lands contained coal deposits. Mullen learned of the matter and took it to the district attorney.

According to Mullen, Judge Michael A. Musmanno asked him to drop the prosecution. Instead, Mullen notified the district attorney of this alleged attempt to fix the case. The two councilmen were tried, convicted, and sent to prison.

Thereupon, the district attorney brought charges against Judge Musmanno

no for trying to "fix" the case. Musmanno denied the charges, but the district attorney was able to present evidence—telephone company records of phone calls—that seemed to contradict Musmanno. At any rate, Musmanno was not convicted of the charge. It did, however, result in a great deal of unfavorable newspaper publicity for Musmanno.

Before long, Musmanno asked for and received a hearing before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee to prove that the charges against him were a Communist plot. The star witness for Musmanno turned out to be none other than Mazzei, who declared that he had known Mullen as a member of the Communist Party, and that the witness-tampering charge was a Communist plot.

Mazzei's wife also testified, as did Musmanno. Mullen then denied the charges under oath.

It was obvious that either Mullen on the one hand or else Mazzei and perhaps Musmanno were guilty of perjury. It was announced at the time of the hearing that the record would be sent to the Justice Department in order to prepare perjury proceedings.

However, although the case was heard over a year ago, the transcript of the testimony has never been submitted to the Justice Department. As a matter of fact, the transcript of the hearing has never been printed. And a report by the staff of the committee, which asked for perjury proceedings, has never been printed.

Judge Musmanno is a Democrat and a majority of the subcommittee and the committee are Democrats. The chairman of the subcommittee and of the committee is Senator Eastland of Mississippi. The other Democratic member of the subcommittee is Price Daniel, soon to become governor of Texas.

The government, in its petition to the Supreme Court, now admits that it doubts Mazzei's testimony in this case.

STUMPERS

There are a number of questions concerning Mazzei which should be answered:

(1) How many innocent people lost government jobs or were otherwise hounded as the result of the informing of this stool-pigeon who is now disowned by his employers?

(2) How long did the government continue to use this "expert witness" after it knew he was lying?

(3) Why did the government wait until it faced a stunning defeat in court to disown Mazzei? Why didn't it repudiate him as soon as it knew he was lying?

(4) Was a Democratic politician able to arrange an inquiry of the Senate Internal Security subcommittee just to get himself off the hook, and was he able to use this hearing to smear a CIO official, and is he now able to prevent the prosecution of his star witness for perjury?

There are undoubtedly more sensations hidden in this case. We venture to predict that one of them will be an investigation of the other star witness in the case, Matt Cvetic, if it ever comes to that.

Grumbling at Eden — —

(Continued from page 2)

measures to better the lot of the middle classes; and this is often coupled with the allegation that the fall in middle-class living standards is due to the failure of the government to crack down heavily upon the wage demands of the trade unions.

The resolution from Southgate Tories puts the middle-class philosophy into a nutshell: "This conference," it says, "explores the progressive deterioration in the standard of living of the middle classes, caused by the failure of the government to grapple with the ever increasing demands of 'Organized Labor.'"

None of these highly critical resolutions will be debated, because the Tory Central Office itself selects the resolutions on which debates will take place and marks them with a star in the agenda. This year only 15 resolutions are "starred" out of the total of nearly 400, and all of those chosen are relatively mild in their approach.

But this behind-the-scenes manipulation of the agenda cannot conceal the fact that there are wide divergences of opinion within the Tory ranks, and that many of the Tory party's traditional middle-class supporters are dissatisfied with their lot and want the government to embark on an all-out war against the trade unions and the working class.

This puts the government on a spot. Already it has aroused the trade-union movement because of the tougher line it has pursued during the past 18 months in an effort to straighten out Britain's economic troubles and at the same time appease the disgruntled middle-class Tories. If the government bowed to the pressure of its rank and file and launched an even bigger attack upon the workers, the response from the unions would be sufficient to bring it tumbling from power. And it is this that the Tory leaders have to explain to the unsympathetic audience at their annual conference.

They have a tough job.

The definitive biography!
A masterly political portrait
of the totalitarian dictator

Leon Trotsky's
'STALIN'

This book is out of print, but
we have copies available for
\$6.00

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

VOTE SOCIALIST — —

(Continued from page 1)

Supreme Court desegregation order.

But at the Democratic Party convention, labor had "nowhere else to go," because it does not have its own party. Therefore also the Negro people have no such real champion to look to.

Before the Democratic convention, Walter Reuther said, "The Democratic Party cannot have Mr. Eastland and have us at the same time." Other labor leaders said as much. But the day after, the Democratic Party still has Reuther and Eastland; it has Herbert Lehman and Herman Talmadge—and it is not labor and the NAACP which are dominant in this strange and unnatural coalition.

Here is what labor's leaders were afraid of in Chicago: that any struggle by labor within this shell of the old party, on decisive questions, could only lead to the breakup of that wretched alliance, and put them willy-nilly on the road to an independent Labor Party. That is why the labor-liberal-NAACP bloc at the convention crumbled away in the test.

By the same token, what happened shows the utter unpostponability of a break with the Democrats if labor is to fight wholeheartedly for its program on the political field at all.

PROMISES AND PLANKS

What is true with regard to the question of Negro rights is also true with regard to all other questions and issues in which labor and the little people have a vital stake, even if less spectacularly.

The Democrats were exposed in Chicago on the civil-rights question because on this question there are masses of people actually fighting, actually in motion. On other issues, where labor is quiescent, the Democrats were able to be freer with promises, which they have no intention of fulfilling.

One such promise is to repeal the anti-labor Taft-Hartley Act. But every Democrat-controlled Congress since the adoption of that law has failed even to seriously amend it in favor of labor, let alone try to repeal it. Promises like these are frauds, just as Eisenhower's promises of amendment were a sham.

A Democratic victory will not change America's anti-democratic foreign policy, which supports French colonialism in Algeria, the British hold on colonies like Cyprus, imperialist demands on Egypt, and reactionaries all over the globe like Chiang Kai-shek. Such imperialist attitudes provide no real obstacles for the totalitarian threat of Russian Stalinism, which only feeds and wins adherents on the basis of it.

Mess of Pottage

Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the NAACP, spoke to the California State Federation of Labor on August 16. The following excerpt from his remarks is reported by Tony Czerwinski, vice-president of UAW Local 212, in his column in the local's paper:

"Hill told the labor convention that the civil-rights plank in the Democratic Party platform was basically no different from that in the Republican platform. 'The [Democratic] civil-rights plank is no civil-rights plank; it is a mess of pathetic pottage that says nothing, that takes us back, that does not take us forward.'"

There is a rare example of where this plain truth is reported in the union press.

But this foreign policy was not invented by Dulles, but by Truman-Acheson and their Democratic administration, which likewise anticipated the GOP in placating and aiding dictatorships like Peron's in Argentina, which Stevenson now demagogically attacks.

A Democratic victory will not put an end to the witchhunt against basic civil liberties which has plagued American life so long. This witchhunt did not begin with McCarthy, and it has not ended with his political decline.

It was initiated first and foremost under Truman, who created the notorious police-state system of the Attorney General's "Subversive List," and who first set up the so-called loyalty-security system. The Smith Act, which penalizes "dangerous thoughts," came into existence under the Democrats; so did the McCarran Act. Some of the worst features of the "Communist Control Act," like the provision for concentration camps, were put into it by Democratic "liberals" like Hubert Humphrey.

Adlai Stevenson has not raised a peep against this anti-freedom system, except to complain when the Republicans, in their witchhunting enthusiasm, employ the same methods against good Democrats and smear his own party colleagues.

NO LESSER EVIL

The Democratic Party has nothing real to offer to workers, to the little people of the country, to the exploited and segregated Negroes. It is no meaningful "lesser evil" as compared with the Republicans. Indeed, the capitulation of the Democratic Party to Southern racism may, if anything, strengthen the Republicans, and thereby bring about the situation which labor was so concerned to prevent by bowing down in Chicago.

The present policy of labor in supporting the Democratic Party is self-defeating: it not only strengthens the hand of the reactionaries in that party but also the hands of the Republican reactionaries as well.

Until labor is in position to take command of the nation in the name of the people and democracy, it must seek to exact concessions from the capitalist parties and government. The only way it can do that, on the political as on the economic field, is by its own independent class organization and activity. The only way of doing that on the political field is through an independent Labor Party.

The capitalist "friends of labor" in the old parties would have a thousand times more respect for the unions in that case, even if Labor elected only a few of its candidates at the beginning, than they have for labor now when it begs at these parties' back door with hat in hand.

But in 1956 the official labor movement has shut off the road to such an indispensable instrument of labor political action, such as is possessed by almost every other working class in the world.

Under these circumstances, there is one means to cast a vote for working-class independence, for peace, for democratic rights, for racial equality, for a world of abundance. That means is:

VOTE SOCIALIST!

We propose a socialist protest vote as the only available means in 1956 to register these convictions in the voting booth on November 6.

We propose that you "Vote Socialist" as the only way to make a vote count on the side of the Negro people, on the side of labor, on the side of the colonial people and workers abroad who look to America for signs that its people are not a monolithic conformist bloc behind its H-bomb-brandishing statesmen and militarist-minded diplomats.

To "Vote Socialist" in 1956, we recommend a vote for the candidates of the Socialist Party, especially for its presidential and vice-presidential candidates, Darlington Hoopes and Samuel H. Friedman.

We select the Socialist Party for this electoral recommendation, from among the three socialistic organizations that have nominated candidates, because we believe that a vote for the Socialist Party candidates will be most easily and widely interpreted as a socialist protest vote in its general sense, and not because we wish to indicate any endorsement of the SP's program or policies as a whole. The So-

cialist Party maintains positions on a number of vital questions of the day, including its attitude toward the war question, which in our opinion are incorrect policies for the socialist movement.

By voting for the candidates of the Socialist Party we wish also to encourage the more staunchly socialist and internationalist sentiments in the Socialist Party, to encourage Third Camp policies on the war question and revolutionary socialist positions on the vital issues of the day, to encourage a return by the Socialist Party to the internationalist traditions of Eugene V. Debs.

The recording of the largest possible vote for the Socialist Party candidates under the difficult conditions of the 1956 elections will also serve to encourage all those socialists who have remained true to their principles and convictions by resisting the pressure of the ex-socialists who have abandoned the fight for socialist democracy in trying to dissolve the organized socialist movement as a whole, and who have tried to transform the Socialist Party in particular into a mere "left wing" of the Fair-Deal Democrats, thus contributing to the very weakening of the socialist movement in the United States by which they have sought to justify their renunciation of the fight for socialism.

In particular, in view of the proposal that has been raised in the Socialist Party for socialist unity, including unity with the ISL, we wish to encourage this sentiment, which can help to bring about a new and healthy socialist movement.

OTHER GROUPS

Other socialistic groups offer candidates this year, namely, the Socialist Workers Party and the Socialist Labor Party. Undoubtedly, many votes which appear on their lines will be cast by militants who wish to express, as do we, their opposition to both capitalist parties and their support to independent working-class politics. We, however, cannot recommend a vote for them.

We cannot recommend a vote for the SWP in 1956. In addition to its previous rapid movement in the direction of political capitulation to Stalinism and political solidarity with Stalinism in the looming world war, this year sees the SWP putting itself forward before the voters as, in effect, the *ersatz* electoral instrument of pro-Stalinism in the absence of any candidates put forward by an outright Stalinist or Stalinist-run party. This is the nature of the essential appeal which the SWP is making in this campaign, and perforce, by its own choice, this will be the sense in which its vote will ask to be interpreted. Our wish is to add to the numbers of a socialist protest vote, not a pro-Stalinist protest vote.

The Socialist Labor Party, for its part, remains a hopeless sect not merely in size and influence but in policy and outlook. It takes a position against the two imperialist camps, and in this is distinguished from the SWP; but at the same time it is hostile to the real labor movement. The ISL is highly critical of the policies of the U. S. labor movement, particularly its stubborn support of the old parties; but the SLP opposes and rejects the union movement itself and thus tends to intensify the isolation of socialism in the ranks of the working class.

FOR PROTEST VOTE

To "Vote Socialist" in the 1956 election therefore means to vote for the candidates for the Socialist Party—Darlington Hoopes for president and Samuel H. Friedman for vice-president.

In this election, unlike previous years, the Socialist Party will appear on the ballot in few states. In the others, it is necessary to ask voters to cast a write-in vote for Hoopes and Friedman.

To vote Socialist is, to be sure, no adequate substitute for a labor party that could effectively oppose the two parties of capitalism, but it is the only way this year to record a protest vote against this society based on exploitation, war preparations, witchhunting and inhumanity to man.

Vote Socialist in 1956 — vote for Hoopes and Friedman.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE
INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE
MAX SHACHTMAN, Chairman
ALBERT GATES, Secretary

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Please enter my subscription:

- 1 year at \$2. 6 months at \$1.
 Payment enclosed. Bill me.
 New sub. Renewal.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

What Choice for Youth in the Election?

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

There is no basic, fundamental difference between the policies of the two major parties in the coming election. The Stevenson-Kefauver and Eisenhower-Nixon tickets stand for a bipartisan devotion to the status quo which is incapable of offering progressive solutions to the problems before America.

This is not to say that there are no differences between the two parties. The Democrats command the allegiance of the organized labor

movement, the liberals, and, if they are not completely sickened by the events of the last four years, of most Negroes. The Republicans are a party of big business and out-and-out reaction.

But it is precisely the point that these differences have been muted, concealed; that the progressive elements which back the Democrats have subordinated their own independent politics to a spurious party "unity." And these are the two things which we must understand about the coming elections: that there is no real choice for the voter; that the

basis for what would be such a choice is in existence here and now, but that it has been pushed off of the political stage.

First, is there a choice? Where do the Democrats and Republicans stand on the great issues which confront us, on civil rights, foreign policy, civil liberties and domestic social legislation?

Look at the question of civil rights. Negro children braved mobs in Kentucky, Tennessee and Texas; the Negroes of Montgomery have sustained their magnificent boycott, month in, month out; this is THE domestic question before the American people today, and more even than that, it is an issue with ramifications throughout the world. Where does the Democratic Party and its candidate stand on civil rights?

For the last four years, Adlai Stevenson has made it clear that he regards the unity of the Democratic Party as his road to the White House. He spent a Thanksgiving dinner with Talmadge; he accepted the support of racists in the Florida primary. At the Democratic convention in Chicago, he stood by while civil rights, the most immediate issue facing America today, was disposed of in a mock "debate" which lasted for half an hour. And while that "debate" was going on, the Reporter magazine noted, Stevenson's managers were mixing with the delegates arguing against a roll-call on civil rights.

One need only compare 1956 with 1952 to get the full flavor of the point.

A CONTRAST

In 1952 when Stevenson was nominated everyone understood that the ticket had to be balanced by a Southerner. Sparkman of Alabama was named to take the curse off Stevenson's "liberalism." But in 1956 it was the other way around. Kefauver, a border-state senator with a much more forthright stand on civil rights than Stevenson, was necessary to shore up the ticket in the North.

The distance between these two conventions is more than a mere four years: it represents a thorough switch in the basis of the presidential nomination and the position of the party, a retrogression from the exceedingly moderate stand of 1952—a defeat for civil rights.

If Stevenson is elected, his ability to act will be tremendously compromised, to put it mildly, by the fact that his party contains the leading racists in America and that, by and large, they supported him. More, a Stevenson victory will represent the increased power of the South in the Senate where it controls the majority of the powerful committee chairmanships.

Eisenhower does not suffer from this built-in institutional restraint on the question of civil rights. He could act. But his own dedication to a philosophy of "states rights" has precluded that so far. Still, the Republican potential on civil rights remains a little greater than that of the "united" Democratic Party. And that's not saying much for the Republicans.

"You can't have me and Jim Eastland in the same party": that's what Walter Reuther said before the Democratic convention. And now, Adlai Stevenson has

(Continued on page 4-C)

A Challenge to the Campus

The facts confronting American youth today are radical facts.

In the South, Jim Crow forces young Negroes to walk the gauntlet of a racist mob in order to go to school. And "Crisis," the organ of the NAACP, tells us that at such a time the present political campaign offers a choice of "Tweedledum and Tweedledee"!

That is a radical fact.

The draft is still on—not only still on, it has been stepped up so that American youth now face eight years of obligation to the army, two on active duty and six on call in the Reserve. Why is it that this is true—that for sixteen years now young Americans have had to interrupt their lives for this service?

That is a radical question, because the fact is radical.

McCarthy has had his power diminished, but the witch-hunt still rolls on. There's still an Attorney General's List, that completely arbitrary and unchecked system which is used to deny employment, government and private, to award bad discharges from the army, and so on and on.

That is a radical change in democracy, to have institutions of unfreedom as a seemingly permanent part of the landscape.

Young Americans today are denied an education for lack of money. Various leaders of the country have become alarmed because we "aren't keeping up with the Russians," because "we aren't training enough people for industry," and so on. But what of the youth and their needs? They haven't heard a single program yet which really gives them a straight answer.

That is a radical lack in a society proclaimed to be the most prosperous in human history.

The facts are radical; but American youth are not.

For the last six or seven years, almost all political youth organizations have suffered a terrible decline. The ferment, the debate and argument, the action that was once part and parcel of education in America have died down.

In its place there is an atmosphere of conservatism, apathy and cynicism.

We take our stand against this situation. We believe that radical facts demand radical answers, socialist answers.

We don't believe that youth can sit out the issues that effect them. We are against the conformist trend, against the banning of student clubs, the loyalty oaths, the fear on the campus. We are for making a beginning, here and now, and a beginning it is because there is a tough fight to make.

That beginning has to start with ideas. We must understand the radical facts, we must know why the Thirties was a decade of depression, the Forties of war; the Fifties of Jim Crow, impending holocaust in war and the new conformity. For us, that means that we have to have a socialist analysis, that we have to see these events as part of an over-all picture, as developing out of the very structure of this society.

But ideas, even radical ideas, are not enough. This is not a time only for academic discussion pure and simple, for banding together in polite little utopias of discussion. The ideas have to lead to action.

We have no illusions that we are going out to remake the world tomorrow morning. But we know that the world will never be changed if we simply hang around and wait for it to happen. We believe that we have to do something—whatever is possible, here and now.

"Young Socialist Challenge" is published by the Young Socialist League. That is an organization which does not simply discuss but which acts too.

This issue contains a short description of the YSL, and a series of articles which reflect the YSL view on the major issues of the day. The questions and answers which you will find here are radical because the facts before youth today are radical.

For us the only real answer is organized socialist action. That is what this issue means and what the YSL means.

We offer this as a challenge to the campus, a challenge to America's youth to face up to the radical facts!

Both Parties Have Turned Their Backs On the Heroic Negro Fight in the South

By SAM TAYLOR

The issue of desegregation of the schools, on the background of the great fight being made for it in the South, is today's challenge to the nation.

It shows how great are the gaps in American democracy. It puts every mealy-mouthed politician on the spot, including those that want to be president.

But behind the school-desegregation issue are the much broader problems of which the school issue is only a part. The South has not kept the Negro shackled under the bondage of Jim Crow just because of racist theories of "white supremacy."

The pattern of segregation throughout the South is a means of keeping the Negro in an inferior economic and social position, in the lowest paying jobs. It is a means of denying him the vote. It is a means of appeasing poor and ignorant

Southern whites by giving them someone to look down on.

Big business in the South and the Northern corporations with Southern bases of operation have an interest in the present economic status of the Negro, and so do the politicians who have staked their careers on the support of segregation.

The bastions of Southern racism could not have been expected to go down without resistance just because the Supreme Court adopted a decision. Initial successes, especially in the more liberal urban areas, which were at the same time accompanied by vacillating and weak-kneed attitudes in the government, served to

stiffen the resistance of reactionary elements who were alarmed by the successes but encouraged by the vacillation. Now these hardbitten white-supremacists feel that if they act tough enough, they can postpone the day of reckoning.

It is against this measure of the problem that we have to look at the preformance of the two major political parties. Both parties and their presidential candidates are cut out of the same cloth on this question, as they are on so many other issues.

They have deliberately and purposefully evaded the real issue in all public pronouncements. Neither has indicated the slightest desire to take leadership or responsibility for leading the struggle against segregation.

The civil-rights planks of both the Democratic and Republican platforms were worked out after long and hard toil—not to take a clear-cut stand but to evade and doubletalk, with the Republican plank coming out only a shade better

(Continued on page 4-C)

WHAT IS THE YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE?

The Young Socialist League is the only nation-wide socialist youth organization in the United States. It was organized in 1954 to spread the ideas of democratic socialism among students and young workers and to participate in the day-to-day struggle for democracy and equality.

Despite the efforts of defenders of American capitalism to picture this country as a perfect society which has solved, or is solving, all of its problems, thinking young people know that the American social fabric is rife with oppression, inequality and injustice. The vile suppression of the democratic rights of the Negro people in the South and elsewhere, the witchhunting assault on civil liberties and academic freedom, the economic insecurity felt by millions of workers in the face of today's "prosperity," and above all the possibility of another world war—all of these integral aspects of the "American Way of Life" bear down upon our people and the people of the world.

To aid all progressive efforts to better the people's lot and to educate for the socialist reorganization of society which will put an end to all exploitation and oppression of man by man—this is the purpose of the Young Socialist League.

THE STRUGGLE FOR NEGRO RIGHTS

The rising tide of militant struggle by the Negro people to realize their emancipation—which was proclaimed nearly one hundred years ago—is the most important development in our social and political life. This is a battle against all that is rotten and backward in the South and the nation as a whole; it is a struggle for democracy.

In response to this movement the government and the leading spokesmen of the Democratic and Republican Parties counsel "moderation" and hide the "extremists on both sides." Evading their clear-cut duty to take a stand on the side of those who struggle for their elementary rights, they content themselves with vague rhetoric in favor of civil rights.

We have done and will do all in our power to support the struggle of the Negro people for their rights. We say that it is the duty of the government to enforce the ruling against segregation in the schools and to make all acts of segregation and discrimination illegal. We call upon the Negro people and all progressive sections of the population to join in a mighty movement to demand the end of all oppression of the Negroes now.

CIVIL LIBERTIES AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Today, although some of the more flagrant aspects of McCarthyism have disappeared, the denial of civil liberties to communist party members and sympathizers, socialists and radicals has become part of the fabric of American life. Believers in unpopular ideas and members or sympathizers of organizations on the Attorney General's List are excluded from government jobs, teaching positions, and some fields of private employment.

We stand and fight for the fullest civil liberties for all, including those whose views we detest, such as Communist party members and fascists. We are for the right of all who are qualified to teach, to hold teaching positions. We support the right of students to organize freely, to hear speakers of their own choosing, and to have a democratic student government, without suppression or interference by the administration.

THE ROAD TO PEACE

All of humanity dreads the prospect of a new holocaust. And yet it threatens. Despite the fact that war does not loom imminently the way it did several years ago, no one believes or can believe that its prospect has been eliminated. Nor can it be so, as long as the rulers of the two war blocs are left in power.

At present the world is divided into two war camps which contend with each other for domination of the world. One side is led by the United States, the last stronghold of capitalism, which in order to hold on to its markets and positions of power, exercises imperialist sway over the whole capitalist world. It aligns itself with the forces of reaction everywhere, propping up the Francos and Chiang Kaisheks, supporting French and British imperialism in North Africa, Cyprus and elsewhere.

The other side, under the imperialist hegemony of Russia, consists of countries deceitfully described by those who rule them as "socialist." Far from being "socialist," these countries are run by a brutal ruling bureaucracy which exploits and oppresses the people. The revelations about Stalin by Khrushchev & Co. confirm this to the hilt. The present rulers, who were Stalin's accomplices and are now his heirs, are not ending and will not end voluntarily their totalitarian oppression of the Russian people.

THE THIRD CAMP

No peace will come from the likes of these. For the forces who can create a peaceful world we must look to those whose interests oppose the warmakers. We must look to the workers of the world and the oppressed colonial peoples.

We call this force the Third Camp, for its interests are opposed to the American and Russian war camps.

LABOR AND POLITICS

We support the struggles of labor to build a strong labor movement, to fight for economic and social advance. We favor all progressive policies and tendencies inside the unions and fight against racketeering and bureaucratic elements. We call upon the labor movement to organize a political party of its own, an independent Labor Party, as a necessary instrument in the struggle for labor's needs and democracy.

The Democratic Party is the party of Eastland in the South, the party of "White Supremacy." In the North it is the party of the bosses and city machines. Having controlled Congress most of the time since the war it has been unable even to repeal the Taft-Hartley Law, not to mention the long list of needed reforms reserved exclusively for liberal rhetoricians.

A victory of the Democratic Party puts the control of all leading Senate and

House committees in the hands of the Dixiecrates like Eastland and Co., who will fight any progressive demand by either labor or the Negro people. Such a party, based on a coalition of such conflicting forces, cannot offer progressive leadership to the American people.

SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY

The thread of democracy runs throughout all of these struggles. All involve an attempt to achieve greater control by mankind over its destiny. But capitalism by its very nature limits democracy; under it the means of production are in the hands of a tiny group upon whom all are dependent.

At the basis of the current "stability" of American capitalism lies the Permanent War Economy. World War II got us out of the depression and our vast armaments program keeps us out now. Capitalism cannot provide real peace and prosperity at the same time.

We call upon the working people of this country to take the running of industry into their own hands, to abolish the exploitation of man by man.

There can be no socialism without democracy nor a lasting or genuine democracy without socialism.

John the Young Socialist League—Join the Fight for a Better World!

Witchhunt Still Goes On In Post-McCarthy Climate

By RALPH HODGES

The "post-McCarthy" period is felt by many liberals to mean a decisive change in the civil-liberties picture in this country. The sanguine reasoning which accompanies the "post-McCarthy" characterization has as its premise the belief that what is wrong with civil liberties today is that there are certain practices and procedures—"excesses"—which need to be modified and reformed. Stevenson and Eisenhower, for example, mention their concern for the "innocent" victims who have been wrongfully treated because of "inadquacies" in the federal loyalty-security system and they call for the correction of the system's mistakes.

But to fall into the trap of simply calling for the reform of certain practices, is to concede the entire basis of a witchhunt which still continues today against non-conformist thought. While every civil-libertarian should be for such reforms, insofar as they are possible, it must be understood that any system which makes radical, socialist and other non-conformist views subject to governmental control or interference will be sure to produce "injustices."

The Attorney General's "subversive list" still exists and people are still persecuted on the basis of membership in listed organizations; the army gives dishonorable discharges to young men based on beliefs and associations which occurred prior to their entrance into military service; the House Un-American Activities Committee runs wild still; academic freedom and the rights of students are still being trampled on by university administrations and local patriots.

All of these instances and many more can be cited to demonstrate that what must be fought against are not "excesses" but the very nature of the "security" program.

THE NEW FEAR

Students and young people have a special interest in civil liberties. In two of the areas mentioned above, academic freedom and the military-security program, young men and women are directly affected.

The very quality of student freedom to stand up for unpopular ideas, to join organizations, and to pursue an intellectual life without fear of the pressures and penalties imposed by the representatives of orthodoxy, has declined drastically in the last ten years. Today students tend to take for granted situations in which they must weigh their words and actions for fear that in some future time a McCarthy will "get" them.

If proof is needed that the "post-McCarthy" period has not produced anything more than a more favorable climate, then let us list some examples of how the witchhunt continues.

At City College of New York the school administration still requires membership lists from the various recognized organizations. The meaning of this requirement is that the school officials want to hold a blackjack over any stu-

dent who has the temerity to join a "Marxist Discussion Group" or a Socialist Club. Presumably the list is private; but in fact it is open to any cop or snooper who takes an interest in student political life.

Fortunately, in this case, one can find the only meaningful manifestation of "post-McCarthyism"—that is, the students at CUNY have resisted the list requirement. It is resistance to the witchhunt, and not generous acts by officials, which has led to whatever improvement there has been in the civil-liberties atmosphere.

At the University of California, the administration maintains a "security" officer on campus to keep an eye on student political activity. The university officials claim that he is concerned only with personnel working on "secret" projects; in fact the activities of the "security" office reach right into student life.

At UCLA the administration sends spies to off-campus student political meetings and also into the classrooms of "suspect" teachers. What is crucial about the witchhunt on campus is not only the specific actions, but the threat which is held over teachers' and students' heads.

Any young man, student or worker, must account for his political (and social and personal!) associations and beliefs to the army.

He must swear to them that he has never harbored a dangerous thought, spoken to a subversive person, or joined a suspect organization. If he has committed one of these fiendish acts—even though he was a civilian at the time and not subject to military control—he must justify himself to men whose very lives and ideas stem from a rigorous undemocratic caste system. Note that we would say that if they were sterling democrats then they would have the right to judge the legality of the acts and thoughts of young citizens. Any civil-libertarian must: it's none of the army's business what the opinions or associations of its recruits are; their business is only his performance as a soldier.

Parenthetically, let us say that if the Sidney Hooks who show so much concern over the "abuse" of the Fifth Amendment and the "problem" of Communist teachers were really concerned with what is happening to civil liberties, they would write and talk about this problem. Instead they write articles on the "ethics" of the Fifth Amendment, and keep their mouths closed over the very real persecutions going on, for example, in the army.

We of the Young Socialist League believe that students and teachers must

(Continued on page 3-C)

GET ACQUAINTED!

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

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

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

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

SCHOOL (IF ANY).....TEL.....

The Stalinists' New Turn: LYL Heads for a Face-Lifting

By GEORGE POST

The entire Stalinist world has been sent reeling by the impact of the 20th Party Congress of the USSR Communist Party in February of this year. Charges which the Stalinist faithful have always labeled "lies" and "perversions" are now admitted to have been true by the current leadership of the Russian state, by the leading figure in the bureaucratic class which rules Russia with a totalitarian hand.

This has touched off an irrepres-sible spate of discussion within the Stalinist world, and within the American Communist Party. Once the discussion has been opened as fully and drastically as it has been, there is no way to close Pandora's box.

Especially among those who joined the Communist Party or the Stalinist youth organizations within the past ten years or so, this drastic 'changing of the guard' has created serious doubts about their allegiance to the Communist movement. The Stalinist youth, having had less time to go through the corrupting experiences that the Stalinist world offers its members, many of whom are sincere radicals, are in greater distress than their elders. At least this is true among those who were recruited on the basis of politics rather than on the basis of the amorphous folk singing, pony-tail, blue-jeans atmosphere which is one of the hallmarks of the current Stalinist youth operations.

The first official reaction among the leaders of the Labor Youth League was to play the same old record, to do business in the same way at the same stand. Their line was: little has changed; little needed to be changed; Russia is after all a socialist society; true, a great man gone wrong, Stalin, has committed errors, blunders, mistakes, perhaps even sins, which had to be corrected by "criticism and self-criticism," but still there are only minor adjustments to be made.

In this mood, the leadership of the Labor Youth League refused to answer a written challenge by the Young Socialist League to debate the major issue raised by the 20th Party Congress: the nature of Stalinism and the Stalinist state. Only after constant pressure by the Young Socialist League, a pressure

designed to bring the issues involved squarely before the LYL rank and file, and after the consequent questioning of the LYL leadership by the membership on why they had not accepted the YSL's challenge, did the LYL leadership meet with YSL to discuss a possible debate.

There were several meetings in June, but the LYL has yet to agree to a debate which would clearly force the LYL leadership to discuss Russia and their attitudes toward it. It is hoped that in the near future such a debate can be arranged.

Politics continues to be de-emphasized by the Labor Youth League. Any thorough examination of its magazine the *New Challenge* (no relation, not even an illegitimate one, to this periodical) can be completed in ten minutes, for it never contains any articles which have much to do with politics or ideas. Based in format on the ten-cent, pocket-sized "girlie" magazines, the intellectual and political content of the *New Challenge* is objectively on the same level.

A great emphasis is placed upon the social activities of the organization, and "political" life for many teen-age LYL-ers does not differ very greatly from the life of non-political teen-age clubs. The LYL is led by a group of ancient "youth" leaders, who have been involved in Stalinist youth politics for upward of fifteen and more years. (The outgoing national chairman of the LYL, Leon Wofsy, is reputed to have a teen-age child of his own who is old enough to be eligible for membership in the LYL.)

WHITEWASH AHEAD

The meeting of the National Council of the LYL in May of this year indicated clearly the direction in which the organization was moving. It will ratify the new line of the CP as contained in the CP National Committee's draft political resolution, with no genuine debate except that stirred up within its ranks by adherents of certain groups such as the independent Stalinist-Sweezeyites and the American Socialist-Cochranite group.

Leon Wofsy's report to this May meeting was a perfect harbinger—as is to be expected—of the CP National Committee resolution. All the "mistakes" of the past of the LYL are laid at the doorstep of short-sighted politics, narrow-minded bureaucratic leaders, misinterpretation of the political situation in the U. S. and isolation from the youth and the working class. While all of these, of course, are true, they require explanation in turn, for by themselves they do not amount to a relevant explanation for the crisis and isolation of the LYL.

Any relevant explanation would have to deal with the fact that (1) the LYL has always been a pliant tool of the CP, with no real independence. (Incidentally, while we oppose the inclusion of the LYL on the Attorney General's "subversive list" because we oppose the entire list, including the listing of the CP on it.) (2) The American CP has never since the late twenties developed its own program, but has had its program handed down to it by the Russian bureaucratic ruling class. (3) The monolithic, totalitarian nature of the Communist movement stems from the monolithic, totalitarian, anti-socialist and reactionary nature of the Russian state and the Russian ruling class.

TO "BROADEN"

There have been many hints, although as yet no absolutely certain indication, that the LYL will either be dissolved and replaced by a newer, broader, "avowedly non-Marxist" organization of the type of the wartime American Youth for Democracy and the post-war Young Progressive

Citizens of America and Young Progressives of America, in which the Stalinist leadership was carefully buried and which appealed to all "liberal and progressive" youth; or it may be "broadened" into such an organization while maintaining the same name.

Whatever the actual form may be—and this will be dictated by the CP's assessment of the situation—the actuality will be that LYLers will function in a careful, conservative fashion within campus NAACPs, the SDA, the Young Democrats, and similar Democratic Party and liberal organizations. (It is reported that at the recent convention of the California Young Democrats, a Crypto-LYLER was almost elected as that organization's representative to the Democratic National Committee.)

They will be hard to spot for those students who have not had experience dealing with Stalinists, and they can, if not challenged and combated, play not insignificant roles in such organizations.

The many honest, radical youth within the Labor Youth League who believe that they are part of an autonomous organization with only political ties with the Communist Party must look to the current events within the Communist Party in order to learn the anti-democratic nature of Stalinist politics and Stalinist organizations.

The forthcoming convention of the CP, postponed from the original September (and then December) dates, will occur one year after the 20th Party Congress, a year in which the Stalinist leadership has worked arduously to hold together a Stalinist party. (The LYL convention also has been postponed from the original November date to February.) But the CP convention, while it may have more discussion than previous CP conventions, will not be a democratic one.

DECISIONS MADE

The basic decisions have already been made. The outline of these decisions has been made eminently clear by the Draft Political Resolution recently issued by the National Committee of the Communist Party.

The Communist Party is going to execute the change in line unanimously dictated by the Russian 20th Party Congress. The convention will only act to formalize the decisions taken by the national committee, although dissident voices may be raised. This will follow the precedent of all previous CP conventions since the late 1920s.

The CP National Committee statement disavows the "left orientation" of the Progressive Party period as a mistake—and comes out for a "people's anti-monopoly crusade," in short for the line of the Popular Front and of the so-called Browder period. This will entail support for the Democratic Party, although figures around the Communist movement, such as Harry Bridges, have indicated that there is some sentiment for backing the Republican Party instead, as the party most likely to preserve peace, i.e., to handle American foreign relations so ineptly as to play into the hands of the USSR. (Not that there are basic policy differences between the Republicans and the Democrats—but Dulles-Eisenhower are more inept than were Acheson-Truman.)

While acknowledging—as they must, given the fact that Khrushchev has told them that they must—that the CP was wrong in not offering "fraternal and constructive criticism" of the Soviet Union and the "peoples' democracies," the National Committee places all the blame for this upon its own mistaken view that any public criticism would hurt the USSR rather than aid it, and, of course, it claims that the 20th Party Congress and the "process of self-correction" in Russia and the "peoples' democracies" "are irrefutable evidence of the historic role and vitality of the socialist system." Not a word, of course, which might indicate that the American CP is the puppet manipulated by the Russian Stalinist ruling class, that it could not criticize that class because the

master would not allow it. Not a word, of course, that would even acknowledge that there might be some question about the "socialist" nature of the USSR.

The draft resolution discusses bureaucracy in the party—in the same way as Khrushchev did—and talks about the "establishment of closest ties between membership and leadership," it offers the most minimal set of changes possible. These include the continuation of a monthly publication, such as the current *Party Voice*, to be "devoted exclusively to articles or letters discussing, debating or differing with party policies," and "Minutes of National Board meetings must be circulated among all members of the National Committee."

This last provision reveals the incredible lack of democracy within the CP, in which the National Committee, which elects the National Board, has not been entitled previously to the minutes of the meetings of that board.

STILL SEETHING

But any basic restructuring of the party, of course, is not contemplated. The document specifically prohibits the right to create factions with a factional press, the only real safeguard for democracy within a democratic working-class party: such factions, they avow, would destroy the monolithic "unity" of the party, which must be preserved at all costs.

The document reveals that the Dennis tendency—the official 'Stalinists' leadership of the party—has emerged victorious; the opposing wings led by John Gates and William Z. Foster were forced to vote for the Dennis document. That group in the party which was most severely shaken by the events of the past eight months and which called for the liquidation of the party was explicitly attacked.

But it also reveals that the party underneath the surface of the leadership is still seething. That is indicated when the document must promise a monthly discussion publication, must make even very moderate changes allowing for a modicum more democracy, must explicitly attack the "liquidationist" tendency (you don't have to attack a group which has no strength, for such a group can be best dealt with by ignoring it).

While it is predictable that the CP will make the turn demanded by the new line of the Russian bureaucratic ruling class, nevertheless this must have the impact of disillusioning certain segments of the CP's rank and file and sympathizers, of breaking them away from the CP.

Although the CP will continue in its present form, its ranks will be even further depleted; its significance in American life even further diminished. Among the youth especially it is hoped that the greatest disillusionment will occur.

N. Y. YSL • SCHEDULE

- All meetings at
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.
- Thur., Oct. 11—at 8:30**
Joint meeting with ISL:
CIVIL RIGHTS AND
THE CANDIDATES
Speaker: Max Martin
- Fri., Oct. 19—at 8:30**
FOREIGN POLICY AND
THE ELECTION
Speaker: Sam Taylor
- Sat., Oct. 27—at 9**
YSL PARTY: Dancing,
Folk-Dancing, Folk-sing,
Refreshments, Social
- Fri., Nov. 2—at 8:30**
Pre-election forum:
IS THERE A CHOICE
IN THE '56 ELECTION?
- Columbus Day Weekend Camp:**
N. Y. YSL Camp, from Friday lunch
(Oct. 12) through Sunday supper
(Oct. 14), at Mountain Spring Camp
in New Jersey . . . all kinds of sports
and recreation, and educational talks;
Saturday social . . . For details, phone
or write N. Y. YSL office, WA 4-4222.
Phone immediately — reservations
limited.

Witchhunt — —

(Continued from page 2-C)

wage a vigorous campaign to eradicate not only the "spirit" of McCarthyism but also the system which calls it forth.

We, like all real civil-libertarians, defend the rights of all political tendencies to have a voice and to present their views. We defend the right of a Communist Party member to teach on the ground that the only proper criterion for the maintenance of academic status is competence.

Moreover, we call for a student "bill of rights":

- (1) The right to join and to organize freely on campus in student groups without fear of administrative reprisal or spying.
- (2) The right to a student government independent of university control.
- (3) The right to publish and to propagate students' views on all subjects.
- (4) The right to hear any speaker of their choice without administrative veto or "screening."
- (5) The right to be free to study and write on whatever subject one may be interested in, subject to the limitations only of relevance.
- (6) The right to organize, as students, to protect these rights against the administration or even the faculty.

These demands, these rights, are basic to any program for civil liberties on the campus. We Young Socialists call upon liberal, progressive students and teachers to support them and to work for their establishment. Thereby perhaps we may soon see the re-establishment of an atmosphere of free inquiry and free association on the American campus.

What Choice for Youth? — —

(Continued from page 1-C)

managed a "unity" which embraces Jim Eastland and Walter Reuther.

In other words, he has subordinated the progressive pro-civil-rights forces to the power of the most reactionary elements in his party. What can we expect from such a man as president? A strong stand on civil rights?

Take foreign policy.

We live in a revolutionary world. The most gigantic fact of our time is the crumbling of the edifice of Western imperialism. The colonial masses, the workers of Europe, are anti-capitalist.

Against this background, Russia and the United States have led their respective blocs in a titanic battle which has threatened man with an atomic holocaust. Stalinism has come forth as an "anti-imperialist" imperialism, opposed to the imperialism of the West, dedicated to its own totalitarian imperialism. But because it is also anti-capitalist, it has been able to rally millions to its banners, it boasts of huge Communist Parties in Western Europe, of volunteer armies in Asia. It falsely parades before the peoples of the world as the inheritor of the October Revolution, as the embodiment of socialism.

WHO'S FREE?

The American response to this challenge was initiated by Truman and Acheson, continued by Eisenhower and it is today supported by Stevenson. It is based upon a series of military alliances which are completely indiscriminate in their "anti-Communism," numbering Chiang Kai-shek and Franco and French repression in North Africa as part of the "Free World." America's camp has been the camp of the status quo and of reaction.

There has been a total inability to frame a political response to a political challenge. Those who are in fact the peoples of the free world, the workers, the colonial masses, the oppressed under Stalinism, find themselves often enough looking down American-supplied gun barrels in Algeria, Indochina, Cyprus and the like.

Stevenson and Eisenhower are agreed on this basic policy. They both support the system of reactionary military alliances. John Foster Dulles has, of course, carried out this policy with an incomparable flair for bumbling, and Stevenson might well improve the style or the finesse of U.S. foreign policy; but its substance remains bipartisan and tragic.

Assume, for example, a Stevenson victory; assume that Chester Bowles, a liberal who has shown a considerable understanding of the necessity of America's coming to grips with the colonial revolution, was appointed secretary of State. As long as America backs NATO, Bowles would have to contradict his own analysis; for our support of France stands between us and the people of North Africa, our support of England divides us from the people of the Middle East.

Stevenson has not demonstrated any inclination to break with this basic policy, and as long as this remains true, one cannot speak of alternatives in foreign policy as between the two parties.

WITCHHUNT TO GO ON

Civil liberties? It's not even an issue between them in this campaign. There will be charge and counter-charge on the notorious "numbers game" of the Republicans, but the basic institutions of the witchhunt—the Attorney General's List, the Smith Act, the so-called Loyalty and Security Program—are safe for another four years.

After all, the witchhunt was begun by the Democrats under Truman, it was continued by Eisenhower, and there is no reason to expect that Stevenson will act differently. The bill this spring to increase the sentences under the Smith Act was a bipartisan orgy of "anti-Communism," and there has been no word of dissent from Stevenson.

Finally, there is the issue of domestic social legislation.

Since 1938—the date when the ruling legislative coalition of reactionary Southerners and Republicans took over—America has not seen a single major piece of social legislation. The Dixiecrat coalition has been strengthened by the Stevenson unity strategy and there is no reason to expect a change on that score.

On other issues, the two parties vary: the Democrats are better on public power in the Pacific Northwest, but then they are committed to the natural-gas giveaway bill and the tidelands oil deal. But important as these issues are, they are peripheral. The main fact about social legislation is that the reactionary coalition in Congress has been strengthened by the Stevenson campaign and is not challenged by Eisenhower.

Thus, on the basic issues there is no fundamental disagreement between the Democratic and Republican Parties this year. They stand together for a continuation of a militarist and reactionary response to the challenge of Stalinism. Neither offers any real hope for civil rights, though the Republicans have a greater potential on this score; both ignore civil liberties; and neither stands for any real opposition to the coalition of reactionary Southerners and Republicans which has blocked all major social legislation for the last eighteen years.

THE INDEPENDENT WAY

But what about compromise, what about the "lesser evil"?

To begin with, it is clear that a certain amount of compromise is essential in politics. But in compromise, one side gives up something and gets something in return.

The Stevenson strategy has been to lead the progressive forces which are inside the Democratic Party to give up many things, including principles, without getting anything in return.

And a similar conclusion holds true for the argument of the lesser evil. It is not a lesser evil when a party stifles progressive possibilities, when it fails, not our socialist ideals, but its own liberal potentialities. That is a headlong retreat which must be fought, not a lesser evil to be supported.

But is our analysis then simply negative? Do we say "a plague on both their houses" and leave it at that?

The answer to this question has been implied in what has gone before. There are progressive forces in the United States; indeed they represent the majority of the population: the labor movement, the militant Negroes, the liberals, those two-thirds of the American farm families who have been untouched by the agricultural programs of the last two decades.

Today, these forces are subordinated to the unity of the Democratic Party; they are the tail to the kite. At the Democratic convention in Chicago, they were silenced by their support of Stevenson and his tactic of unity.

In 1948 this coalition could get the Democrats to make a verbal commitment to a militant program and they won the election. In the four years that followed, not a single major plank of the Fair Deal was passed into law.

This year this progressive coalition suffered defeat even on the terminology of the platform. Their hope for a legislative enactment of their program is even less than it was in 1948.

The years have made it plain that there is no way out of this impasse in the Democratic Party.

The 1956 convention of the Democrats underscored the point, if that were necessary. The way out is for these progressive forces to speak and act in the name of their own independent politics. The way out is a labor party.

Such a party would not be loaded down with the Eastlands and the other Southern reactionaries; such a party could speak out in the name of its own politics without being the tail to a "unity" kite.

In 1948, as we pointed out, the Demo-

crats won the election on a liberal rhetoric and without the South; but then the nature of the party stopped them from doing a thing about all the brave words even if they had wanted to. Not so with a labor party. Its majority could not be subverted from the inside as in the case of the Democrats. It could do more than win an election—it could put through a program.

The kind of party we are talking about would not, at the beginning, be socialist, though socialists would support it. It would not have a "perfect" program. But if it began only by working for the policies of the organized labor movement as it is today, that could be a tremendous step forward.

LABOR'S ROAD

In foreign policy, there could be at least the beginning of a political appeal to the masses through labor's ties with workers and unions throughout the world; on civil rights, labor has been the largest section of the country to come to the aid of the Negroes; on civil liberties, labor has made a fight on the basis of job security, even if belatedly and inadequately; and on domestic social legislation, labor has stood for public housing, TVA, aid to education—in fact, for almost every single progressive measure put before the American people.

Such a party, we repeat, would not achieve utopia overnight. But when one compares it to the sorry spectacle of Stevenson and his Democratic Party today, one can understand immediately what a gain it would be.

And the road to that labor party does not lie along the way of "critical" support of a reactionary unity; it is only by demanding that the progressive forces stand up independently and fight for their own program that we can achieve this aim. For that reason, we refuse to make the fake "choice" between Stevenson and Eisenhower; we commit ourselves to working for the only real choice, for a labor party.

Negro Fight in the South — —

(Continued from page 1-C)

than the Democrats' complete knuckle-down to the South. The Democrats found it impossible even to come out for the Supreme Court decision as "the law of the land." Instead they wrote that it was "part of the law of the land," a variant fitted to the segregationist argument which holds that the state's right to legislate segregation is the "other part of the law."

But worse than the platform has been the failure of the liberal and labor forces inside of the Democratic Party to make a vigorous fight for the passage of a strong civil-rights plank. They put up the minimum token "floor fight" and now supinely console themselves with thoughts about the danger to America if Nixon becomes president.

SMALL CONSOLATION

They are now in the process of trying to make us believe that because Nixon is an opportunist, it is necessary to make an alliance with such "principled" men as Talmadge and Eastland. One could only wish that liberals had the strength of their principles such as the Dixiecrats demonstrate for theirs.

It is also small consolation to make a comparison with the shameless inaction of the Eisenhower administration. The GOP government stands up and fights vigorously only for the interests of the scions of wealth and privilege. If Eisenhower thinks that it does not matter whether or not he as president supports the Supreme Court's decision, this statement reveals nothing new about this Republican administration. But why does it follow that liberals must hail the pussy-footing displayed by the Democratic candidate?

Adlai Stevenson has often raised the question of the "need for a strong president" and "the responsibilities of leadership." Yet the most he has been able to say thus far is that he "accepts" the court's decision; and then he hastens to reiterate, as he did in his Little Rock speech, that he supports the Democratic platform on civil rights. No Dixiecrat need fear a man who says he stands on that platform.

Nor does it suffice to make a big point

that Eisenhower is president and he has the responsibility for leadership; while Stevenson is "only a candidate." Does it follow that he has no responsibilities as a leader?

Stevenson's major point is that the other fellow should act—viz., that the president should call a conference of the opposing sides as the solution. It is like the rest of Stevenson's little jokes. The effectiveness of such an approach can readily be seen if we try to imagine a conference at which James Eastland and Herman Talmadge sit down with Roy Wilkins and Walter Reuther to iron out the misunderstandings and difficulties over desegregation.

Last year when the Eisenhower administration called the White House Conference on Education as a substitute for doing anything about relieving the growing shortage of schools, liberals and the labor movement ridiculed the conference approach as a substitute for action. Conferences, commissions and "impartial citizens committees" are a time-honored technique which both parties use to avoid action. What makes Stevenson's proposal the essence of wisdom now, while Eisenhower's use of it was the essence of inaction and evasion?

The reality of the situation is that the Dixiecrats, with or without the white hoods, and inside or outside the White Citizens Councils, are not going to be talked out of segregation at a conference.

Perhaps it is thought and hoped that a conference will put some spine in Southern liberals, enough for them to crawl out of their holes, but the sad fact is that they have bowed under in face of the racist pressure. They will come out when the federal government and the labor movement indicate that they are ready to meet the Talmadges, Eastlands and Shiverscrats head on.

DEMOS CAN'T DO IT

The responsibility of leadership is to make clear what has to be done to destroy the roadblocks to desegregation which the Dixiecrats have been erecting. What will be the answer to governors such as Shivers of Texas, who, after defying a federal district court order to desegre-

gate the school in Mansfield, challenged the federal government to cite him for contempt of court?

The Democratic Party leadership of the seven Southern states which form the hard core of racist resistance have announced their plans. In general, it is a series of legal devices designed to circumvent the Supreme Court decision to proceed toward desegregation with "all deliberate speed." What will a conference accomplish in face of this provocation?

It can probably be said in all fairness that Stevenson and Eisenhower are personally for a desegregation program. So are many other well-intentioned people in both parties. This has little to do with the reality of Republican or Democratic Party politics.

The Democratic Party is not the party of liberalism, of progress and the "New America." It is a mass of contradictions containing the most diversified elements in American society, including the most reactionary, the Southern racists.

The Democratic Party is incapable of carrying out a civil-rights program as long as the Southern congressmen control the decisive committee chairmanships and the Senate filibuster rules are unbroken.

Stevenson and his supporters made the decision to cement their alliance with Southern reaction and the Northern big city machines concurred in it. And when the labor movement went along with this alliance, it became the tragedy of the 1956 elections.

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the *Challenge* or the YSL.