

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 22, 1954

FIVE CENTS

## Court Gets Appeal on Shachtman Passport Case

The Shachtman passport case has been appealed to the U. S. Court of Appeals, in a test of the State Department's right to refuse a passport on the ground that an applicant is connected with an organization listed as "subversive" by the attorney general's office.

This is the second leg of the case's journey to a decision. The case involves Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, and his application for a passport.

Earlier this year, the Passport Office definitely denied the passport, clearly stating that the reason was the "subversive" listing of the ISL by the Department of Justice. In March the Passport Office denied Shachtman the right to appeal this decision to a passport appeals board.

The case was then taken to the courts—to the U. S. District Court for D. C.—by attorney Joseph L. Rauh Jr., acting for Shachtman, in an action asking for injunction and declaratory judgment against the State Department. The government made a motion before the court to dismiss, basing itself on the general discretionary right of the State Department to do what it wills with passports. On August 2, the District Court decided for the motion to dismiss. Now the case moves up a notch toward a test of the arbitrary government position.

The passport policy of the State Department, as expressed in a number of cases in addition to Shachtman's, is an integral part of the witchhunt pressed by government agencies against radical, non-conformist, socialist and Marxist dissenters in this country and not only against Stalinists.

In the brief filed before the Court of Appeals by Joseph Rauh and his associated attorneys Daniel H. Pollitt and Mitchell J. Cooper, the legal basis of the case is summarized in two arguments, as follows:

(1) The law requires the secretary of state to exercise its discretion in the granting of passports, but the State Department failed to do this (i.e., exercise its own discretion) when it relied solely and simply on the "subversive" designation of the attorney general—"which designation bears no relationship to the issuance of passports and which was made without notice or hearing."

(2) "The Passport Act and Executive Order 7856, as applied to appellant [Shachtman], are unconstitutional, in that they abridge his freedom to travel, speak and assemble in violation of the First Amendment, and in that they deprive him of liberty and property without due process of law in violation of the Fifth Amendment."

The point made in the first argument, involving "discretion," is a point on which the higher courts have more than once opposed the government's case, as in the Kutcher case.

### IMPORTANT ISSUES UP

The brief further summarizes the larger questions of law and democracy to be decided in this case, in its "Statement of Questions Presented":

"(1) Does the District Court have jurisdiction to review the final action of the Secretary of State denying appellant a passport when the Passport Act lodges exclusive discretionary authority in the Secretary of State, and when, as here, the Secretary of State denied the passport solely because the attorney general,

in an *ex parte* proceeding, had designated an organization, of which appellant is the chairman, as subversive for purposes of the Federal Employee Loyalty-Security Program?

"(2) Does a complaint state a cause of action under the First Amendment" and "(3) Does a complaint state a cause of action under the Fifth Amendment," given the circumstances of the State Department's denial of a passport to Shachtman?

The heart of Attorney Rauh's brief deals with the question of civil liberty and passports and how it has been treated in the courts. Because of its general interest and the importance of the case, an early issue of LABOR ACTION will publish this section.

## SPOTLIGHT

### Mendes-France Shoots

Among the phenomena of our time is the readiness of presumably independent-thinking liberals to squeal delightedly like intellectual bobby-soxers at the sight of a Great Man going into action to Save the People. (Psychosociological footnotes on "charisma" are in order at this point; please add to suit.) The swooning of the international intelligentsia before one such savior, Mendès-France, is likely to come to a bad end pretty soon.

From Max Lerner, who rather tended to regard the French premier as an inspired mixture of FDR and Moses, to a prominent British anti-colonialist, who hailed him as setting a model to Britain for anti-imperialist action, Mendès-France appealed for what seemed to be

his enlightened ability to change the spots on French imperialism. Did he not make the deal on Indochina (even though with gun to temple)? Did he not promise freedom to the Tunisians?

Now we read that the negotiations for a degree of autonomy for Tunisians, between Paris and the moderate Neo-Destour leader Bourguiba, are in a bog; it would seem that the Great Man's original commitments on the subject were sort of exaggerated in the outburst of liberty-loving talk that he permitted himself. And on page 3 of this issue, you may read of the Great Man's military expedition against the Algerian helots of French colonialism, answering demands for liberty with a liberal outlay of cold steel.

It's a terrible life that liberal illusionists lead.

### The Pope and Hookism

The pope's statement of November 3 on the church's scope of authority is a very interesting document from more than one standpoint; right now we wish to comment on its relevance to a somewhat peripheral question: the issue of academic freedom and civil liberties in the U. S.

It means that—according to the doctrine which effectively prevails in this country on the ideological qualifications for teachers, according to the doctrine of which Sidney Hook is the leading theoretician and of which every witchhunting school board in the country is an effective practitioner—a devout and practising Catholic has no right to be a teacher.

For ourselves, we repudiate with abhorrence both this conclusion and the reasoning behind it.

What is the connection between this  
(Continued on page 4)

## Dilemma of the Democratic Party

... page 6

## Guns Against the Algerian People

... page 3

BOLIVIA: U.S. Wins a Round ... page 3

BRAZIL: The Rise of Janio ... page 7

BRITAIN: Bevanites vs. the Exec ... page 4

## THE McCARTHY TRIAL

# Something's Wrong With the Picture

By PHILIP COBEN

No doubt every decent person in the country is rooting on the side of the angels as Joe McCarthy agonizes before the Senate in his trial for political life. The elimination of this SS-type witchhunter from the political happy hunting grounds of Washington would be an undoubted asset to humanity; and the side of the angels is not his. But anyone who tries to spot the angels more exactly will have trouble.

There is something wrong about the picture in Washington as the righteous wrath of the Good Guys descends upon the Bad Guys.

We suggest some thoughts, with texts attached, for an unastigmatic view of the decline and fall of Joseph McCarthy, if that is what is in the cards.

A Washington columnist, Thomas L. Stokes, gets a feeling of "irony" about it all:

"The irony is this: Sen. McCarthy is not being 'tried' for what has come to be called 'McCarthyism'—that is, indignities heaped upon witnesses, charges that he never proved, tarnishing of reputations, slandering of innocent persons, at least, so as the great bulk of such cases is concerned. No—he is indicted in the censure resolution only for abuse of five senators and a general, persons with power to protect themselves and fight back. Senators finally did fight back—but for themselves. They have not raised the issues at all in the proceedings now before the Senate in behalf of the smaller fry who can't fight back for themselves." (Nov. 16.)

### THE INNER CLUB

William S. White, a veteran *Times* Washington correspondent, writing in his paper's magazine section of Nov. 7, explains the Senate's reaction to McCarthy in terms which go far beyond his intended explanation. He expounds at first, as others have done, the fact that McCarthy overstepped Senate bounds not by his anti-democratic excesses but by his irresponsible senator-baiting, thus offending the rules of the gentlemen's club that is the Senate. And then he goes on incidentally to describe who runs this club.

It is a lesson about the internal mechanisms of class control in capitalist parliamentarianism.

Let's throw this into the picture: "Since what is now being examined is the high club respect of the Senate—the Senate as it is inside—the most important single fact about the coming great trial is wrapped in the intangibles of personality, and specifically the personalities corporate and individual of the Watkins committee. All are unimpeachably conservative; one cannot be a 'Senate type,' and be otherwise. No avowed liberal is ever quite a 'Senate type' because he is never wholly and without reservation accepted into what now must be described as the club within a club that is the center of all ultimate power in the Senate.

"This club within a club is a loose, entirely informal and rarely even mentioned personal association of men—Republicans and Democrats—who may disagree on many things but are consciously

(Turn to last page)



London *New Statesman* and *Nation*

# LABOR SCOPE

## Left-Wing Group In Socialist Party Puts Out Platform

## Guilty Conscience... Tourism and Labor Party... New UAW Demand

By BEN HALL

One congressman who voted for the Humphrey-Butler bill outlawing the Communist party was John F. Shelley, Democrat of California. Since then, he hasn't been able to sleep well. At least, that is what he says according to the *Dispatcher*, official publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

This bill, it will be remembered, was opposed by the labor movement, mainly because it gave the Subversive Activities Control Board authority over unions; but after the bill was passed very few unions protested with any vigor against it. Shelley is not only a representative; he is a very prominent AFL leader in California.

The *Dispatcher* reports that he attacked the new law, for which he voted, as a measure which endangers "fundamental liberties." In speeches before the Commonwealth Club and the San Francisco Central Labor Council he regretted the moment of weakness in which he capitulated to the witchhunt hysteria.

"I cast one vote which in the 13 years of my legislative experience is the only vote I ever regret casting," he said, "and that was for the so-called bill to outlaw the Communist Party." And he went on to say, "We did not even have the bill before us," explaining that typewritten notes on the measure were hastily passed around just before the vote.

"The pressure was on: you can't vote against it. I passed twice, then weekly went down and said Aye. I have tossed every night since, wishing I'd said No."

There are very few ardent fighters for democracy; at least there are some guilty consciences.

### Tourism and Labor Party

It seems that there is a Labor Party in Britain but none in the United States. It would appear, too, that whenever American labor officials visit Britain their minds are prodded a bit and the formation of a workers' political party doesn't seem so silly after all.

Not long ago, George Meany was a case in point. Now it's Paul L. Phillips, president of the AFL Brotherhood of Paper Makers, who attended the recent convention of the British Trade Union Congress at Brighton, England.

It is nice to read what he told the British labor delegates but it would be

even nicer to hear him tell it to his own AFL now that he is home:

"In the United States, we do not have a 'labor movement,' certainly not in the full scope of the term as you have. A true labor movement, of course [note that "of course"] is divided into three parts: trade unions, political party, and co-operatives. You have all three. In my country the first part is divided while the other two parts are still missing...

"Politically, labor in the United States is weak and, to a great extent, ineffective. This is not to say it is impotent, for on occasion when thoroughly aroused, the workers have effectively united politically. This is, unfortunately, the exception rather than the rule. In practically all political elections, we must have a score-card to distinguish our friends from our enemies, for there is no party or political organization around whose banner and principles workers can rally. This stems from a deep-seated prejudice and distrust of direct political action. Naturally, this is a legacy of Samuel Gompers' philosophy of relying solely upon delayed timing in political action, to reward your friends and defeat your enemies, a philosophy which is impractical in the political climate of today."

### New UAW Demands

The UAW has transmitted to all auto and truck manufacturers under contract with it a firm and urgent request for statistics. The union wants to know certain basic facts, namely: what is the expected production at each plant, month by month, from November 1954 to the end of 1955, and what is the expected employment for the same period at these plants.

What is more vital to a worker than to know whether he will get work or not? As the UAW letter puts it, "As the recognized representatives of the workers employed by your company, we are legally and morally entitled to the above information so that our members will know where they stand and what they can expect. Auto workers are people and not tools of production that can be mothballed when not needed. They are human beings with families who must be fed and clothed and sheltered 52 weeks of the year."

Yet, simple as this request might seem, we assume that it will meet with bitter resistance from the employers, especially from the Big Three who will undoubtedly

detect in it a further encroachment by labor on what the corporations consider their sacred rights of ownership.

The letter explains the background for the request. In early 1953, the big auto companies began a production race; they scoured the country, recruiting new workers from the Deep South and other non-industrial areas. Thousands of workers left their homes and resettled. At that time, the union protested that management's production policy was "anti-social and will result not only in disrupting the lives and security of individual workers and their families but it will seriously affect many communities by placing upon them costly burdens resulting from the economic dislocation and unemployment."

The warning proved prophetic. After a few months of intense production, mass layoffs hit as the assembly lines slowed down. The new workers, lured by promises of steady jobs, were thrown on the streets to make their way back home as best they could, or to try desperately to get on local relief rolls.

The end of 1954 brings forebodings of another production race, so disastrous for the workers. Production schedules for December have been set so high that they cannot possibly be maintained for the whole of 1955. Again the UAW cautions, "we are seriously disturbed by the possibility that a reckless production race in the early months of 1955, similar to that of 1953, may bring with it a repetition of the irresponsible and anti-social policies of recruiting additional workers for only a few months of employment, to be followed by widespread layoffs and short work-weeks for the industry's regular employees later in the year."

And so, the union wants to know what next year's production and employment schedule will be, month by month.

But obviously, the UAW is not interested in this information merely to complete its reference files in neat order. If it is not satisfied with the report of any company for any month, it will protest; it will demand revisions. In other words, what the UAW now demands is that the basic scheduling of production and employment ceases to be the unilateral right of employers and enters the sphere of collective bargaining. The union demands a voice in production.

And this is what the big corporations will resist.

## Government Purge Victimizes a Socialist

A clear-cut case of government persecution of a socialist for his political convictions has been made public in the case of Robert W. S. Browne, who on September 30 was dismissed from his job as exhibits worker at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington.

The socialist group to which Browne belongs, Libertarian Socialist League, is not only anti-Stalinist but moreover one which is not even on the attorney general's "subversive list." Yet Browne was witchhunted out of his means of livelihood.

So weak and worthless were any possible pretexts for firing Browne from his job—which is formally classified as "non-sensitive"—on security grounds, that the actual excuse for his firing was made out to be a couple of minor misstatements on a form he filled out. But the record

conclusively proves the real motivations.

During a series of investigations, inquiries and harassments over his membership in the socialist group, Browne was repeatedly shown the nature of the "evidence" against him. On July 9 he was handed an "interrogatory" (a series of leading questions regarding his political activities and opinions) signed by the chairman of the Smithsonian security board. The interrogatory wanted to know such things as whether he was a member of the LSL; whether he agreed with the LSL in being for "socialistic revolution"; whether he would "support the U. S. in a war against the Soviet Union"; whether he would be a conscientious objector if drafted; whether he would "cooperate with the FBI if it was investigating an organization to see whether or not it was subversive, even though you were a member of that organization"; whether he had ever stated he was "opposed to the American form of government"; and other such questions revealing the witchhunting mentality.

Exactly a week after the receipt of this interrogatory, Browne's wife, also an active socialist, who was employed in private industry, was summarily fired from her job—no notice given, no reason given. The personnel officer told her, "This matter is extremely confidential, and will not be discussed even with you." There can be no doubt about the "mystery" here.

### HYPOCRITICAL PRETEXT

On September 9, the personnel office suggested to Browne that he resign; he refused, of course. On September 15 he received his routine "efficiency" rating,

which stated that he had performed his duties in an entirely satisfactory manner. On the 20th he was informed that he was dismissed as of the 30th.

Browne is a veteran of the Second World War, 1943-6, with service overseas in Europe as a combat soldier from 1944 to January 1946.

Since it appeared that the witchhunting arms of the government could not make out a case for his dismissal from his non-sensitive job, or perhaps because it was simply the easiest way out, the political reasons were not given as the cause. Instead he was charged with having falsified his Form 57 (the government's application for employment).

In answer to a question about previous arrests, he had not listed an incident from 1947 when he and his fiancée had been picked up by a cop for "necking" and charged with "disorderly conduct." To protect the girl from publicity, Browne did not fight the charge, paid a small fine, and forgot about it. Secondly, for a period of a year or two, during which time he was living in a rooming house where mail was exposed, and he was receiving socialist literature, he had used the name George Russell for mailing purposes; he had not put this fact into Form 57.

These pretexts were used only after strenuous efforts had been made to find political reasons for his discharge. In point of fact, the government act means that in the United States today, a person with socialist convictions does not have the right to earn a living even as a "harmless" technical worker in a government museum. This is "security"—1954 model.

A left-wing group stirring in the Socialist Party has put out an inner-party statement of principles with the hope of stemming the party's steady drift to the right. The *Reading Labor Advocate* (local Pennsylvania SP organ)—but not the *Socialist Call*—has published its text, though omitting some initial paragraphs which apparently contained a dim view of the SP's organizational disaggregation. The left-wing group, as previously reported in *LABOR ACTION*, is called Committee for a Socialist Program.

Explaining why it is "deeply disturbed" by the SP's political evolution, the Committee writes:

"... The party leadership does not today hold the position of vigorous opposition to war, and it has compromised on civil liberties. The party orients increasingly toward labor's bureaucracy rather than toward labor, toward the liberal wing of the Democratic Party rather than to the people as a whole."

This party crisis, it goes on to say, partly springs from the social and political conditions of today, but "there is a second factor... one that we can do much about":

"The support of capitalism by the American people has reflected itself within the party in a feeling that old principles should be revised in the direction of compromise with capitalism. Rather than strengthening the party membership with a confidence in the socialist program, particularly necessary because of the hostility toward socialism, a section of the party itself has lost confidence, and thereby becomes a disintegrating force within the party. We will resist this piecemeal abandonment of socialist principles."

### AGAINST BOTH BLOCS

The statement emphasizes the wish of the left-wingers for a "revolutionary" party rather than a "reformist" one, and their wish to build the party as loyal members, though a minority.

Summarizing the principles proposed for the party platform, the Committee's statement says they must be based on the class struggle as well as democratic socialism. It calls for "greater organizational perspective and responsibility" rather than "the present sense of futility and apathy."

Among the nine points listing the proposed "principles," two deal with war and foreign policy and express the group's general desire for an anti-war program:

"We oppose any support for the capitalist or the Stalinist blocs. We oppose rearmament, colonialism, and any attempt to repress the peoples of the world. Capitalism has shown itself unable to stop the aggressive force of totalitarian Communism. Only the widespread support people would give to revolutionary Democratic Socialism can stop Stalinism."

"We reaffirm the traditional Socialist position on war, declaring our opposition to militarism, conscription, and other devices used by this government to secure conformity in its mobilization for war. At the same time, we would remind those who work for peace that only a program of economic change such as Democratic Socialism, can make it possible for us to continue to provide for the needs of the people without resort to war."

### HIT SUPPORT TO DEMOCRATS

On civil liberties, it says: "We condemn the arrest of the Stalinist leadership in this country for alleged acts of advocacy as opposed to any overt attempt at a violent revolution. We oppose and would abolish all subversive lists, loyalty oaths, congressional investigations into areas of personal belief, and other such steps toward a totalitarian regime."

In another point, advocating electoral action for the party, the Committee states: "We oppose the support at any time of any capitalist candidate by the party and call for the expulsion of any member of the party who should run on a major-party ticket."

An editorial note in the *Reading Labor Advocate* says that the left-wing Committee was "founded, and for the moment, largely confined to the California section of the party." The California state organization of the SP has been discontented with the right-wing trend of the SP leadership for many years now.

**There's No Angel Around** to finance *LABOR ACTION*. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

**A sub is only \$2 a year—  
Subscribe now!**

# Mendes-France's "Solution" for Colonial Resistance to Oppression: French Guns Against the Algerian People

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Nov. 9—The insurrection which broke out in Algeria on November 1 has assumed the proportions of a major battle, and has created within a few days a situation comparable to the crisis in Morocco and Tunisia.

Acts of terrorism and sabotage have taken place throughout the country, and in the mountainous region of the Aurès, near the Tunisian border, about 3000 armed rebels are offering energetic resistance to the French army.

Although this sudden development surprises everyone, nobody seemed more surprised than the government. Only a week earlier Roger Leonard, governor of Algeria, was giving reassuring interviews to the press. The increase of fellagha [nationalist guerrilla] activity in Algeria, he said, was nothing to worry about: "these acts, which are closer to banditry than to organized political activity, are of no gravity whatsoever."

Two weeks before the outbreak of armed rebellion Mitterand, minister of the interior, gave several speeches on his visit to the country, outlining a glowing future for "democratic Algeria" taking its first stumbling steps out of political infancy under the benevolent guidance of the French administration.

It is obvious that at least large sections of the French ruling class, here and in Algeria, have become victims of their own propaganda, which pictures Algeria as a happy and prosperous French province in which the great civilizing mission of France has been rewarded by the warm gratitude of the Algerian people. If this is true, it follows that the armed uprisings can be only the work of "foreign agitators," and this is exactly what the government is saying.

While the settlers' press is screaming triumphantly that this is the result negotiations with the nationalists necessarily lead to, the government press, such as *Le Monde* and *L'Express*, expresses its hurt indignation that a handful of "foreign agitators," paid by Moscow gold and inspired by the Egyptian radio, is driving a wedge between France and her loyal citizens.

Mitterand himself, justifying the vicious military repression under way, says that Algeria is a French province and that armed rebellion of French citizens cannot be tolerated.

## OFFICIAL FABLE

Actually, few official fables are as shameless as the fable of "French Algeria." Algeria, although composed of three departments and administratively an integral part of France, is a colony. The Algerian people, although juridically citizens of France, are exploited like every French colonial people.

After the military conquest of Algeria by the French in the 19th century, the land owned by the Algerians was increasingly expropriated and turned over to commercial mono-cultures. In the fifty years following French conquest, over 12 million acres were expropriated, while the population doubled during the same period. The stolen land was immediately converted into the production of export crops: wheat, wine, citrus fruits, tobacco. In 1949, 90 per cent of the vineyards belonged to Europeans, and 63 per cent of the wine crop was exported. In 1951, 94 per cent of the citrus groves was owned by Europeans, and 70 per cent of the citrus crop was exported.

The process of expropriation created a great mass of landless proletarians, a one-sided and vulnerable economy, and the particular form of poverty called "overpopulation." In 1946 the government had to admit in an official report that "several hundred thousand families do not have enough land.

"In addition, about half a million families have no land at all and earn their living as sharecroppers or agricultural wage-workers. In fact, the present distribution of landed property has created an immense agricultural proletariat which lives under difficult and precarious conditions."

This situation could have been changed by serious land reforms and by industrialization. However, no serious steps in this direction have been taken, and the economy has remained a colonial one. To this day the major industries are those of wheat, and processing wine and tobacco, the three major export crops. The tobacco industry, employing 10,000 workers, is the largest of the three. How little such industries can absorb the pop-

ulation surplus can be measured by the fact that the rate of population increase is 130,000 a year!

To round the picture out, let us add that 83 per cent of the Algerian exports go to France and that 73 per cent of the imports come from France, and that the French merchant marine has a monopoly over Algerian overseas shipping.

This situation is closely approximated in America by the West Indies, and in particular by Puerto Rico. Like the Puerto Ricans, the Algerians are juridically citizens of the conquering country, and they have been emigrating to France in large numbers, attracted by higher wages and higher living standards.

In France, however, they have met with increased exploitation, racial discrimination and oppression. When they were lucky enough to get any work at all, they were forced to live in appalling slums, to take lower wages, to do the heaviest and dirtiest work available, usually unskilled labor in the building trades, foundries, coal mines, etc. Their political and civil rights have been continuously curtailed, and their manifestations bloodily suppressed, such as on Bastille Day 1953, when six Algerians were shot down by the police in Paris.

The Algerian people do not need "foreign agitators" to revolt: all the agita-

tion is done by their everyday experience. The surprising thing is that they have waited so patiently and so long. Today, viewing the situation objectively, it would seem that the only "foreign agitators" in Algeria are Mitterand, Chevallier, Leonard and their stooges.

However, the "foreign agitator" theory serves a purpose, to the extent that it provides a rationale for smashing the political organizations of the Algerian people.

Since the end of last week, the full weight of political, military and police repression has been brought to bear against the Algerian resistance movement. Massive troop shipments have been sent from France to occupy the three departments and to crush the resistance in the Aurès mountains.

## MTLD SUPPRESSED

At the same time political measures have been taken: the MTLD has been declared illegal, the press of the MTLD, of its recently expelled reformist faction, and of the Stalinists, has been suppressed, and 200 arrests have been made, among them the secretary-general of the MTLD.

Yet the participation of the MTLD in the terrorist outbreaks of last week is by no means established. All the newspaper reports indicate, on the contrary, that the population of the cities, where the MTLD is strongest, remained calm. In the Aurès region the resistance movement appears to be led by the same elements that are in command of the Tunisian fellaghas, that is radical nationalists with a chauvinist and religious ideology. Also the methods of struggle used by the authors of the recent terrorist outbreaks are not the MTLD's. The

MTLD's methods are those of collective action, involving mass meetings, demonstrations, strikes, not individual terrorism and especially not its indiscriminate use.

The true reasons for the repression of the MTLD have been stated by the correspondent of *Le Monde*: "The official circles consider that, although the MTLD has not been directly and clearly implicated in the first outbreaks, it is to be feared that it will benefit from the atmosphere created by the disorder and launch the revolutionary action outlined in the program established after the July split."

There is absolutely no charge against the MTLD except that it frightens the French bourgeoisie! *The MTLD is being suppressed, not because it engages in terrorist activities but precisely because it is the only force capable of replacing blind individual terrorism and isolated struggles by organized and disciplined mass action.*

Today the MTLD is alone capable of imposing a progressive solution in Algeria. To do this, it needs all the help it can get, in the first place from the French working-class, but also from international public opinion. The working-class organizations of all countries can protect the North African people and its organizations by raising strong protest against the French repression with the representatives of the French government.

International solidarity can again be demonstrated by demanding withdrawal of all troops from North Africa, the lifting of the ban on nationalist parties and publications, the right to organize free trade unions, the release of political prisoners and the return of the exiled political leaders.

## BOLIVIA Nationalist Regime Dumps Lechin State Dep't Whipcracker Got His Man

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Nov. 10—The policy of the U. S. State Department with respect to the Nationalist (MNR) regime in Bolivia has been one of "wait and see"—a policy directed toward dividing the political forces of the country and isolating the left by clever pressure. It seems that this policy is getting results in Bolivia, the only country in Latin America where Washington's policies can chalk up a success.

We are referring to the recent visit to Bolivia by Holland, the State Department's Latin American affairs chief, in the course of his tour of the continent. The policy of "isolate the left" had its effect on the Nationalist regime of Paz Estenssoro, although we cannot know, of course, exactly what happened behind the scenes.

In any case, Holland's visit resulted in the resignation from the cabinet by Juan Lechin, and not only from the cabinet but also as general secretary of the Mine Workers Union. Thus what we foresaw a long time ago has happened. President Paz has won in the fight against Lechin; the right wing of the ruling party, the MNR, has won out against the Mine Workers Union; and now Paz Estenssoro has sacrificed Lechin's head to U. S. pressure.

To all external appearances, the change was very well prepared and managed, very "soft." Lechin declared that "sometimes opportunism is necessary when we have to defend the existence and the future of the revolutionary people." And after this statement he left the ministry and was replaced by his "alter ego," Mario Torres.

## CAPITULATION IS THE WORD

Thus the leader of the MNR, Paz Estenssoro, has proved himself to be an excellent political tightrope walker and an ideal arbiter of the internal fight in his party. But this political cleverness cannot change the political and social content of the political process that is going on: the pushing-out of the MNR Left, that is, of the workers' unions, from their political position and role in the government and in the country.

To be sure, Lechin has many times declared his readiness to leave the cabinet and go back to his "base," i. e., the masses, but each time this statement was met with resistance by the MNR "leader," because his government would risk

its stability without Lechin in its ranks. The fact that the regime is willing to risk his resignation now, and even replace him by Torres, is proof that the MNR has been won away from the workers' unions and that the regime is going decisively to the right. In the political alliance between the Nationalist MNR and the pro-Nationalist workers' unions, it was the workers who bore all the costs of the nationalist revolution but did not gain anything.

The change was camouflaged by statements made by Lechin and Torres, defending the alliance between the MNR and the unions as the only possible policy because of the bankruptcy of the left parties, the Stalinist PIR and the Trotskyist POR. But this smokescreen cannot change the fact of Lechin and Torres' capitulation to the "right-wing bourgeois restorationists," represented by the MNR itself in Bolivia.

## END OF A PERIOD

Lechin is "going to the masses" not as an opposition leader but as a used and sucked-out ex-minister, defending his opportunism, too cowardly to tell the truth to the workers about the political change that is going on. On the other hand, Torres is only a second-grade figure, and his replacement of Lechin symbolizes the less weighty role played by the unions in the regime's policy.

Parallel to all this, the government party is absorbing leading elements from the left, especially from the POR. Two former general secretaries of the POR, Edwin Moller and Jorge Salazar, and the POR theoretician Ernesto Ayala Mercado, as well as Lechin's ex-secretary Jose Zegada, have entered the MNR officially. Thus a part of the POR staff has capitulated to the MNR, as we predicted long ago. Ideological capitulation preceded the personal and organizational capitulation. The right turn of the MNR is complemented by the capitulation and disintegration of the "left."

The Nationalist regime is likely to gain economic assistance from Washington and external peace, as well as greater economic and political stability. But this means the liquidation of the revolutionary period, together with the elimination of the political intervention of the workers' unions in the government. It means that the Nationalist party is absorbing the workers' unions, replacing them with the bourgeois state, and closing the road

to a real social revolution. This tragicomic farce is going forward with the collaboration of Lechin, Torres and the POR's leaders, who are playing the role of "dying gladiators" with respect to the MNR as the bearer of bourgeois restoration.

The target is the liquidation of the workers' movement and of the "romantic past" of the MNR. It closes the period of "revolutionary imitation," for, as we have written, the MNR was never a revolutionary party but only imitated revolutionary methods; and the nationalization of the mines as well as the agrarian reforms were the result of the workers' intervention and leading role in the country.

## MNR AS TOOL

It may be that the Paz government can hold out for some time with this new policy, but its role will be that of bearer of the counter-revolution and hangman of the working class which pushed it to power. Since the bourgeois liberal opposition is incapable of defeating the workers' movement, it will be the MNR itself which will be the instrument for capitalist restoration in Bolivia. It seems that the "Russian way" is the general pattern for the world counter-revolution.

The defeat of the Bolivian revolution and of the Bolivian workers' movement seems to have been accomplished by methods different from those used against Guatemala. Instead of armed intervention, in Bolivia the liquidation of the workers' movement is being carried through by the "revolutionary" government party and with the collaboration of the workers' "leaders," and even of the staff of the POR, official section of the Fourth International.

I am very sorry that my pessimism about the Bolivian POR has been confirmed by the facts.

## WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

## LONDON LETTER

# Bevanites Blast BLP Exec's Gag Attempt

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Nov. 10—Despite an apparent slight recession in the U. S. of recent years, European economy has been booming. Production in every major Western (and Eastern) European country continues to rise. With the end of the Korean and Indochinese wars, and the settlement of the Persian and Egyptian disputes, the prognosis for British economy for the next year or two is really quite good.

A report of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation puts Britain on the back. Last year her production increased by 6 per cent and consumption by about the same figure.

It is only human that the Tories try to gain credit for a relief of world tension due to Malenkov's strategic policy. They are lucky enough to be in power when Russia's internal difficulties, and the ally which she has in Time, have combined to relieve the political struggle in which world trade finds such difficulty in prospering.

For these reasons Churchill, with his keen histrionic sense, is believed to be thinking about staging an election next spring. In order to do this he has begun to pay attention to two large groups of hitherto neglected voters, the women and the old-age pensioners.

This week, Richard Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer, announced a retrospective pay increase (from July 1) to 400,000 civil servants. The average increase is from 1½ to 2½ dollars per week. What is important about this is that women will get the same increase as men—not a proportional increase, as is usual.

It may be remembered that at a Labor Party Conference in 1950 a unanimous resolution was passed calling for equal pay for women in the civil service. Attlee arose to say that the Labor government could not be bound by decisions of the Labor Party Conference. However, as soon as the economic position of the country allowed it, the government would bring in equal pay.

It is believed that the equal rise in pay for women may well precede granting of equal pay to women in the civil service in the New Year. If this occurs, it will gain the Tories very many women's votes.

The most depressed class in this country are the 4,000,000 old-age pensioners who try to live on \$4.50 a week, whose value decreases every day. Recently in their journal they called for a minimum

pension of \$7.10 per week. They have demonstrated their great difficulty in living on the present sums by the fact that over one third of them have to apply to the National Assistance Board. This is a (very necessary) government-run "charity," as applicants, although they have a moral right to its aid, have to prove their poverty in order to obtain it. This is degrading for them.

**Richard Butler has promised to take action on the old-age pensions. He has stolen a march on the Labor Party.**

For the record, it should be said that the Labor Party while in power put up the old-age pensions from \$1.50 per week to \$3.70; during the same time it fell in value by 70 cents due to rises in prices.

The Tories have since put it up by 30 cents so far, and that has recently been cancelled out by an increase in prices of basic commodities representing the same sum.

No one knows exactly how much the pensions will be increased, but this too will add to the Tories' popularity. If they have an election in spring under these circumstances they will probably be returned with an increased majority.

What has the Labor Party to offer? Attlee has tabled a motion in Parliament calling for the pension increases to be made before Christmas so that the elderly could enjoy it, and have a more comfortable winter.

## 'TRIBUNE' TALKS BACK

The prospects of the election are the background to a minor struggle within the Labor Party over remarks during the recent dock strike. At the time, *Tribune*, edited by Bevanites Jennie Lee (Bevan's wife), Michael Foot and J. P. Mallalieu—all Labor MPs—attacked the TUC and Arthur Deakin's handling of the dock strike. It suggested that Deakin—head of the Transport and General Workers Union—did not know what the dock strike was about. It criticized Deakin for labeling the strikers as "Communists," and suggested that he was not in touch with the rank and file.

This provoked an ultimatum from Morgan Phillips, secretary of the Labor Party, asking them how they reconciled the attack on the leadership of the TGWU with membership of the Labor Party.

In passing it should be said that the *New Statesman and Nation*, a more petit-bourgeois weekly of larger circulation, has expressed the same views as *Tribune*. It seems that the Labor Party Executive does not feel that this paper

has as much influence with the rank and file as does *Tribune*.

On Friday next, *Tribune* comes out with a full-blooded attack on the attempt to suppress criticism of the official policy, "it becomes a wholesale ban on almost all forms of controversy," it says. In 8000 words it first justifies its attack on Deakin and follows it with an analysis "of the principles of free discussion which a democratic party must wish to uphold."

"... A party which aspires to expand its empire of liberty must practise it within its own territory. ... The most melancholy feature of the national executive's letter to us is that it might lay the executive open to charges of asserting a totalitarian doctrine.

**"Trade-union leaders are not a special breed of humanity, always to be shielded from the rough breezes of democracy. ... They are there partly to be shot at, like all other elected persons who must run the risks of public life if they aspire to hold the prizes and the power."**

The article gives a number of examples of attacks on Bevan which the Executive has ignored. If the Executive tries to take disciplinary action against the three Bevanites and all the others who support them, it will have to expel all but one of the representatives of the local constituency parties, which would bode extremely ill just before an election.

## Dock Strike Ends

[The following London Letter was crowded out of last week's special issue.—Ed.]

LONDON, Nov. 3—The 44,000 strong national strike of stevedores and dockers ended last week-end in considerable mystery. The dockers' leaders claimed a "substantial victory." But the employers, the Transport and General Workers Union, and a Labor MP, all of whom opposed the strike over compulsory overtime, claimed that the agreement made had been the same as that offered to the dockers in settlement some months ago.

Since the agreement has not been made public, it is difficult to assess the opposing claims.

On the eve of the settlement, the Trade Union Council announced the suspension from affiliation of the Stevedores and Dockers' Union, after a complaint by the Transport and General Workers Union of poaching. Members of the former union are alleged to have tried to persuade men at London, Merseyside and Liverpool to break away from the TGWU.

The Stevedores and Dockers Union represented less than half the total number of strikers. The rest were members of the TGWU. Since the latter union had not supported the strike, the Stevedores and Dockers attracted the militant workers of the TGWU. It is, however, unlikely that canvassing for members took place.

**The TGWU, as has been pointed out in previous London Letters, is a union of 1,250,000 members, and its head is reactionary Arthur Deakin, big boss of the TUC. Very few of its office-holders are elected, and its leadership has little sympathy with the politically-active rank and file. Thus the much more militant Stevedores and Dockers Union has not only led the recent strike, but has been recognized by the dockers as a more democratic instrument of political action.**

The National Dock Labor Board was just heaving a sigh of relief about its \$500,000,000 cargoes which would now be set in motion, when 4000 of the returning dockers came out in London again. This strike, led by Victor Morney, unofficial leader of the Transport and General Workers, following upon the recent four-week strike, was to enforce union membership on all truck drivers who transported goods to and from the docks. This was an attempt by the TGWU to regain its prestige.

Councillor Geoghegan, mayor of Bermondsey (London) and an official of the TGWU, intervened, and got the dockers to go back on condition that the non-union truck drivers joined a union by November 30. So far, so good.

In case the Dock Labor Board thought its troubles were over, yet a new strike of 6,000 men broke out on November 2. This was to protest against the fact that some of the dockers who had struck against non-union labor have not yet been reinstated.

## SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

### conclusion and the pope's statement?

The theoretical rationalization which has been developed by the contemporary backsliders from liberalism for going along with the attack on academic freedom is this: Communist Party members have no right to teach because they are under a superior intellectual discipline which tells them what to think and believe; they cannot therefore be disinterested searchers for truth.

Sidney Hook, for example, "proves" his case by quoting from official statements of the CP in which the Stalinist leadership asserts its desire to control the beliefs of its teacher members. Thus membership in a disciplined organization which has this aim in its theses is sufficient ground for disqualification; the individual's competency or actual work or actual record as a teacher is superseded by demonstrating the simple fact of membership.

### FOR IDEOLOGICAL DISCIPLINE

The point has been made before this: *What about teachers who are practising Catholics and who are therefore bound by church dogmas in various fields of teaching?* The reply of the Hook-type theoreticians has usually been to decry the analogy on the ground that the Catholic discipline is looser.

The pope's statement of November 3 is directed precisely to asserting firmly and insistently that the church must exert discipline over its members in intellectual fields outside religion, specifically on social and political questions. It is for this reason that it made the front page of the *N. Y. Times* for Nov. 4, in a dispatch which is not notable for clear details but which makes the main point plain enough.

According to the pope, we read, "the belief that 'the Church's authority is limited to purely religious matters' is an error, and Roman Catholics 'must take an open and firm stand' against it. Social problems, whether merely social or socio-political, were singled out by the pope. ..."

The pope restricted the right of anyone to reject "instructions and propositions published on matters within the moral law by the pope for the whole church and by bishops for those in their dioceses."

**"On the contrary, even though to some one certain declarations of the Church may not seem proved by the arguments put forward, his obligation to obey still remains," the pope continued.**

Later the dispatch says, "He [the pope] then spoke about ecclesiastical discipline and condemned in strong terms the tendency among present-day Catholics, both men and women, who 'think that the leadership and vigilance of the Church are not to be suffered by one who is grown up.'"

If a Sidney Hook can consider his case proved when he quotes a statement by Earl Browder of some years back about the "tasks" of CP teachers, certainly the stand taken by the pope (now more clearly than ever) is immediately pertinent to the question: Does not the edge of this made-to-order witchhunting doctrine turn against the Catholic Church and its theses on the intellectual tasks and obligations of those whom it threatens with rewards and punishments in another world?

## The DA Wants a Machine-Gun

Charges of intimidation against conscientious objectors in the state of Michigan are contained in a complaint sent to the attorney general by the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors.

The COs concerned, one a student at the University of Michigan, the other doing alternative service work at Ann Arbor, were called to the office of the district attorney, Ronald Greenberg, as a result of an advertisement they had placed in *The Michigan Daily*. It ran as follows:

"Men of Draft Age—Have you considered the alternatives to military service? For information about the rights of men

conscientiously opposed to war, call..."

During the interview with the DA it is alleged that Greenberg accused the COs of a conspiracy to counsel evasion of military service; that he threatened to have the men's cases reviewed by their draft boards; that he demonstrated prejudice against some CO groups by being verbally offensive to Jehovah's Witnesses and Muslims (saying of the latter that he wouldn't mind going into their temples and rounding them up with machine guns); that he told one man that he was living under the "shadow of the axe" ready to fall any time, and the other that "we've got men everywhere and sooner or later they'll get you, so be careful."

The complaint to the attorney general was submitted by the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors in late July. In a letter received by the committee on September 14, from the assistant to the deputy attorney general it was stated that:

"I have made an investigation and review of (your complaint) and have come to the conclusion that no additional action on our part is warranted."

Later, Lyle Tatum, the Committee's executive secretary, visited Greenberg and talked with him, but the outcome was not satisfactory.

The committee is thus continuing its attempt to get a report of the incident from the Department of Justice.

It is the opinion of the CCCO that, if true, the charges which have been made against Greenberg are serious, and that the public has a right to know whether or not the charges have been adequately investigated and substantiated or disproved.

The committee asks that citizens interested in this case should write letters to attorney general and members of Congress asking for a full report.



## LABOR ACTION

November 22, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 47

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## READ ABOUT SOCIALISM

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

Socialism: the Hope of Humanity ..... .10  
by Max Shachtman

Marxism in the U. S. .... .35  
by Leon Trotsky

Plenty for All: The Meaning of Socialism ..... .25  
by Ernest Erber

The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism ..... .10  
(LA Special Issue)

Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

young  
socialist

# CHALLENGE

November 22, 1954

Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

## Harvard 'Crimson' Survey Raises the Question— Is There a Witchhunt on the Campus?

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

After a solid decade of the growth of the witchhunt and of the attack on academic freedom, it may seem undue concern with political ABCs to devote a leading article in CHALLENGE to the existence of the problem. Yet in all of the debate over American policy toward subversion, the crucial question still remains one of fact: Is there such a witchhunt? Depending on how this point is answered, an entire political analysis follows.

On one side are those who maintain that there is no witchhunt on the campus. And almost inevitably, those who take this position also support the broad lines of American foreign policy, whether from the standpoint of Eisenhower Republicanism or liberal lesser-evilism.

On the other side are those who call attention to a great danger to freedom. Again, the political motivation is varied, ranging from the Stalinist to the old-line conservative, a spectrum which once included Senator Taft and left-wing radicals of every type.

The editors of CHALLENGE have obviously made up their minds about the fact and the political interpretation of it. And since they do not view the American campus from Mars, there is an obvious connection between the two. Yet it is necessary to review the ABCs periodically, to state the facts on which the opinion rests.

This was done last June in a special issue of the Harvard Crimson on Academic Freedom. A review of this issue provides the occasion for stating simple truths, to be sure, but also basic truths.

The lead article in the Crimson report is a survey of the various interpretations which have been offered of the current situation. It is a news story, not an editorial, though the weight of it leans in the direction of the point of view that there is no witchhunt on the campus, or at least that the danger has been exaggerated. Yet the article does provide a solid political context for the review of the facts.

### WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

Typical of the position which sees a great threat to freedom in the current campus situation is a quote from an article by Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas: "This fear has even entered our universities, great citadels of our spiritual strength, and corrupted them. We have the spectacle of univer-

sity officials lending themselves to one of the worst witchhunts we have seen since early days. . . . The lips of the younger generation have become more and more sealed. Repression of ideas has taken the place of debate."

And as a spokesman for the opposite attitude, there is the now ubiquitous David Riesman: ". . . the people who tell such stories are unconsciously seeking to create a climate which will justify in their own minds the concessions they are making. . . . In short, intellectuals who, for whatever reasons, choose to regard themselves as being victimized contribute to the very pressures they deplore."

Within this context, my own personal prejudice is, of course, in sympathy with the position of Justice Douglas. Riesman's remark, so typical of his habit of the sophisticated inversion—"But two and two is five!"—strikes me as almost meaningless. But what are the facts as the Crimson presents them, independent of prejudices?

The following cases came to light within the last year.

### BLACK BOOK OF THE PURGE

Berkeley, California: it was revealed that a "contact man" for the California Senate Committee on Un-American Activities is at work on the campus here. President Sproul has asserted that his only duties are concerned with "personnel engaged in classified governmental research. . . ." However, the counsel of the California committee, Richard E. Combs, testified before the Jenner Committee that the "contact man" system had been used to get teachers suspected of Communist leanings fired. (Young Socialist Challenge has carried articles on this case.)

Michigan University: the most interesting cases from Michigan are two (previously reported in Challenge). The first concerns a co-ed who spied for the FBI on her date and her friends. The second involves the suspension of three professors and the ultimate firing of one of them.

Orangeburg, South Carolina: This case is not directly concerned with loyalty and security but with the race issue. Professor Lewis K. McMillan wrote a book entitled Negro Higher Education in the State of South Carolina. He was fired from his post. A year's struggle had been, at the time of the Crimson report, a failure.

University of Nevada: A professor who disagreed with educational policy at the university. Through the Nevada State Supreme Court he eventually won his case.

Similarly a professor at the University of Nebraska won a case on his right to take a position in disagreement with the National Farm Bureau. It is interesting to note that these, the only two victories for Academic Freedom reported in the Crimson issue do not involve any charge of "Communism," "subversion," etc. These are old-fashioned disputes, and though the victories are certainly to be applauded, it must be pointed out that they occur outside of the major arena which is that involving accusations of disloyalty. The comparison between these cases and all the others cannot be carried too far, yet there is some evidence here of the very real relation between the

configuration of American foreign policy, domestic legislation on Stalinism and academic freedom. But more on this point later.

### ACROSS THE COUNTRY

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (Troy, N. Y.): At the beginning of the 1953-4 term, Arthur L. Levy, an assistant professor of chemistry at RPI, was dismissed as "unfit." He had invoked the Fifth Amendment in April 1953.

Philadelphia: Jefferson Medical College fired three professors who were ex-Communists. They were given written assurances that their dismissal had nothing to do with their loyalty. However, the dismissal came after questioning on politics by an ad hoc committee of the University.

Georgia: All teachers in the state school system must sign a loyalty oath. Originally, the Klan and a few fascist groups were dropped from the list, but they were finally returned to it.

Massachusetts: At the time of the Crimson article, the question of dismissal of a permanent teacher for use of the Fifth Amendment was before the State Supreme Court.

Alabama: The Schoolbook Labeling Law (authors and men mentioned in books who are subversive to be catalogued as such in the front of the book) was killed because of the impossibility of administering it.

Temple University: In 1953, Barrows Dunham was fired. He had used the Fifth Amendment.

Southern Methodist University: The rights of a professor accused of anti-Semitism were upheld by the university. He had written a book generally applauded by anti-Semites.

After being fired by San Diego State for refusing to say whether or not he was a Communist, Professor Harry C. Steinmetz was hired by Cornell. He regarded this as vindication. Shortly thereafter, Cornell fired him.

University of Vermont: Dr. Alex B. Novikoff was fired for belligerence with a congressional committee. A special faculty-trustee committee recommendation that he be retained was overruled by a Review Board.

University of Colorado: Composer-conductor Aaron Copland was declared a "controversial figure." He was not allowed to appear.

Rutgers: Abraham Glasser resigned under fire. He had invoked the Fifth Amendment.

### BASIS OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Approximately sixteen specific cases were cited in the Crimson report. In two of them, not involving the question of loyalty, there was a victory for academic freedom. In one, involving a man said to be anti-Semitic, the scant report would seem to indicate that civil-libertarian principles were observed, although the motivation may be questionable. In all of the other cases, academic freedom was defeated.

By defeats for academic freedom we mean: cases where use of the Fifth Amendment was the grounds for firing; cases where state laws for loyalty oaths or book-checking were passed; cases where a "controversial figure" was barred.

On this last point, there is obviously a considerable element of interpretation involved. Many would challenge the "fact" of a violation of academic freedom in such instances on the grounds that those who invoke the Fifth Amendment should not be allowed to teach. On this, we can only reply that academic freedom is mainly concerned with academic competence. Is a man a bad teacher for having invoked his constitutional privilege? Is there empirical evidence of a link between incompetent pedagogy and the Fifth Amendment? Is a man a member of the Communist Party if he invokes the Fifth Amendment?

If this point of interpretation is granted, it is possible to return to the basic ABCs—our original question. These are not all the cases. Others have been reported in Challenge, notably the loyalty oath for all ROTC students when ROTC is compulsory, i.e., a loyalty oath for all male students in land-grant schools. This problem arose after the Crimson study.

### PAST THE DANGER POINT

But on the basis of the Crimson study alone, is there a witchhunt on the campus?

Here it is not a case of ABCs but of multiplication tables. At what point is academic freedom in danger? I would say in any case. But passing that point, would fourteen cases of defeats for academic freedom in a period slightly longer than a year constitute a witchhunt on the campus? Does the danger begin when all controversial teaching is stilled? Is there a danger when 53 per cent of 250 teachers questioned in Los Angeles felt that they were not so free to discuss controversial questions as they were five years ago?

Or more pertinently, in terms of Riesman's charge that the witchhunt on the campus is largely the invention of capitulators, does the evidence in the Harvard Crimson indicate the truth of such an analysis?

For me, it is clear that the review of some of the important academic-freedom cases in the Crimson confirms the broad outline of the witchhunt on campus. This witchhunt is not the fantasy of ritualistic liberals. It strikes at all non-conformity, more often than not at those with some past or present Stalinist connection. It is usually bound up with the entire question of loyalty and security—the two cases where freedom won in the Crimson report were not. It is based on reactionary propositions which are present in many other spheres of American life: that invoking a constitutional privilege is an admission of "guilt," that a "subversive" cannot be a prize-fighter (in Indiana), or an inhabitant (in some of the Southern states).

Regardless of whom it strikes it must be opposed.

### JOIN THE YSL NOW!

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

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

NAME .....  
ADDRESS .....  
CITY..... ZONE..... STATE.....  
SCHOOL IF ANY .....

### The YSL's Aim

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

## DISCUSSION: A VIEW OF AN INDECISIVE ELECTION

# DILEMMAS OF THE DEMOCRATIC STRATEGY

By GORDON HASKELL

The political forces in the United States remain weighted to the right of dead center, and the drift remains a rightward one. That is the chief fact and tendency underlined and emphasized by the mid-term elections, despite the victory which netted the Democrats 17 additional seats in the House, two in the Senate, and eight governorships.

From a strictly party point of view, the Democrats did well in the elections. Despite a campaign in which they carefully refrained from presenting any program to the country, they rode back to power, even if by a very narrow margin, on the popular feeling that they are the party of the "little man" as against the Republicans who defend the interests of the rich.

As in the past, the workers in the urban centers voted heavily Democratic. Except for California, where the AFL bureaucracy engineered one of its typically narrow-minded deals with the Republicans, the labor movement supported the Democrats openly and unambiguously, only here and there endorsing a Republican liberal for the sake of keeping alive the old myth that the union movement is bipartisan in its politics.

The heavy unemployment in certain areas, the Republican do-nothing attitude about it, the fear of unemployment and the loss of overtime in other areas, all served to re-solidify the workers behind the Democratic Party, and probably to bring into the fold some who had strayed to support Ike in 1952.

### PROGRAM-LESS

On the other hand, the Democrats failed to make the sweeping gains among the farmers which had been forecast on the basis of resentment against Secretary Benson's farm program. For one thing, the real effects of the lower price supports in Benson's "flexible" formula have not yet made themselves felt, and for another, the farmers are not blind to the fact that their previous boom prosperity was a result of wartime shortages and high prices.

But since the Democrats made advances, and the Republicans suffered losses, how can the assertion be made that the weight of American politics is on the right, and even more, that the drift rightward continues? Is not the Democratic advance a sign that the high tide of Republican conservatism on which Eisenhower rode to victory (or which was to some degree created by his candidacy) has now turned, and that the Democratic gains of 1954 are simply a prelude to a more sweeping, leftward Democratic trend in 1956?

The first thing which should be borne firmly in mind is that the Democrats did not win this election by stirring the electorate to action behind a program of broad social measures. Their whole record as an opposition in Congress, and their strategy in this campaign, has been not to counterpose a program of their own to that of the Republicans. This is true in the realm of both domestic and foreign policy. It is true in the area of civil liberties, housing, health and every other social measure which could be identified with a new advance of the Fair Deal.

### THE DEMOCRATIC STRATEGY

During two years in opposition and during the campaign itself, the Democrats have confined themselves to criticism of this or that Republican program (tax structure; give-away of resources), to criticism of the "do-nothing" attitude of this or that governmental department, and to vague generalities about how the Republicans are cutting down on America's military might while at the same time they are dissipating all the alleged goodwill the United States had built up among the peoples of the world under the governments of Roosevelt and Truman.

The Democrats howled about the un-

employment, but promised no sweeping measures for its alleviation, and said nothing at all about what they would do toward its cure.

There was reason in the Democratic strategy, though it seems apparent that this strategy was one of the causes of the smallness of the Democratic gains this year. The reason was simply this: any attempt of the Democrats to come to the country with a concrete program would have exposed the deep cleavage in the party. Instead of all good Democrats uniting against the evil Republicans, or all good Democrats standing aside while the two wings of the Republicans go through some shadow-boxing over McCarthyism, a concrete program would have set the Democrats at each others' throats. Far better, their high command reasoned, to get back into office, gather the plums of committee chairmanships, state patronage and eventual federal patronage once again into the Democratic basket, and then after all that has been achieved, there will be time enough to worry about a program.

In one case after another, the Democratic candidate gave the impression that he is a supporter of Eisenhower's foreign policy as distinguished from that of the right wing of the Republican Party. On domestic issues, the Democrats were happy to campaign against unemployment in the North, and against school integration in the South.

### TRADING ON THE PAST

But if the Democrats have done everything possible to conceal from the voters any programmatic difference between themselves and the Republicans, how did these same voters make up their minds in significant numbers to switch their votes from the latter to the former?

The answer is that the Democrats thought they could afford to campaign without a program, because the workers and a significant section of the middle class still believe them to be the "party of the people," no matter how little they may do to prove it. And the Republicans in office have appeared to do their utmost to prove that whatever the Democrats may be, there is no question about the fact that the GOP is the party of the millionaires, of big business.

But after all that has been said, and after it has been admitted that neither party represents the true interests of the workers and little people of the country in any consistent or forthright or really principled manner, is it not nevertheless true that this election shows a swing away from the most reactionary party, if even a small one? And does not that give reason to hope that this swing will continue and that hence it is not correct to say that this election confirms the idea that the rightward drift in American politics continues?

Of course, it is quite true that one's answer to such questions will depend to some degree on exactly what one means by "rightward drift" and "turn to the left." But the following fact should at least have some bearing on any serious analysis.

### SOUTH IN THE SADDLE

The Democrats have won control of the House and Senate, and have a majority of the governors. But outside the solid South, in the rest of the country where the two-party system actually exists, here are the relative strengths of the two parties after the November elections:

In the House, the Democrats have 122 seats to 193 for the Republicans. There are 22 Democratic senators, and 47 Republicans. There are 14 Democratic governors, and 21 Republicans.

There is, of course, nothing new about the fact that the Democrats do not have a majority outside of the South. This situation was not brought about in this election, nor even in the last one. But it underlines the fact that bare Democratic majorities in the House and Senate do not mean that the conservative trend in the country has been replaced by a liberal one. In this case, it seems to indicate only a slight decline from the Republican sweep of 1952.

The solid South is not a single reactionary mass, and that is even true of its politicians. Among them are men who on many "economic" issues will stand with the most reformist Fair Dealers. On foreign policy, the Southern politicians have generally been "interventionist," which in this country passes for the same thing as "internationalist," and have generally held back from the China Lobby element grouped around Senator Knowland.

On the question of equal rights for Negroes, the "courageous" liberal in the Southern Democracy is the man who does not make racism the center of his campaign, but who confines himself to denying that he is really for an FEPC, a federal anti-lynch law, and the like.

These, however, are the exception. As a whole, the Democratic Party in the South is a bulwark of conservatism, especially in those periods when the Democratic Party in the rest of the country is treading water politically.

Thus, there was nothing decisive about this election. It revealed a country politically in a near-stalemate with respect to the two parties, and with no force asserting itself independently in this election which gives early promise of breaking that stalemate. And in this period of the atom bomb, the cold war and the general decay of capitalism, a stalemate means a continued drift to reaction.

That being true, is there anything to

be said about the special role of the labor movement, of the working class in this particular election? Is there anything about the election which gives promise of some movement toward independence of labor from the stifling confines of the Democratic Party?

### MORE DIFFICULT NEXT TIME

Actually, it appears that the labor leaders are well satisfied with the performance of their PAC and LLPE machines in the election. Although this time we did not have the kind of boasts which followed the Truman victory in 1948 (that it was the labor movement which did the job) there seems to be a quiet air of satisfaction in the labor press (which reflects above all the attitudes and feelings of the labor bureaucracy) at a job well done.

Reports from all over the country (and specially from the depressed industries) indicate that this time the workers were more willing than in the past to "give a buck for PAC." It appears that there were more volunteers than usual for door-to-door work, and the like.

But at the same time, the integration of the PAC-LLPE forces into the Democratic campaign appears to have been more thorough than ever. Although some conflicts may have escaped general attention, the air is not rent with the charges and counter-charges of betrayal and double-cross which the machine and labor elements were hurling at each other both after the 1948 and the 1952 campaigns.

This does not seem to point to any early rupture in the relationships of the labor movement and the Democratic Party, nor even to any early struggles inside that party among the disparate elements in it. One of the reasons for the programless character of the campaign was precisely to minimize the internal differences, and this purpose appears to have been achieved.

And now, even though the Democrats have responsibility for legislation, it can be expected that they will seek to continue their do-nothing "oppositionist" role as much as possible, hoping for continued party unity in 1956. Of course, such unity must be bought at the expense of any program in the interest of the people. But it will be more difficult to justify to the workers the role of a passive or even cooperative opposition now that the Democrats control Congress, and it will be even more difficult if they win the presidency two years from now.

It will probably take at least that much time for labor to become disillusioned with the only kind of politics the Democratic Party, as a whole, can engage in. But there is no reason to believe that the Democrats can continue to live on the vague popular feeling that they are the party of the New Deal, of the common man, forever. When the time finally arrives when masses of workers and middle-class people in both North and South come to the conclusion that this vehicle cannot ride them anywhere they want to go, the organized political activity of PAC and LLPE can well serve another purpose: to form the basis for a genuine labor party in America.



# Out of the Sao Paulo Election, a Portent for Brazil: THE EMERGENCE OF JANIO QUADROS

By BRASILEIRO

RIO de JANEIRO, Nov. 3—The elections to the state Chambers of Deputies and the state governorships did not fulfill the hopes of any of the contending political camps.

The right-wing liberal ex-opposition did not win a victory; and likewise the party of the dead President Vargas did not gain its anticipated majority by profiting from the dramatic suicide of its leader.

The "Getulist" PTB (Vargas' "Labor Party") lost positions it held previously, and even the official leader of the party, Jango Goulart, did not succeed in getting elected as a senator. In ex-President Vargas' native state, Rio Grande do Sul, the successful candidate for governor was the oppositionist Meneghetti. The process of political decomposition is going forward in the Vargas camp, and the elections attested to this fact.

On the other hand, the right-wing liberal camp did not win the masses over to its policies, and so its own political future is very problematical. This leaves the army as the pivot of the new political structure, and the generals remain as the "guardians" of "democratic legality" and the constitution.

## REVOLT BEHIND QUADROS

The result of the election in the most highly industrialized state, Sao Paulo, is very significant. As our pre-election articles explained, there were three candidates for governor: Prestes Maia for the rightist bloc; Adhemar de Barros for his own party of political adventurism, and Janio Quadros, who ran as the candidate of the Socialist Party and was backed by amorphous political forces. After the death of Vargas we wrote that Janio Quadros had a good chance of winning, in spite of the pessimism of

many Brazilian leftists, who were frightened by the prospect of a victory by De Barros.

**Quadros won the election against both Prestes Maia and Adhemar de Barros, in spite of the united front of the official press, and in spite of the powerful political machine wielded by De Barros, who invested millions and millions stolen from the public treasury.**

The election of Janio Quadros certainly represents, in part, the revolt of honest people and honest workers against the right wing, and in the first place, against its corruption and political prostitution, against its systematic pillage of the public treasury, as represented by Adhemar de Barros.

But the victory also has its shadowy side; for Janio's victory would have been impossible without Vargas' suicide and the special political conjuncture created by his death. Profiting by the situation, Janio Quadros, who was being run as the candidate of the Socialist Party, made an agreement with the leaders of the Vargas "Labor Party," especially with ex-Minister Oswaldo Aranha and the party's general secretary, Jango Goulart, and also Ivette Vargas, the daughter of the late president. The Vargas party's support played the decisive role in the election of Janio.

## AMORPHOUS COALITION

One might say that the SP has achieved the "Popular Front" which the Communist Party so desired—a united front with the powerful Vargas party against the Right. But it was not a "victory" for the SP as a political force but rather a personal victory for Janio; or perhaps it would be more true to say it was a fortuitous political circumstance, an "act of God." In the struggle between the Vargas camp and the "oppo-

sition," in Sao Paulo, a way was opened for "Janio's third force," a new political force, which has prospects for growth in the country and whose expression and leader is Janio himself.

**What is this political force, and what political parties make it up? In the first place, it reflects a spontaneous movement of the workers and middle class against capitalism, against corruption, and also against the Vargas policy as well as against the present government; it is an opposition which is largely indefinite and amorphous, but which is opposed to the Right as well as to the corrupt Adhemar party and the government.**

The groups backing Janio were the SP, the mass following of the Vargas "Labor Party," and the "National Labor Party" (Partido Nacional Trabalhista), plus a large non-party mass support. Janio Quadros is only the accidental expression of this movement, and it is just as likely that he can build himself up to national leader of this movement so that he will disappear from political life after finishing his term as state governor. The political future for Janio and "Janism" depends completely on the objective conditions in the country and on the development of the political consciousness of the popular masses.

In any case, the political composition of this movement is middle class and petty-bourgeois, from the SP to Janio and the Vargas party. Its political development and fate depends in the first place on the position of the working class and its pressure on Janio's "caucus" and state government.

## SP GAINS BUT—

The future of Janio's state administration depends on the support it gets from the right-wing parties, the UDN-PSD coalition (National Democratic

Union and "Social Democratic Party," the parties which backed Prestes Maia nationally), and also from the Vargas party; for the parties which officially ran Janio are only a small minority in the state Chamber (SP and "National Labor Party"). According to press reports, the outgoing governor, Lucas Garces, has promised Janio support from the PSD. There is also a wing of the UDN which will come to an agreement with Janio.

The SP wants a government that will carry out its "minimum program," which Janio pledged to support as the condition for his place on the SP ticket; but what counts is that it is willing to enter a government with the right-wing parties if Janio will declare that he will carry out his pledge. On the other side, the Vargas camp is searching for a new political leader, after the defeat of Jango Goulart.

**What is the future of Janio's political support in the country? If he is to govern the state of Sao Paulo, he must govern with the support of the rightist majority in the Chamber, and so he will lose mass support and risk political eclipse. To make possible his rise nationally, he must go out to capture the presidency of the republic, and to this end he must make himself the leader of a new political movement—a new-style Vargas, as he dreams indeed. Only the future can answer which alternative he will adopt.**

The Socialist Party got more than 100,000 votes, four state deputies and one federal deputy, and it is now a considerable political force. From the standpoint of electoral policy it made gains out of the agreement with Janio; but the price it pays in a political alliance with Janio, support of his government consequently, and new political compromises.

## THE ELECTION AND THE STATE AFL POLICY: California Got a Choice of Reactionaries

By B. ARNOLD and S. BEILAS

SAN FRANCISCO, Nov. 8—Little consolation can be taken by the Democratic Party of California from the fact that an increased drift of support took place on November 2 in comparison with the results of both 1950 and 1952. For the conservative Republican machine engineered an overwhelming half-million majority in California in contrast to Republican heavy going in all other industrialized and urbanized states.

Despite a 3-to-2 registration majority for the Democrats (almost 900,000 more Democrats registered than Republicans), they lost the gubernatorial election to Goodwin Knight in an atmosphere of political apathy and voter confusion.

**The incongruity of the reactionary Knight, who called even Warren a "Socialist Republican," campaigning as a labor-supported candidate is attributable to the machinations of the state AFL. The largest single union in California, the Teamsters, rammed through a Knight endorsement at the state LLPE convention early in May, in exchange for an obvious deal with Knight and Harold Powers, the GOP lieutenant-governor candidate. Local council rebellions against this deal split the AFL vote and created confusion in labor's ranks.**

The CIO endorsement for Richard Graves, Democratic candidate for governor, amounted to little, for the CIO in California is outnumbered over 5 to 1 by the AFL. To add to the confusion, Graves himself, a registered Republican up to this year, had an anti-labor record as head of the League of California Cities, and was particularly vulnerable on both scores.

## ROYBAL RUNS AHEAD

Significantly, the most liberal Democratic candidate on the slate, Edward Roybal, candidate for lieutenant-governor, was the front-runner on a statewide basis. The Los Angeles city councilman surpassed Graves by over 16,000 votes and polled 45 per cent support to Graves' 43.5 per cent.

Roybal was the first Mexican-American to run for a leading state office in California, and the campaign against him was marked by undercover anti-Mexican propaganda. He openly opposed the loyalty oaths in use throughout the state, and came out for the right of Communists to teach on the basis of competency. In spite of this stand, and his liberal, pro-labor record in the Los Angeles City Council, the state AFL endorsed and campaigned for his GOP opponent as part of the Knight-Teamster deal. Roybal outdrew Graves in every Southern California county with the exception of Santa Barbara.

The labor movement had unanimously endorsed Samuel Yorty, Democrat, for the U. S. Senate over Thomas Kuchel, the GOP incumbent, whom Senator Morse called "Knowland's water-boy," and still Yorty polled only 46.5 per cent of the vote.

**Although Yorty's record in the House of Representatives may appear mildly liberal, his campaign marked him as a jingoist and a spokesman for the Southern California aircraft corporations. His prime slogan was "increase the air force budget." Yorty spent the most money of all the Democratic candidates and waged a chauvinistic campaign to show that he was not "soft toward Communism," and he still lost by over 265,000 votes.**

The personal intervention of Vice-President Nixon against Robert Condon, Democrat from the 6th District, highlighted the California congressional campaign. Condon, who had been denied an Atomic Energy Commission security clearance for his alleged past Stalinist associations, was smeared by Nixon's dirtiest brush wherever the latter went. The witchhunt against Condon included

the denial of Democrat National Committee support by Chairman Mitchell; nonetheless the California labor movement and the NAACP united behind him.

An unprecedented newspaper, television and radio barrage—unprecedented even for California—was unleashed against Condon, yet he lost by only 1,500 votes in the closest congressional election in the state. Condon carried the farming areas of Solano County and the industrial city of Richmond, but lost to his GOP opponent, Baldwin, when the latter swept the middle-class suburban sections of Contra Costa County.

## SMALL GAINS FOR DEMS

A victory in Fresno, however, enabled the Democrats to retain 11 of the 30 representatives in Washington. This gain in Fresno indicated once again that the Democratic stronghold still exists in the Central Valley counties in contrast to the metropolitan counties.

In the state legislature the Democrats gained three seats in the State Senate, including the seat formerly held in Los Angeles County by Jack Tenney of notorious California Un-American Activities fame. Thus both San Francisco and Los Angeles Counties are represented in the Senate by labor-endorsed Democrats for the first time in decades. Although the Democrats also gained six additional seats in the State Assembly, they are still in a weak minority position, as they have been throughout this century.

The failure of State Proposition 4, which would have increased old-age pension benefits from \$80 to \$100 monthly, further showed an over-all conservative tendency in California. Probably more money was thrown by big business into defeating this proposition than all the other 19 propositions on the state ballot put together. The labor movement only formally endorsed Proposition 4, but the advertising huckstering slogan "against pension dictators" defeated the one proposition which warranted all-out liberal-labor support.

The Stalinist-controlled Independent Progressive Party (IPP) ran a slate of three candidates in this election in an

effort to retain its position on the statewide ballot. In actuality, however, the Stalinists supported Democrats wherever possible, and the Stalinist *People's World* suddenly discovered that Graves was a progressive candidate. The IPP had to poll over 3 per cent of the vote cast to retain its ballot rights, and as of this writing it appears that it had failed to receive the necessary number of votes required under the law.

**Why is it that California did not reflect the national trend and remained a solid GOP bastion? When political pundits like Senator Kuchel say, "The people of California are not partisan-minded . . . [and] decide elections on the basis of issues and the candidates," they are being self-laudatory and are deliberately confusing the question.**

With the exception of the *Los Angeles Daily News* and the McClatchy chain in the Central Valley, the daily press is completely controlled by an arrogant GOP machine. In the last few months two former GOP Speakers of the State Assembly have been indicted for bribery, but none of the Republican papers made mention of this. The case of Ernest Bramblet, GOP representative from the 13th District, who was ousted from Congress on similar charges, was also glossed over during the campaign. So partisan is the Republican press that it seldom mentions the political opposition except in derogation and even fails to list the party affiliation of the candidates it endorses, urging instead the re-election of "incumbents."

## NO CLEAR-CUT CHOICE

Moreover, the marked weakness of the Democratic Party precinct organization prevents it from capitalizing on the influx of preponderantly Democratic voters to the state. In other West Coast and Southwest states where there is a similar increase of voters with the same political tendency, the shift to Democratic support is apparent. The fact that seven of the eight senators from Washington, New Mexico, Oregon and Arizona are Democrats or Independent is a commentary on

(Turn to last page)

# The McCarthy Trial —

(Continued from page 1)

or unconsciously sympathetic on the basic things in human relationships. One man—say Senator Earle Clements of Kentucky—quietly and automatically enters this club on the day he enters the Senate. Another may 'make it' after some years. The Southerners, by the way, run this utterly bipartisan outfit."

## WHO'S A McCARTHYITE?

So, with indignant sincerity, these pillars of conservatism are telling McCarthy that what he has done is just too-too, and the liberals rightly cheer.

At the same time, Secretary of State Dulles fires John Paton Davies from the Foreign Service, for "lack of judgment"—he once advocated coalition between Chiang and the Chinese Stalinists, like General Marshall. Davies is thrown out under a moral and political cloud, and deprived of his pension to boot, to teach him and his colleagues either better judgment or more judicious (if crawling) silence.

And there is a special angle to the case. As a recent member of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff has just written:

"In his statement Mr. Davies says he has informed the secretary that he would welcome publication of the whole record of his case, including my 1950 recommendation that we seek a preventive showdown with the Soviet Union. The implication here is eloquent. Any recommendation that we seek a preventive showdown with the Soviet Union is at least as much at odds with our actual foreign policy as were the recommendations that Mr. Davies made so many years ago on our relations in the Far East. But from the point of view of the police-mind looking for security risks any error, in this case, is on the right side." (Louis J. Halle, letter to N. Y. Times, Nov. 14.)

In this war of principle between the Good Guys and the Bad Guys over McCarthy, as is well known, Dulles and the other Eisenhowerites are Good Guys. No McCarthyites, they!

## ARMY OF FREE MEN

Speaking of McCarthyism and China, West Point and Annapolis have just forbidden their debating teams to participate in college debates on recognition of China.

The Army Department in Washington officially gave as the reason the argument that it is a "controversial subject."

Henceforth, we are permitted to deduce, the West Point debating team will be permitted to debate only non-controversial subjects—either side of them.

As everybody knows, the Army Department is headed up by a notorious foe of McCarthyism, Secretary of the Army Stevens of TV fame.

## FINE OLD CONSERVATIVES

Sen. Watkins, who is bravely leading the embattled forces of Decency against McCarthyism, or maybe against McCarthy, is a fine old man, we read: conservative, oh yes, but one of those sterling conservatives who is willing to sacrifice himself, spastic stomach and all, in order to fight the Good Fight against the arch-foe.

# California —

(Continued from page 7)

the amateurish and inept character of the California Democratic Party.

In California, where the AFL alone has over one million members and where both senators and the majority of congressmen are decidedly anti-labor, the miserable role of the state AFL in politics is highlighted.

During the last three off-year elections, the AFL endorsed GOP candidates for governor, preferring "high-level" deals with the Republican machine to an active political participation of rank-and-file members in pro-labor politics. Little wonder that apathy and confusion beset the voter when the state AFL prefers to endorse a Knight, and when the alternative of the rebel labor councils is that of blessing a Graves. Even when the California labor movement is unified over a candidate it can only pick a man like Yorty, a jingoistic candidate.

A clear-cut choice for labor-controlled, liberal oriented candidates is called for in California. That responsibility lies in the hands of the state AFL.

We also read that his party leader, Vice-President Nixon, has likewise returned from fighting a Good Fight, in the course of which he did his bit for God, party and country by explaining how the Democrats grease the way for Communism, and by bucking up and mucking up those friends of his who were placing spot announcements on the radio about how Moscow was demanding the election of Democrats.

Nixon, it has been conclusively proved, is a foe of McCarthyism, for it is a matter of record that he invaded the state of New Jersey to support Republican candidate Clifford Case, who was under attack by McCarthy.

It is not on record, however, that this fine old conservative Watkins even has his digestion impaired when he thinks of Nixon, let alone his blood pressure.

## LIBERTARIAN

Then there is that "old-fashioned" libertarian named Senator Ervin, Democrat of North Carolina, member of the McCarthy-eating Watkins committee, who arose on the floor of the Senate to tear into the Wisconsin witchhunter. Who can fail to give him two cheers or so?

Who indeed? One need not be dissuaded by the clearly irrelevant though disconcerting thought that this old-fashioned defender of democracy, along with the rest of the brave men in the Senate, voted for the Humphrey law to outlaw the CP. For that Humphrey law was put through by liberals, Good Guys like Humphrey himself. Why, some time before Humphrey introduced his bill he had appeared on the Invitation to Learning radio program, and what was the classic he chose to discuss? It was John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty*—so there!

There comes to mind a dreadful coincidence. On Monday as the Senate club (and the club within the club) met on McCarthy's trial, Senator William Jenner, one of McCarthy's bosom pals, rose to make his pitch. It seems he began by quoting . . . Mill's essay *On Liberty*.

Perhaps he had been listening to Humphrey. At any rate, it is further reported that, having paid his respects to the dead, he turned to the living and asked: "Where do you think the Communists are working today? They are working day and night to worm their way into the highest councils of the Republican Party."

The fine old conservatives who are all set to slay the dragon of McCarthy took that in their stride. The Communist-smear has been thrown at (1) the CP; (2) anti-CP socialists; (3) anti-socialist radicals; (4) anti-radical liberals; (5) anti-liberal Democrats; (6) anti-Democratic Republicans like Clifford Case; and shall it now, finally, be spared from being slapped in the faces of the Republican high command itself? Who do they think they are?

## KEEP HEALTHY!

However, if McCarthy is slapped down by a Senate censure, all will be well. The N. Y. Times brings these glad tidings to us in the lead article in its magazine section on Sunday, and everybody knows how McCarthyism disgusts this fine old conservative paper.

Moreover, it presents the good news over the by-line of fine old conservative Paul Hoffman, recently head of the Ford Foundation, and more recently returned to his job at the head of Studebaker-Packard; and everybody knows that the Ford Foundation spends real money to investigate the threat to civil liberties.

So, as we were saying, Paul Hoffman informs us that "The complex of fear that has spread over America during the past eight years, and particularly the past four, bringing to this great nation a period of near-panic of a kind it never knew before, has begun to abate in the past six months."

The joy to be evoked by this announcement can be tempered only by the fact that Hoffman omits any evidence for this view. Like all our other fine old conservatives, however, Hoffman is perfectly sincere. It turns out, as one reads him, that he merely means that the fortunes of the man McCarthy are declining.

But the news columns inform us, the other day, that a veteran named Charles Christie was fired from his job at Republic Aviation in Long Island as a "security risk" because his record showed that he suffered from neurodermatitis. Neuroderma-something? Obviously a psycho-unreliable-risk-security regulations—

It turned out that neuro-etc. was a skin disease; so this particular unabated complex made the papers. Besides, the



McCarthy

man was reinstated, wasn't he, even if it did take five months. Happy ending. But suppose Christie had really been a veteran with an emotional disorder—and fired as a security risk?

Don't worry about it. Our fine old conservatives are fighting McCarthy, the complex of fear, the near-panic and all. But to make sure, just don't get neurodermatitis.

## HURRAY FOR DECENT PEOPLE

This could go on, but perhaps we have hinted at what bothers us about the picture in the Senate. It's those fine old conservatives they talk about. What are they fighting?

And if and when—especially if—McCarthy gets censured, or half-censured, we shall naturally cheer along with all other Decent People.

But not so loud as to drown out the protests that arise as Decent People crucify the victims of the responsible-type witchhunt, the fine-old-conservative type witchhunt; the witchhunt of the Good Guys who never never go around abusing generals and raising embarrassing questions about the IQ of senators; the witchhunt of "the club within a club that is the center of all ultimate power in the Senate"; the witchhunt of the respectable bureaucrats who will have no more truck with "controversial" figures than with "controversial" debating subjects, being so uncontroversial themselves; the witchhunters, in short, who quote John Stuart Mill rather than Indian Charlie.

## AMERICA'S LEADING MARXIST REVIEW

### The New International

In the current issue:

- Max Shachtman: Two Revolutions—A Review of Isaac Deutscher (II)
- Albert Gates: The Crisis of American Socialism
- A. Stein: France and American Foreign Policy
- T. N. Vance: The Counterfeit Concept of Countervailing Power

\$2 a year 35¢ a copy

NEW INTERNATIONAL  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

## World History—Year by Year

### The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-52.....\$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

## The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

## The Handy Way to Subscribe!

### LABOR ACTION

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE