

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 28, 1955

FIVE CENTS

THE CHURCH-STATE TIE-UP UNDER ATTACK IN ENGLAND

... page 6

THE CASE OF IGNAZIO SILONE

... page 4

How They Knifed UAW in Ohio

... page 2

By Al Capp: The TV Iron Curtain

... page 4

The Perfect Civil-Liberties Case at Last!

By PHILIP COBEN

The perfect, the pluperfect civil-liberties case for liberals has hit the news. This is the case of Irving Markheim.

Up to now, the model type of civil-liberties case beloved of our liberals has been the Ladejinsky affair. What characterizes this model type is that the case has to be an idiotic mistake even from the withhunters' point of view. Then the liberal can yell for justice and fairness, and against the "excesses" of the loyalty purge, with good conscience, for there is no dissident or non-conformist actually involved and no question of the right to be radical.

The Landy case was another windfall for this kind of courageous liberal. Here was a man penalized for association with his mother, who was accused of once being a Stalinist sympathizer. What made Landy such a wonderful security risk for the valiant liberals was that he could prove that he would have had nothing to do with his mother if she had been a Communist.

In fact, one of the requirements for the "good" liberal civil-liberties case is that the victim has to be next-to-indistinguishable from the inquisitor.

From this point of view, the case of Irving Markheim is a liberal's dream.

Markheim is the man who, from 1932 to 1937, was a stoolpigeon in the CP busily reporting to the Los Angeles police red squad, U. S. Immigration, and the Better America Federation, a "patriotic" organization. After officially quitting the CP, he made out affidavits for the House Un-American Committee and testified for the government in the Bridges case.

But what makes Markheim's case so

(Turn to last page)

Security Risks All

Historian Henry Steele Commager, on "The Perilous Delusion of Security," in the Reporter (Nov. 3):

"No men are exempt from suspicion. Very few of our great leaders of the past could survive the security tests of our time—the tests of association, for example, or of membership in subversive organizations. Not Washington, surely, for he not only consorted with Benedict Arnold but praised him and promoted him to positions of trust. Not Jefferson, for he associated not only with Aaron Burr but with incendiaries of the French Revolution, and, what is more, he advocated the overthrow of government by force and violence. Not Madison, for he in turn associated with Jefferson, with that alien Gallatin, and with the Jacobin clubs. Not Hamilton, for quite aside from his foreign birth and his association with foreigners, his private life alone made him an obvious security risk; he was not only susceptible to blackmail (that is enough nowadays) but he was actually blackmailed. Of all the Founding Fathers perhaps only John Adams led a blameless life, though in his day his defense of the British soldiers who participated in the Boston Massacre was regarded pretty much as a legal defense of the Rosenbergs is regarded today."

Army Retreats Under Attack on 'Loyalty' System for Draftees

Issues New Rules As Hearings Blast It

By GORDON HASKELL

The Defense Department demonstrated last week that even in these conservative times, a stubborn and tenacious fight for civil liberties pays off in the long run. In the face of such a fight against its loyalty-security program, spearheaded by the Workers Defense League under Rowland Watts and a number of soldiers closely associated with the Independent Socialist League, and under the pressure of mounting public indignation at the Defense Department's methods, the brass has beat a major retreat toward "prepared positions" on the loyalty-security field.

The new policy on handling "security risks" in the armed forces was made public at a session of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights at which Rowland Watts, national secretary of the WDL, and Barry Miller and William Witthorn, formerly of the Socialist Youth League, were testifying against the army's procedures in handling soldiers whose political views and associations do not meet with the approval of the government.

Under the new regulations, a draftee who refuses to fill out the questionnaire on his political associations, or who indicates that he had had some association with organizations listed by the attorney general as "subversive" will be screened for "loyalty" before he is inducted into the armed forces.

If the army "does not have full confidence in his loyalty" (as the N. Y. Times for Nov. 22 put it) "he would be rejected. If the army accepted him, there would be no more investigations unless it was discovered that he had concealed activities."

Thus, the new procedure would eliminate the ridiculous and unjust system whereby a person was inducted and forced to serve, even if he "admitted" in advance political associations for which he knew the army would give him a less than honorable discharge before they were through with him.

It leaves untouched, however, the fact that the armed forces will continue to discriminate against people for their legal political views and associations.

In cases in which the prospective draftee "concealed" activities (by which, it appears, is meant any case in which he

(Turn to last page)

Speaking of civil liberties, as this front page does: As we go to press, a cheer is due for Judge Luther Youngdahl's significant decision attacking the government's use of confidential information, supplied by "faceless informers," which remains unknown to the victim. Although rendered in the passport case of Leonard Boudin, this will undoubtedly have an impact on other areas of the government witchhunt.

By SAM ADAMS

On November 18 the Senate Sub-committee on Constitutional Rights, under the chairmanship of Senator Thomas C. Hennings Jr., reached the Armed Military Personnel Security Regulations program in its investigation of the entire loyalty-security program as it has been practised over the years by the successive administrations in Washington.

Meeting in the Senate Caucus Room, the subcommittee heard Rowland Watts, secretary of the Workers Defense League and a member of the Maryland Bar, summarize his recent sensational report "The Draftee and Internal Security," which he, together with Norman Thomas, had presented to Secretary of the Army Wilber

Bricker on August 6 of this year.

Appearing with Watts at the hearing and testifying were Barry Miller and William Witthorn, who prior to their induction had been members of the Socialist Youth League (affiliated with the Independent Socialist League before fusion into the Young Socialist League) and the Politics Club at the University of Chicago. Miller and Witthorn became army security cases under the regulations and their

(Continued on page 7)

Two Court Decisions on the COLD WAR VERSUS DEMOCRACY

By H. W. BENSON

Two recent court decisions affecting civil liberties, one good and one bad, emphasize how erratic and unpredictable is the fate of democracy in the hands of judges.

In Washington, a federal judge found Harvey O'Connor guilty of contempt for refusing to answer certain questions before the McCarthy committee. O'Connor, formerly research director for the CIO Oil Workers Union, is the author of books once circulated by the State Department in its libraries abroad.

McCarthy, "investigating" his books, demanded that O'Connor tell the committee whether he had been a member of the Communist Party when he wrote them. O'Connor refused to reply, standing not on the Fifth but on the First Amendment to the Constitution, the one guaranteeing free speech. He maintained that the attempt to probe his political opinions as an author violated his rights.

The judge decided against him, ruling that the facts "justify the abridgment of the defendant's rights under the First Amendment" and citing Supreme Court rulings that "the right of free speech is not absolute, but must yield to national interests . . ."

This formula is truly diabolical. Free speech, like everything else, is not "absolute." Neither is the right to eat, to have children, to breath. If all which is "not absolute" yielded to "national interest," the American Legion could at last breathe (if it were in the national interest) easily.

Only one minor question would remain to be cleared up: just what is and what is not in the "national interest"? And until that is officially settled, perhaps by an attorney general's list, we must be dependent upon the quirks of judicial caprice for an interpretation of our democratic rights.

Meanwhile, in California, Judges Pope and McAllister of the U. S. Court of Appeals declared the Coast Guard's screen-

ing program unconstitutional. Up to now, the Guard has denied work-cards to long-shoremen and seamen who it decided were "security risks." Its right was challenged by a group of former members of the Marine Cooks and Stewards Union who protested against the use of star-chamber processes, secret informers, and unspecified charges—methods that have become standard procedure in all questions of "security."

When the case was first tried before U. S. District Judge Edward P. Murphy, he ruled against the victimized workers, dismissing their complaint even after conceding that one of the central problems of our times was how to reconcile the freedom of the individual with national security. Here again, "national interests" played a decisive role in upholding an authoritarian screening program.

But on appeal, the screening program was thrown out. The Appeals Court found a violation of due process and added:

"It is a matter of public record that the somewhat comparable security-risk program directed at government employees has been used to victimize perfectly innocent men. The objective of perpetuating a doubtful system of secret informers likely to bear upon the innocent as well as the guilty and carrying so high a degree of unfairness to the merchant seamen involved cannot justify an abandonment here of the ancient standards of due process."

The judges also declared, "The whole question here is whether the danger or possible danger to national security is of such a character and magnitude that the ancient rights of notice and hearing envisioned by the Fifth Amendment may be denied to these seamen citizens. . . ."

In his case, the judges ruled that the danger was not so great. Every democrat will welcome the setback to the arbitrary screening program. But the legal standards are becoming so elusive and shadowy that no one can know what will happen in the next case.

SPOTLIGHT

Bipartisanship at Work

After all the talk about reforming the injustices of the security system, it is clear that the only step being taken by the administration is directed exclusively at the type of "excess" represented by the Ladejinsky-Landy-Markheim type of case, and not at any refurbishing of civil liberties.

This is in evidence from the make-up of the new commission appointed to investigate the government's loyalty program. As the ADA has pointed out, there is not a single champion of civil liberties among the 12 appointed.

Not one! That is, not even a single one for window-dressing. It is remarkable evidence of how little the witchhunters think they have to fear liberal grumblings at the program.

The commission was appointed one-third by Eisenhower, one-third by Vice-President Nixon as presiding officer of the Senate, and one-third by House Speaker Rayburn, the leader of the Democratic Party, which is thereby involved in responsibility for it too.

There was no reason to expect anything from Eisenhower or Nixon, certainly. But some liberal sentiment in the Democratic Party might have been expressed through Rayburn's appointments, one might expect? Take a look at the two Democrats appointed by this Democrat (he had to name four, of whom only two could be Democrats). They were (1) a Texas lawyer, and (2) Congressman Walter of the infamous McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

Matters of Russian Legislation Only, Please

In a letter published in the N.Y. Times on Nov. 14, James T. Farrell came out as opposed to the McCarran Internal Security Law. Which is very nice, except for a point in his letter which deserves notice.

The occasion for the letter—a kind of "To Whom it May Concern" public declaration—was, Farrell writes, because "many people have come to believe that I am in favor of the McCarran Internal Security Law." This in turn was so because of the "statement I issued criticizing 360 Americans who had signed an amicus curiae brief supporting the Communist Party's position in the pending Supreme Court case concerning the McCarran Internal Security Law."

This attack on the 360 was on behalf of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, of which Farrell is chairman. It was indeed an accurate reflection of the anti-democratic position of the ACCF, which seems to become exercised about cultural freedom mainly when its principles are flouted behind the Iron Curtain, or when members of the ACCF are mistakenly witchhunted, but rarely when the cultural freedom of political dissenters is involved.

This, however, is a long-standing characteristic of this organization, and nothing new. What is new to us is the claim which Farrell makes further on in his letter:

"I am making this statement [of opposition to the McCarran Law] as an individual, and not as chairman of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom. The American Committee for Cultural Freedom cannot take a position, as an organization, on matters of legislation. However, I do want to make clear my own view."

This is a very remarkable excuse for the failure of the ACCF to oppose the McCarran Law. Perhaps Farrell is unaware that the ACCF has indeed taken positions on "matters of legislation." As a matter of fact, one of the outstanding cases revealing this organization's peculiar view of cultural freedom came on the McCarran Immigration Law. In a special statement on the visa problems dealt with by this law, the ACCF made a series of proposals and gave a series of verdicts on a number of provisions in this law.

It did not, however, it stated at that time (nearly three years ago), take a position on "the general principles" of the law. The reason for this restraint was semi-public knowledge: there was too much sentiment inside the ACCF in favor of this police-state law.

Now Farrell, who was not chairman at that time, says that the ACCF "cannot take a position as an organization on

matters of legislation." Is this some new rule it has adopted to avoid future embarrassment, or is it merely an ad-hoc pretext for not opposing the McCarran Internal Security Law? In either case, the committee seems to be severely limiting its own cultural freedom.

But never fear: this will not cramp the ACCF's style when it comes to Stalinist crimes against freedom, cultural or otherwise. It is only at home that the ACCF becomes tongue-tied. It functions, in other words, as an American Committee for Cultural Freedom By The Other Guy.

Another U.S. Injustice To Pacific Islanders

The story of American injustice to the people of still another Pacific island came out when the Times for Nov. 9 printed, in its letter columns, an appeal by representatives of "over 7000 displaced inhabitants of the Bonin Islands," signed by two officers of the group which the Bonin Islanders had formed to seek repatriation.

These two officers have come to this country, they write, to petition for the right of their people to return to their homes. They give assurances of observing security regulations and point out that the repatriation will not be at U. S. expense.

Here is their story:

"The Bonin islanders were evacuated under compulsion by the Japanese military authorities shortly before the end of the Pacific war, and those who then remained to serve in the defense forces were similarly evacuated immediately after the war by the Occupation authorities. After the war we naturally expected to return to our homes and occupations in our native islands, but to our great disappointment such was not the case.

"After the war the American authorities permitted 135 of our compatriots who are of partly Occidental parentage to return to the islands. We are hard put to understand this unfair action, for we are all Japanese and do not make any distinction among ourselves.

"Moreover, the provisions of the San Francisco Peace Treaty governing disposition of the Bonin Islands applies to other former Japanese islands as well. But while the inhabitants of Okinawa who had been evacuated to Japan during the war have all been permitted to return, all Bonin islanders, except the 135 of mixed blood, continue to be shut off from their native homes. It is our hope that we will at least be given the same treatment as that given to Okinawans.

"Deprived of the economic base which we and our forebears had established in the Bonins and stranded in the home islands of Japan where we have no roots, we are undergoing severe hardships to eke out a living. More and more are falling back on government relief."

The reader should especially note the racist criterion used by the American authorities.

George Washington's "One-Party System"

When Molotov, at the Geneva conference, defended the one-party system, there was of course the indicated comment by the American press—indignant or sarcastic. Indeed Molotov's polemic was one of the crudest recent examples of the Stalinist mind.

All the more reason, therefore, to give some publicity to the following statement on the one-party system which was not made in Russia or by Russians, but by a U. S. government organ.

This is the periodical *Noticias de Actualidad*, which is the official publication in Spain of the U. S. Information Service.

In a letter to Theodore Streibert, the head of this agency, Norman Thomas pointed to an article which purported to describe the two-party system in this country, and which contains a statement that is "historically inaccurate and designed to palliate a dictatorial one-party country, such a system as Franco has in Spain and some Latin American dictators have encouraged":

"The U. S. [stated the article], like all countries born of a revolution, began by having a single party. George Washington and many other defenders of the cause

of national independence did everything possible so that this state of matters would continue, in their desire that the future presidents to be elected should be above all political differences."

If, instead of this fascist sentiment, a radical idea had been discovered in some U. S. government publications, it can be imagined that a fierce investigation would have resulted.

Splitting Question for A Peccable Grammarian

Far be it from us to cavil non-politically with any of Adlai Stevenson personal predilections, but after all, Stevenson's status as an egghead has long assumed political significance. There are people around who are willing to admit that, to be sure, the man isn't really a liberal—at least, it's hard to prove he is—but after all, he is an intellectual... literate, you know.

So it is in a purely captious spirit of discontent with these latter types, and not so much with Stevenson himself, that we hereby inject into the presidential campaign the issue of Stevenson's Split Infinitives.

The GOP would be well advised to ride this hard, since Stevenson has unwisely cut his own throat with both sides of the controversy. It's another case of the compromiser satisfying no one.

The other week, when Stevenson read his statement to newsmen disclosing that he is a candidate for the nomination, the last words of his prepared text were "to so honor me." According to an alert reporter of the Times, he orally changed this to unsplit the infinitive the first two times he read it for the cameras, making it "so to honor me." (The third time, it seems, he gave the splitters the break.) The Times said this was noteworthy because of Stevenson's reputation as an "impeccable grammarian."

This, in itself, was bad enough. It is the official view of the Grammatical Sub-section of the Editorial Style Department of LABOR ACTION that the anti-split-infinitive viewpoint represents a reactionary deviation toward pedantry. (We split infinitives at will, and are glad to do so.)

But this in itself would not have occasioned comment. On Thursday, Nov. 17, came Stevenson's news conference, the transcript of which appeared in the Times next day. We submit that the evidence is damning.

The man's very first sentence (after saying good-morning) began as follows: "I would like to, at the outset, perhaps express my sympathy for you that you shall have to see and listen to me..."

Now even we vicious splitters of infinitives do not believe in going this far. But that's not all. In a few minutes he gave tongue to the following; if the transcript does not slander him:

"... Steve Mitchell, who was chairman of the committee, and whom I believe is entitled to much of the credit for the rehabilitation of the Democratic Party."

As is well known, the Lower Classes tend to say "who" where the grammar books specify "whom," and what Stevenson is doing is inverting this mistake out of fear of making the proletarian type of error.

The political conclusion to be drawn from all this is absolutely clear, namely: It would be best all around if everybody, including us, stuck to discussing Stevenson's politics.

GM, Ford Knifed The UAW in the Ohio Referendum

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Nov. 20

There was plenty of embarrassment in auto circles this past week, and it was entirely understandable.

The news came from Ohio that Ford and General Motors had contributed more money to defeat the AFL-CIO-sponsored unemployment-compensation law—including a clause approving payment of the modified Guaranteed Annual Wage which the UAW had negotiated—than any other industrial group.

The Wall Street Journal for Nov. 8 reported:

"Contributing to the campaign against the proposal are a lot of non-Ohioans including, strangely enough, Ford and GM themselves. Other big out-of-state concerns with Ohio workers appear to be lined up in opposition to the plan too. The list includes U. S. Steel Corp., Sears, Roebuck and Co., Montgomery Ward and Co., General Electric Co. and Pure Oil Co.

"It's not clear just why Ford and GM are battling against their own layoff pay plans. 'We have joined in efforts to oppose the joint referendum in Ohio because we object to it as a package,' says a Ford spokesman in Detroit. 'The package as a whole is not acceptable to us.' GM had no comment to offer."

What was embarrassing is that this revelation exploded sky-high the very comfortable and comforting theory of the UAW leadership on the enlightened character of the "new American capitalism," which is the center of the UAW viewpoint these days.

It may be recalled that a major strategy of the whole Guaranteed Annual Wage fight was based on the theory that once contracts were signed with the Big Three, the auto manufacturers, in enlightened self-interest, would join with the UAW in changing state laws to okay the fund payments and to put pressure on state legislatures to increase unemployment-compensation benefits. This strategy was considered crucial in the UAW theory of making capitalism work.

The Ohio experience proved just the contrary. At the risk of being accused of using out-dated jargon, the theory of class-collaboration turned out for the UAW to be the same one-way street it always was historically. Capitalists never reform; its just reformers who turn into procapitalists.

Following the defeat in Ohio, the UAW has failed to make anything like a realistic analysis of what really happened. Rather it is depending on some deals and special rulings to get the required two-thirds needed to put the plan into effect. But that still doesn't answer the question of what happens in Ohio to auto workers laid off.

TUG-OF-WAR

The Detroit newspapers carried an interesting story on the latest developments in the UAW hierarchy which are worth noting. Since John Livingstone resigned as UAW vice-president to function as organizational director of the new AFL-CIO labor movement, the vacancy has been filled by Pat Greathouse, Chicago area regional director.

This leaves open the director's job, and it has been reported that Jack Conway, Walter Reuther's key assistant, has made a bid for that job. It remains to be seen what happens, for there is quite a tug-of-war behind the scene on this issue.

Success for Conway would place him in a powerful position instead of his being just a brain-truster. Will Reuther support him in the move, or will Reuther again bow to conservative elements on the board who don't like the idea of Conway sitting there with voice and vote as an equal?

There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dimes and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

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

NOW—IN ENGLISH
THE FAMED "VOLUME 4"
OF "CAPITAL"

Karl Marx's
HISTORY OF
ECONOMIC
THEORIES

PART ONE

Langland Press—337 pages—\$5.00

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

LABOR SCOPE

BIG STAKES IN THE IUE WESTINGHOUSE STRIKE

By BEN HALL

The strike at Westinghouse Electric enters its sixth week. On Oct. 16 the CIO electrical union (IUE) shut down 28 of the company plants; a week later, the UE (independent) called its members out of 14 plants where it holds bargaining rights.

The CIO demands:

- (1) Guarantees against speedup and concealed wage cuts.
- (2) Arbitration clauses in the grievance procedure.
- (3) A 15 cents hourly wage increase.
- (4) Rejection of company demands for a 5-year contract.

According to the *CIO News*, "The indications are for a long, tough strike in which the IUE will need help from all of labor." For the first time, the IUE is challenging a big corporation; and Westinghouse has obviously made a decision for a knock-down fight.

For the IUE, the outcome will be decisive. If it stands up, it will emerge as the unquestioned leader in an industry whose workers are divided among several unions. If it is forced to capitulate, it will drop to the status of just one of the competing unions, and electrical manufacturing workers will have failed to establish a single, powerful, unified union.

The Westinghouse decision to resist is in line with a vast program of reorganization aimed at re-establishing its competitive position. It wants a free hand, without union interference, to cut costs by speeding up its workers and to shuffle jobs and pay rates at will.

While profits of most big companies have soared in the last year, Westinghouse has dropped. It lost two government jet-engine contracts, when it failed to produce an engine that would meet performance specifications. Navy pilots refused to take up planes driven by Westinghouse engines because they had been falling apart in the air. They seem to have had their own interpretation of the trade slogan: "You can be sure if it's Westinghouse." Meanwhile, General Electric, its main competitor, has been cutting into its sales to private consumers.

Westinghouse profits for the first half of 1955 have dropped 35 per cent compared to 1954 while General Electric rose 9 per cent. The owners and managers of the company are determined to solve their own business difficulties at the expense of their workers—if they can.

But the union is making a splendid showing in its first big battle. Despite a high-pressure company propaganda campaign, marked by daily full-page newspaper ads, the union membership shows no signs of weakening.

And the labor movement, realizing the importance of this strike, is beginning to give financial aid. Early in the strike, the UAW donated \$20,000, announcing that it was ready, if necessary, to join on picket lines. Two weeks later, the United Steelworkers promised to make \$500,000 available.

Westinghouse forced a strike for its own private reasons. But as the IUE-CIO reports, "Government by big business in the Eisenhower administration has created a climate which gives Westinghouse the courage to take on the IUE-CIO." Secretary-Treasurer Al Hartnett told delegates to the District 7 Council meeting Oct. 16.

Strikebreaker's Memoirs

While today Eisenhower's government -by-big-business encourages strikebreaking employers, it is in Harry Truman's memoirs that you find the background. Here, in case you missed it, is his own account of how he stimulated the strike-breaking spirit in 1945.

During the rail strike that year, he relates:

"In a joint session of the Congress on May 25 I requested strong emergency legislation that would authorize the institution of injunctive or mandatory proceedings against any union leader forbidding him from encouraging or inciting members to leave their work or to refuse to return to work, that would deprive workers of their seniority rights who without good cause persisted in striking against the government, that would provide criminal penalties against employers and union leaders who violate the provisions of the act and that would authorize the president to draft into the armed forces all workers who were on strike against their government."

The rail workers were on strike against

the "government" only because Truman had made a formal "seizure" of the lines, leaving everything unchanged in reality. Railroad officials simply donned army uniforms and presto! became the "government." The strike was called off before Truman pushed through his law. If it had continued despite his strike-breaking draft threat, he would now be recorded as author of the most extreme anti-labor law in the nation's history.

He escaped that fate. But he persisted in the quest for dubious fame that year, when the government "seized" the mines. He tells of his role in these words:

"On Nov. 21, the country was once again plunged into a general coal strike—this time against the government of the United States. I instructed the Justice Department to seek a temporary injunction restraining Lewis' action in calling the strike. Federal Judge T. Alan Goldsborough issued the injunction against the United Mine Workers' chief ordering him to cancel notice of the termination of the contract. When Lewis refused to comply with the injunction, he was summoned before Judge Goldsborough to show cause for his failure to obey the court injunction. On Dec. 4, Lewis was found guilty of civil and criminal contempt of court. His personal fine was fixed at \$10,000 and the United Mine Workers union was fined a total of \$3,500,000. Seventeen days after he had called the costliest strike in his career, Lewis ordered the miners to return to work." Later Truman became known to union officials as a "friend" of labor.

S.F. Mass Rally On Till Case

By CHARLES WALKER

San Francisco, Nov. 14

About 7000 people from northern California came by special busses, cars and ordinary city transportation to San Francisco's Cow Palace yesterday afternoon, to attend an Emmet Till memorial meeting under the auspices of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, held in the midst of a driving rain.

The speech by Ruby Hurley, southeast organizer of the NAACP, was very stirring, describing the Negro's plight in that combat area. So too was the carefully measured agitational speech by Frank "Fearless" Williams of the Northern California regional NAACP. When Moses Wright, Till's elderly grand-uncle, was brought down the darkened aisle with a searchlight picking him and his attendants out, cries of strong feeling could be heard in many parts of the audience. There was no staging of this feeling despite the props used by Williams.

However, this desire for justice, with its element of frustrated hatred toward Till's murderers, did not obtain anything besides its own release in the pink-tea atmosphere of the Cow Palace. After a sardonic attack on the famous Eisenhower team and its creaking Justice Department, plus the absolutely true statement that the Democratic Party was not interested in policing its Southern branch in the interests of justice and equality for the Negroes, the audience was informed by a resolution that it should send letters to congressmen and senators. There was no talk of building a party that will fight against lynching and discrimination; no talk of a march on Washington—not to mention Mississippi.

Also urged were two other measures: contributing to the NAACP to aid its campaign of Negro registration in the South, and joining NAACP.

However, "Fearless Frank" did display his militancy and concern for freedom "everywhere" by calling on the cops, and later on the Cow Palace guards, to harass the socialists distributing literature in the driving rain. These worthies chased the socialists away from the entrances and also interfered with the passing out of literature to stopped lines of cars outside of the parking lot entrance—on the grounds of "interference with traffic."

About 800 copies of LABOR ACTION and special leaflets written for this meeting were passed out to the crowd despite this interference, and some people took three or four copies to pass out inside.

BRAZIL

Social Forces Behind The 'Preventive Coup'

By JUAN REY

Santiago, Nov. 11

The "preventive coup" by Gen. Teixeira Lott seems to have won out, and, barring a second coup from the other side, it would seem certain now that the presidential power will be delivered over to the newly elected Juscelino Kubitschek, in accordance with the results of the election.

As we have pointed out, the electoral campaign did not end the political fight between the two factions of the Brazilian bourgeoisie which are at loggerheads; on the contrary it deepened the political crisis. The victory of Kubitschek meant the victory of the "Getulist" camp—the camp of the former President Getulio Vargas—and his enemies were disposed to dispute Kubitschek's right to assume the presidency. The juridical basis of their argument was that Kubitschek had been elected with the support of an illegal party, the Communist Party.

But out of the electoral coalition that had opposed Kubitschek in favor of Gen. Juarez Tavora, only the UDN (National Democratic Union) was firmly in favor of a coup to prevent the Getulists from taking office. The Socialist Party and the Christian-Democratic Party were against this step, and favored letting the elected candidate take over.

The peculiarity of this situation was that the traditional partisans of dictatorship (the pro-Vargas Getulists, and the Stalinists) were now fervently arguing for "democracy," while the liberal-bourgeois and bourgeois-democrats were advocating a coup against the elected candidate.

The political fight acted itself out around the armed forces, the latter being the center of political power and the key to any future political solution.

ARMY SPLIT

In this period between the election and the assumption of office by the president-elect, President Café Filho—probably under the pressure of Kubitschek's enemies—fired Gen. Zenobia da Costa and his friends from their posts; Da Costa is pro-Getulist. But the minister of war, Gen. Teixeira Lott, was pro-Getulist too. The anti-Kubitschek wing of the army had been much weakened since the death of Gen. Canrobert Pereira.

The clash came over a speech made by Col. Malmade of the Military Club, which is a most important political group in the army. This club had been the center of the fight against Vargas himself and of the "August revolution" which had eliminated him. Its president had been Pereira and its vice-president Juarez Tavora. Malmade's speech attacked "electoral fraud" and "false democrats" in such a way as to challenge the Kubitschek camp. It was considered to be the voice of the section of the army that was for a coup.

Gen. Lott, as minister of war, demanded the arrest of Malmade (who was not under Lott's command); this was refused by the president in his capacity as chief of the army. Moreover the pro-coup faction took another provocative step: when an air force officer made a speech against a coup and for respecting the law, he was arrested by his superior, Gen. Gomes, a leader of the UDN.

But the idea of a coup was unpopular with the masses. The armed forces were divided over it. The UDN was isolated in its pro-coup agitation, which was backed only by the navy and air force and only part of the army. Kubitschek was backed not only by the majority of the voters, but he also has his own "generals." The UDN's case to void the election results was before the high court, but its chances of success were very dubious.

KUBITSCHKE'S PILLARS

But the vital secret of Kubitschek's strength does not lie in the popular support he has but in the financial backing he enjoys from the industrial bourgeoisie and its federations of industry. For Kubitschek was indeed the candidate of the industrial bourgeoisie, who are interested in accelerating the industrialization of Brazil, who are therefore favorable to an inflation policy, speedy capital accumulation, state-capitalist intervention, especially in the oil industry and in regulating coffee prices and export-import policy.

The majority of the working class in the country as a whole follows the bour-

geois lead, backing Kubitschek and the Getulist policy in spite of the fact that the costs are paid by the proletariat.

This is at bottom the social strength which permitted Gen. Lott to intervene. The Getulist strong-man published an "Open Letter" to the nation, declaring himself a defender of legality and the "dignity" of the army, and calling on all the army leaders to solidarize themselves with him. After this gained strength and adherents, the national congress (whose majority is pro-Getulist) met and elected a new president, Senate Vice-President Ramos.

Ramos proceeded to form a new cabinet, in which Lott is the strong-man and minister of war. The state government of Minas Gerais, where Kubitschek is governor, declared its solidarity with Lott's "defense of legality and the Constitution." The deposed president retreated to the cruiser Tamandaré.

For the moment the situation was very complicated indeed. Brazil had about three or four presidents simultaneously: Café Filho, who even before the coup had resigned on ground of ill health in favor of Carlos Luz; Luz, who was now deposed and installed on the cruiser; Ramos, the president installed by Lott; and of course Kubitschek himself, the president-elect, who had not yet taken office.

SOCIAL WAR

For a little while it looked as if the pro-Getulist army forces of Lott were going to be seriously challenged. There were reports that these army elements were planning to base themselves on Sao Paulo if they could not take over Rio de Janeiro Gomes, the UDN leader, was at Sao Paulo conferring with the governor, Janio Quadros, who had supported Tavora against Kubitschek. The cruiser Tamandaré, with its deposed president aboard, was supposed to be on the way to Sao Paulo too.

But then Carlos Luz yielded, called on Gomes to "avoid a fratricidal fight," and the crisis was past for the time being.

Thus it is that the expected coup came not from the party of the liberal right as a blow against Kubitschek but rather came as a preventive coup to ensure Kubitschek's accession to the presidency. This is no assurance, of course, that Kubitschek will be able to finish his term of office, for the UDN and the military opposition will be waiting for their opportunity to get rid of the adherents of Vargas' *Estado Novo* (the New State), as the Getulist social-demagogic program is called.

The aim of the New-Staters, however, is to solve the problem of Brazilian policy by finding an economic policy and political forms to open the doors for the stormy growth of Brazilian capitalism. Hence the menace of civil war, which still remains.

Politically, it is war between the old rightist-liberal camp and the Getulist camp; between the old traditional rural ruling class, backed by the conservative sections of the armed forces, and the new, adventurous industrial bourgeoisie and its political bureaucracy, backed by the popular forces, including a majority of the working class, by the Getulist "Labor Party," and by the generals like Lott, Da Costa, etc.

It is a war between the old "coffee economy" and the new industrial capitalism, between the old liberalism and the new state-capitalism, between the old formal, conservative "democracy" of the landowners and *fazendeiros*, and the new industrial forces backed by the workers.

A New Collection!

MARX AND ENGELS ON BRITAIN

Contains the whole of Engels' *Condition of the Working Class in England* in addition to dozens of their articles and letters. 538 pages—fully indexed—hard-cover—fine binding—but only \$2.50! All orders must be accompanied by payment.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

The Case of Ignazio Silone

An Opinion on His Role in the Italian Socialist Movement

Lucio Libertini, our correspondent in Italy who writes "Reports from Rome" for LABOR ACTION, is a member of the National Committee of the Unione Socialista Indipendente. The following letter was written in response to our request.

In his article on "The Crisis in the Italian CP" (LA, Sept. 26) Comrade Libertini made a passing reference to the political devolution of Ignazio Silone, the famous Italian novelist. Referring to the fact that most of the CP leaders who quit the party had joined either the social-democratic right or the clericals, he remarked: "Typical in this respect is the case of the writer Ignazio Silone, who now directs in Italy the anti-Communist and anti-socialist propaganda of the U. S.-and bourgeois-inspired movements."

We asked Comrade Libertini to explain this, in view of widespread American interest in Silone as both a literary and political figure. His letter gives his reasons for his opinions on Silone.

We have invited Silone to comment on this letter and hope to hear from him. —Ed.

Rome, Nov. 3

Dear Comrades:

The reference to Silone in my last letter was neither arbitrary nor was it lightly made. Here I must open a painful chapter, which I would not do if you had not explicitly asked for it.

There is no doubt that Silone has acquired, during his exile, a well-deserved literary fame, and that his books contain a valid socialist message; even so, their influence in Italy has been modest, infinitely smaller than in other countries. Among us, the writer Silone was in fact discovered by a limited circle of readers only after 1947. Nor does his activity between 1919 and 1928—during the time of the founding and development of the CP—give cause for discussion. But after his departure from the Communist Party a long period of which we know little begins.

I remember Silone's arrival in Rome very well, after the flight of the German army. None of us young people who had organized the independent left tendency of the Socialist Party knew this man, and only a few had heard vaguely of his writings. But the impression he made on us was great, and his language—the language of an independent socialist—struck us deeply. At the first national meeting of the party, in 1945, he made a speech which, if repeated today, might seem to be lacking in political content, but which, at the time, seemed to the independent Left to be a moving and luminous message.

We were first disillusioned with Silone in 1946 when, at the first congress of the party, he appeared in splendid isolation, essentially withdrawing from the struggle, after having incited us to action during the past months. But we did not

give much importance to this disillusion. We attributed his behavior to the passivity of his temperament and to his very bad health, and supported him as candidate for the Directing Committee.

However, once elected, Silone's behavior became stranger. While privately attacking the pro-Stalinists in drastic terms, he would hardly ever show up to do so in the Directing Committee. It may be safely said that his absence—in a body whose political balance was calculated by the ounce—greatly favored the recovery of the pro-Stalinist tendency which had been defeated at the Congress.

WAVY COURSE

In retrospect the only explanation for his behavior that comes to mind is that he intended to sharpen the conflict within the party and to favor the split. Saragat and Nenni, arguing from opposing points of view, of course, have given the same explanation.

However, Silone did not take any active part in the split, and his first comments were pessimistic. For about a year nobody could tell whether or not he belonged to Saragat's new party. In 1948 he returned to the political scene as mediator between Saragat's party, a group of former members of the Action Party, and Ivan Matteo Lombardo, who had previously left the Socialist Party [led by Nenni]. Silone and Lombardo united with the PSDI [Saragat] for the 1948 elections, and Lombardo was elected. In 1949 came Romita's turn. He also left the SP with his followers and raised the problem of unification with Saragat. Since Romita demanded, as a preliminary condition, that the party leave the De Gasperi government, the PSDI was

bitterly divided and finally split. Silone left the party, made an agreement with Romita and became one of the founders of the Partito Socialista Unitario (PSU), which took what might best be described as a Third Camp position. In this period, Silone was very popular among the socialists, and was especially supported by the youth.

Silone's political line suddenly changed as the Korean war was about to break out. He began by writing and distributing a small pamphlet in which he advocated that the PSU support the policy of NATO. (This document is still available; its title is "Peace and Freedom.")

As secretary of the PSU, he conducted an extraordinarily weak struggle against Romita, who had in the meantime become pro-Saragat and pro-government. Finally he substantially agreed, although with many indistinct and never clearly formulated grumblings, to the return of the PSU to the PSDI, of which he had become a member.

Some time later, Cucchi and Magnani left the CP. Silone was among the first to support, help and stimulate them. Although he remained a member of the PSDI, he contributed to *Risorgimento Socialista* [the paper established by the Cucchi-Magnani group] and was with us when we established the first independent socialist groups.

RIGHT DRIFT

This attitude too only lasted a few months. After a certain period he began pressuring for unification with Saragat's party and for giving up the Third Camp position.

Never did Silone openly raise the question. First he would say that he was tired and discouraged; then he'd say that it was necessary for us to get out of our isolation; finally he left our company, accusing us (never in writing, though), of being "crazy" and "inconclusive" and attempting to defame us in certain international socialist circles, as we later found out.

I have told you the whole story so that you may judge the facts for yourself. To us, it seems that there is method in his madness. Since his return to Italy, Silone has always favored splits and pushed socialist groups to ally themselves with the government.

Today Silone spends a great deal of his time with the Italian Committee for Cultural Freedom, of which he is the secre-

tary. It is well known in Italy, and probably nothing new to you either, that this organization is a specialized branch of the American propaganda apparatus in Europe. The main purpose of the Italian section is to redeem Stalinist intellectuals and, in practice, all intellectuals of the Left, for "democracy"—a euphemism for the Western capitalist camp. This is what Silone is doing—with less and less prestige and authority—on the strictly political level.

CHARGES

Today, as far as the Italian socialist movement is concerned, Silone is doing nothing constructive. He says he's disgusted with social-democracy, but he remains a member of this party. Entrenched in his attitude of general disillusionment, he directs vitriolic criticisms against all movements of the Left.

Moreover, he is very active in giving, through a network of agents, anonymous releases to the press, which are always very skilfully directed against the Left and indirectly support the government. The conservative journalists make ample use of them as a basis for their articles and publicize them widely.

This whole past and present activity of Silone has discredited him and has reduced his influence in the Italian socialist movement to nothing. From all sides—and on this point Nenni, Saragat and the SP are in agreement—he has been accused of working for the State Department, an accusation against which he has defended himself but weakly.

I have written all this on your request and, I assure you, without pleasure. I value Silone's intelligence, his literary ability, and I do not underestimate the qualities he has shown in his difficult youth. In spite of the differences in our ages—two generations—I have felt a warm friendship for him in the past.

Finally, I do not wish to associate myself with others who sling glib accusations. It is very hard to say what the man really thinks today, what his relations and intentions really are. But I can testify—and I must testify—that his activity in recent years has only tended to undermine the class movement, and that supporters of the Third Camp have had in him a constant enemy, all the more dangerous as he is ambiguous and undeclared.

LUCIO LIBERTINI

AL CAPP on THE IRON CURTAIN OVER TV

Following is text of a speech made to a Boston audience by Al Capp, creator of the famous "Li'l Abner" comic strip, reprinted from Nieman Reports. For obvious reasons, it is doubtful whether it will get much circulation elsewhere for its hard-hitting denunciation of the capitalist dictatorship over the air waves. Needless to say, we don't ourselves agree with Al Capp's passing expressions of complete approval of the state of freedom in the press and of private enterprise, but you see what it takes to rouse him.—Ed.

By AL CAPP

The two main ways to communicate ideas in America are by press and radio. I've communicated with America both ways. I've found freedom of speech in the American press. I've found an immovable, frightening Iron Curtain in American radio and TV.

In Communist Russia, you think like the Kremlin thinks, or you'd better stop thinking—out loud, at least. On the American air, you think like your sponsor thinks—or he finds someone else who does.

That is why all the thinking that comes out of TV and radio—both from the frankly commentary and opinion programs, and the concealed "messages" in the entertainment shows—represent the thinking of a small group of Americans—the group that sells the whisky and the girdles and the body odor glorifiers—just

as all the thinking on Soviet radio represents the thinking of another small group in the Kremlin.

Now I think that minorities should have a voice. I am prepared to fight to the death for the rights of the men who make whisky or girdles or banish unpleasant smells—but I think us majorities have some rights, too.

TV'S RESPONSIBILITY

In radio, the majority of Americans long ago exercised the one right we had left—the right not to listen.

I have every confidence that the unbeatable team of network and sponsor will make TV just as unbearable.

They are mighty proud when they have succeeded in getting five million sets turned into one show, instead of being ashamed that they've succeeded in getting twenty million sets turned off.

The great idiocy of air surveys is that they rate only the preferences of the people who are listening. They neglect to find out why more millions, who have invested their living rooms to accommodate 'em, who are desperate for decent entertainment, honest news shows, and yet who have been so bored, sickened and offended by the muck that comes out of their machines, that they turn the damned thing off, and read "Li'l Abner" instead.

After the 1952 Democratic primaries in New Hampshire, TV can no longer plead that it is merely an entertainment medium—and therefore has no responsibility to the nation—but only to the whisky distillers or the girdle architects. TV has demonstrated its impact on American thinking by creating a widely popular presidential candidate out of a heretofore obscure senator from Tennes-

see, who, because of a few appearances on TV, was able to beat the pants off the president of the United States and the regular Democratic political machine.

TV, whether the men who run it like it or not, has become, along with the press, the most powerful means of communication (and therefore influence) in the United States. With power comes responsibility. The American press has by and large shouldered that responsibility. No advertisers can buy the editorial columns of any great American newspaper. Any advertiser can buy the editorial influence of any great American network, by buying time and making sure that the commentator who uses the time is their own obedient baby boy.

SOAP DICTATORS

In this way, a tiny minority of national advertisers control most of our network time, and can, and do, pull an Iron Curtain down between the public and any views but their own.

It's dangerous—it's un-American. We don't want our thinking dictated to us, shaped for us, by any small group of commissars, either from the Kremlin, or from the promotion department of a soap factory. It is up to the networks to realize, no matter how uncomfortable the idea is, that in TV they have one of the most powerful media of influence, and that this power must be used for all America, not just their sponsors.

Now the networks have every right to make a buck. It would be, in my opinion, disastrous for us to give control of TV to government. The air should remain, like the press, the property of private enterprise.

But, like the press, the air should be run in an American way—it mustn't,

like Russian air, be the property of a small group. It should, like the American press, keep its influence a clean and unpurchasable influence. TV should remain a business—but a business as great in its dignity and honesty as it is in its influence—not a shabby, unprincipled racket that is willing to sell itself—and us—for thirty pieces of silver.

Well, I guess you won't be seeing me on any TV shows after THIS. At any rate, I'll still be seeing you in the funny papers.



LABOR ACTION

November 28, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 48

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

THE YSL AT WORK

The Chicago unit of the Young Socialist League has been conducting an outstanding series of educational programs and political activities during the first two months of the fall quarter. The unit has been holding an educational-discussion series every Sunday afternoon at 4 p. m. in Ida Noyes Hall at the university, led by YSL members.

During October and November the following topics were taken up:

- Oct. 2: The "intellectual" and "careerist" on campus.
- Oct. 9: Is "coexistence" peace?
- Oct. 16: Heroes and History—the role of the individual.
- Oct. 30: Toward a socialist ethic.
- Nov. 6: Women in modern society.
- Nov. 13: "The Strange Career of Jim Crow"—a review of the book.
- Nov. 20: "The Lonely Crowd"—a review of the book.

The main feature of Chicago YSL educational activity has been a series of forums held on Tuesday evenings at Ida Noyes. These forums, which have received excellent coverage in the Chicago Maroon, student newspaper at the University of Chicago, have presented socialist and other speakers on a variety of subjects of interest to students and of prime political importance.

The series was opened on October 11 by Francis Heisler, noted civil-liberties attorney who is connected with the American Civil Liberties Union and the Workers Defense League, with a talk on "Security and Civil Liberties." Heisler discussed a number of individual cases and related them to the general state of civil liberties in the country.

On October 18, Charles Orr, professor of economics at Roosevelt College, who had been a correspondent in Spain for the Socialist Call during the Spanish civil war, spoke on "Inside the Spanish Revolution."

Victor Howard, Chicago socialist historian, presented a "History of the American Communist Party" at the YSL Forum on October 25; he traced the history of the CP from its inception up to the present. On November 15 the YSL sponsored a symposium on "The Union Movement Today," a discussion of the steel, auto and electrical workers unions in the light of labor unity. The participants consisted of Professor Werner Bloomberg, Carl Shier, officer of Local 6 of the UAW, and Rosemary Mannie, an organizer for the International Union of Electrical Workers.

Two developments in campus politics at the University of Chicago will be of interest to Challenge readers.

JOIN THE YSL!

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

Send me more information about the Young Socialist League.

I want to join the YSL.

(NAME—PLEASE PRINT)

(ADDRESS)

(CITY)

(STATE)

(SCHOOL IF ANY)

At the beginning of the quarter a League for Civil Liberties was organized by liberal and socialist students. The LCL, in which YSL members are participating, is currently discussing the question of whether it should affiliate with the American Civil Liberties Union or the Workers Defense League. As its first project, the LCL has initiated an investigation of administration and faculty cooperation with government "Security" investigators. The project has as its background the fact that a number of former students have received less-than-desirable discharges from the army on the basis of their radical political associations or activities while they were students.

YSLers are also among those participating in a recently formed U. C. Committee to End Discrimination in Chicago Hospitals. The committee is sponsoring a petition campaign to call for adoption of a pending city ordinance to outlaw discriminatory practices in hospitals in that city.

CLASSES IN N.Y.

The New York YSL is planning a Winter class series to begin in December and to consist of four series of classes, one per month, each of which will comprise three sessions, held on Tuesday evenings on a particular subject. The topics are "The Bureaucratic-Collectivist Theory of Stalinist Society," "Imperialism," "The Permanent Revolution," and the "Third Camp," and will be taught by Max Shachtman, Abe Stein, Hal Draper and Gordon Haskell, respectively. Further details will shortly appear in Challenge.

The unit sponsors forums every Friday evening at 114 West 14th Street. Recent subjects discussed have included "George Orwell," given by Mel Becker; "The Role of a Socialist in the Labor Movement," by A. Winters; "The New Deal," presented by George Rawlings; and "Developments in North Africa," given by Max Martin.

BERKELEY BUSY

The Berkeley YSL has projected a series of three classes which will be held on consecutive Sunday evenings at 6 p. m., beginning on Nov. 27, on the subject of "Marxist Philosophy." This class series, which will be held at 2161 Shattuck (Room 31), follows a previously held successful series on "The State." Berkeley YSLers, together with other socialists and liberals, have been distributing leaflets to students in their locality on compulsory ROTC, to educate students to the dangers of militarism on the campus. To date, two such leaflets have been issued, with others in the offing. In addition, the unit distributed a leaflet on the Till case.

A San Francisco YSL (which can be contacted at P. O. Box 3092, Rincon Annex) has been organized and has been conducting distributions of leaflets and Challenge to students in that area. A class on "What is Socialism" is being planned.

Harrington Tour: Michael Harrington, national chairman of the Young Socialist League, is currently touring the Midwest for the YSL. His itinerary includes Pittsburgh, Antioch, Cleveland, Oberlin, Chicago and Madison. A forthcoming issue of Challenge will carry a report on the tour.

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

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

Till Case Spotlights New Negro Militancy

By TIM WOHLFORTH

The recent failure of the Mississippi grand jury to indict Emmet Till's slayers on the self-admitted grounds of kidnapping brings to a close the first phase of the now world-famous Till case.

The case as such is by no means dead. The NAACP has challenged the state of Mississippi to solve the "mystery" created by its jury's declaration that the body found and the boy kidnapped were not Emmet Till. The state must now find out who has been kidnapped and killed.

The second phase of the Till case, however, will not revolve around these legal matters, for the significance of the case far transcends them. To think solely in terms of the case as such is to miss part of the real meaning of the momentous events that have occurred over the last month.

Twenty thousand workers did not gather in the New York garment district just to see that two white men went to the electric chair. The mass of American Negroes and their white supporters did not rally to the support of Moses Wright, who accused the Till murderers, solely on the legal issues of the case.

The protest over the Till case was a far more meaningful thing than that. It was a protest against the terror-ridden South—against the denial of basic human rights and satisfactions to the Negro. The Till case fight was a fight for the Negroes' right to the ballot, for his right to a fair trial, for his right to live without fear and to participate in American life on a plane of equality with his white brothers.

PRO-LABOR NOTE

This protest was significantly different from similar protests revolving around the court cases in the past.

In the first place this case, and the activity around it, was not under the control of the CP, as was true in most previous cases—Scottsboro, Willie McGee, and (in part) the Trenton Six, to mention a few. The Stalinists have been completely isolated from it, holding only a few small meetings attended only by party faithfuls and FBI agents.

The main sponsors across the country have been the anti-Stalinist NAACP and anti-Stalinist unions like District 65 in New York City and the Sleeping Car Porters nationally. Thus the Negro people have been able to support this protest without helping the CP cause.

Secondly, the unions have played a very conspicuous role in the protest. At virtually every rally a spokesman of organized labor has been present. In New York it was District 65 that initiated the great rally in the garment center attended by some 20,000 workers, Negro and white.

At this meeting most speeches tied the Negro struggle for equality to the broader struggle of the entire working people in America for a better life and for the organization of the South. It is this unity of the American worker with the Negro people which was the most hopeful aspect of the entire episode.

DECISIVE FACTOR

Thirdly, the size and extent of Negro solidarity on this issue far surpassed anything in recent history and is the most significant aspect of all. For the first time in the history of the state of Mississippi a Negro stood up in a court of law and accused a white man. This is symbolic of the increase in Negro militancy throughout the South.

The one factor above all else that spells the doom of "Southern gentlemen" rule in the South is the militancy of the Negroes themselves. Nothing that the whites or Negroes of the North can do is quite as important as this. The old passive acceptance of many Southern Negroes is slipping away at a rapid rate. In county after county throughout the deep South

Negroes are risking their lives to register to vote, to join the NAACP, to stand up to racist terror. Some have already lost their lives but this will not hold them back.

Also related to this is the current wave of militant class struggles waged by the Negro sugar workers in Louisiana. These struggles are being carried on under conditions of terror hardly believable in the North.

One person recently returned from Louisiana reports that while traveling at night along the highway in the heart of the sugar region, he observed countless campfires with union men huddled around them with rifles in their laps to protect themselves from scabs and sheriff's posses.

Thus the American Negro is rapidly reaching a state of consciousness and militancy which can spell the doom of "White Supremacy" racism in both the North and the South. But the Negro of course cannot succeed alone. He needs the help of the united labor movement and the help of the American youth.

A LARGER STRUGGLE

During the Till protest American youth responded vigorously. The NAACP held large youth rallies throughout the land; and students, individually and in groups, participated in the struggle.

But what is needed is far more than this. The students, through their own organizations, should join with labor and the Negro people in this struggle. In order to do this they must give up many of their own prejudices and misconceptions.

They must be willing to leave the "ivory tower" and the "groves of Academia" and engage in activity instead of simply studying the situation. Such activity—simply struggling for basic democratic rights for the Negro—will take the student far from the smugness of his middle-class existence.

Such a struggle takes one quickly beyond the bounds of contemporary "respectability." One finds, for instance, that inherent in Southern racial bigotry is the economic exploitation of the Negro and his labor. The fight for Negro rights is pitted against the Southern capitalist and the economic system which nourishes him.

Furthermore one finds that the Negro has few real friends in either of the two major parties. The Republicans have consistently voted with the Southern bloc on civil-rights issues.

The Democrats, for all the pious wishes of the Northern representatives, have adopted a program of consciously side-tracking the issue of Negro equality in order to preserve "party harmony." This was the meaning of Stevenson's good-will trip through the South, of his support by the Southern governors, of good-old-liberal Humphrey's tactical moves to keep civil-rights issues off the floor of Congress.

Such a struggle, which starts out as a simple quest for democratic rights, places one in conflict with American capitalism, and its two parties, puts one on the side of the working people and of those who are working to build a labor party.

BERKELEY YSL CLASS

Marxist Philosophy

SUNDAYS at 6 p.m.

- (2) Dec. 4:
THE RUSSIAN DISPUTE:
LENIN VS. MACH
- (3) Dec. 11:
AMERICAN DISPUTES:
DEWEY, BURNHAM,
TROTSKY

2161 SHATTUCK (Room 31)
BERKELEY

BY-PRODUCT OF
PRINCESS MARGARET'S RECENT DIFFICULTIES . . .

The Church-State Tie-Up Under Attack in England

By OWEN ROBERTS

The frustrated royal romance between Princess Margaret and Group Captain Townsend has been responsible for making the relationship between the state and the church a topic of popular conversation in Britain. Thus the matrimonial problems of an English monarch in the 16th century have found an echo in modern history.

The present relationship between church and state in Britain has most of its origins in the reign of Henry VIII, who has secured a place in history because of his many marriages, which are comparable to those of many a contemporary film star.

Around 1526 Henry became anxious to obtain a divorce from his wife, Catherine of Aragon. Whether Henry had personally become tired of Catherine's company is not accurately determined, but the fact that she was a Spanish princess was sufficient to cause him embarrassment. For at that time royal marriages featured prominently in the field of international diplomacy; and as Henry was then contemplating an alliance with France his personal relationship with a Spanish princess was, to say the least, most inconvenient.

Henry thus applied to Pope Clement VII for a divorce or, to be more accurate, a papal declaration that the marriage was invalid since Catherine had previously been married to Henry's brother. Unfortunately for Henry, Rome had at this time been sacked by an army of Germans and Spaniards and the pope was virtually a prisoner of Charles V, who was Catherine's nephew. The pope—who in normal circumstances would have probably been quite willing to play his normal role in expediting world political alliances—was forced to stall for time, in the hope of finding a compromise which would satisfy Henry without incurring the wrath of Charles.

But, seemingly, Henry was in no mood to play ball with the papacy. He fired his chief minister, Cardinal Wolsey, for failing to carry out orders with sufficient promptitude and the cardinal, stripped of his offices, managed to die just in time to save the royal executioner the distress of performing an operation on the back of his neck with an ax. In his place was established Thomas Cromwell, a man with fewer scruples than Wolsey and one who was prepared to help Henry carry out the plans for plundering the monasteries which were beginning to form in the latter's mind.

After this 16th century purge—which, like many of those of the present day, had the external appearance of an ideological squabble but underneath was deeply bound up with property—Parliament sat down to "rationalize" the position between church and state. In the seven years between 1529 and 1536 Parliament passed, without opposition, a series of acts which severed the church in England from Rome, established the king as the head of the church, forbade appeals to Rome, and effectively brought the church under control of the state.

Lords Temporal and Spiritual

This was the beginning of the development to the position which exists in Britain today. It was not a swift change, but rather a slow process influenced by many factors and spread over a large number of years.

The empirical nature of the whole process can be gauged from the fact that Henry ultimately had the head of Thomas Cromwell lopped off for trying to push England along the

road to complete Protestantism, and Henry later moved back a little towards Rome when he discovered that Charles V was prepared to form an alliance with one who was a bit of a heretic. During this period Protestants and Roman Catholics alike were executed by Henry with almost academic objectivity, from his point of view. The Protestants lost their heads because they denied the doctrine of transubstantiation and the Catholics theirs because they denied that Henry was the head of the church.

It is from such beginnings that the establishment—the Church of England—was created.

Today the Church of England is firmly anchored to the state machine. The House of Lords consists, in the language of British constitutional theory, of the Lords Temporal and the Lords Spiritual. The former are the offshoot of the old feudal aristocracy—today primarily newspaper barons and successful businessmen—and the latter are the two archbishops and 24 bishops; a strange combination which produces corresponding strange results.

Some 970 church appointments are "the gift of the crown" and about 700 of these are "in the patronage of the prime minister." These appointments are defined by the King's Books of Henry VIII, and all those above 20 pounds in value are gifts of the prime minister—which means all bishoprics, deaneries and canonries. The management of the assets of the church is carried out by the church commissioners and these include, besides a number of church functionaries, the lord chancellor, the lord president of the Council, the first lord of the Treasury, the chancellor of the Exchequer, secretary of state for Home Affairs, speaker of the House of Commons, lord chief justice, attorney general, and a number of others holding similar extremely secular appointments. In addition the Second Commissioner is always a member of the House of Commons and answers questions relating to the commission's work in the House.

The Price of Establishment

The current spate of talk had its origins in the decision of Princess Margaret not to marry Peter Townsend, a divorced man. Many people are of the opinion that her decision was forced upon her by the church, which refuses to recognize divorce, and that if the church were to be disestablished this would prevent a repetition of such events. Without entering into the pros and cons of this belief it is sufficient to note that from such emotional beginnings, largely prompted by the tabloid newspapers, a first-class row has developed.

Last Sunday a large number of church dignitaries almost became unfrocked in the blast which the Reverend Lewis Lloyd, Vicar of Chiswick and Rural Dean of Hammersmith, let loose when he preached a sermon in St. Paul's Cathedral in London:

"Is the church's official connection with the state worth the high price that is paid for it, the limitation of her spiritual freedom, the denial of choice in the appointment of her leaders?" he asked. "The answer must be no. The church must free itself from the limitations of state control. This she cannot do by herself. Action must be taken by the state."

The vicar also dealt with other features of church life arising from its present relationship with the state.

He swiped at the system whereby the prime minister appoints the bishops, a topical point because the Archbishop of York and the Bishop

of London, two posts on the pinnacle of the church hierarchy, will soon become vacant. He pointed out that in the past 40 years British prime ministers have included a Welsh Baptist, a Scottish Presbyterian, a Unitarian and, the present prime minister, a man who has "defied the church" by remarrying after divorce.

Echoes of the big row in the 1920's were stirred when Rev. Lloyd referred to the refusal of Parliament to accept a changed form of prayer book which the church had drawn up. On this occasion the church authorities had spent ten years in revising the prayer book and when it was presented to Parliament it was tossed out in two days. One of the most effective speeches against it came from Rosslyn Mitchell, a Methodist.

Two days after this "heretical" sermon in St. Paul's the issue was raised in Parliament when Stephen Swinger, the Labor member of Parliament for Newcastle-on-Tyne, asked the prime minister if he would appoint a Royal Commission to examine the relations between the state and church, "with a view to ascertaining how the church's present status accords with the ideals and desires of the majority of the English people." The prime minister rejected the idea of a Royal Commission and said that no representations in favor of disestablishment had been made by any "responsible or representative body."

Another Labor member, Reginald Sorensen—a Methodist minister—pointed out that the question was concerned only with people of one denomination and that the majority of people in Britain belonged to churches which were not established.

Laborites Hedge on Antidisestablishmentarianism

Neither the Tory or the Labor Party have made any official pronouncement on the issue—and it is most unlikely that they will do so.

The *Daily Herald*, Labor's official daily newspaper, did, however, permit itself to comment editorially on the matter. It said that nobody would deny that it is illogical for bishops to be appointed by prime ministers such as those indicated by Rev. Lloyd in his sermon. It also said that so far there had been no experience of a prime minister who belonged to the Church of Rome and that this presented "an interesting possibility."

But the *Daily Herald* would not commit itself beyond saying: "Establishment has its advocates. Disestablishment has its supporters. Half-establishment is not a possibility." The question, said the *Daily Herald*, was primarily one for the church to decide and, if it chose disestablishment, it was unlikely that opposition would be forthcoming from Parliament.

On the following day, however, Alan Taylor, an Oxford University don and historian who writes a regular column in the *Daily Herald*, really let fly at the Establishment. He said it was "established hypocrisy" and designed to "prop up the existing social order." The record of the Church of England, he said, has been an appalling one. "The bishops have always been on the side of reaction and private property. Bishops have defended slavery. They have defended the hanging of little children for stealing goods worth five shillings. Bishops defend capital punishment now. Bishops opposed the factory acts and owned slum property."

After this lambasting Taylor engaged in some subtle sarcasm. He said that he did not doubt that the bishops were always kind and worthy men in their private lives; the trouble was that they had been corrupted by their association with the Establishment. "Disestablishment would set them free to follow their finer feelings."

A Question of Filthy Lucre

Taylor then rubbed a handful of salt into the wound. He said that the church must not think that disestablishment would mean that it could retire into private life with its property intact, oh no! Certain church buildings were the property of the nation and the Church must pay rent for them—as does the Roman Catholic church in France.

This question of "disendowment" unquestionably looms large in the minds of the church when the subject of disestablishment is raised.

(Continued on next page)

Army Retreats Under Attack —

(Continued from page 1)

cases were handled by Watts. They appeared at the subcommittee hearing as two outstanding examples of the "unconscionable . . . and unconstitutional infliction of punishment" by the army.

Prior to the above-mentioned session, the Senate subcommittee had already unearthed a mass of material on the attorney general's list of so-called "subversive organizations" and the misuse to which it was put throughout the country by government, private and fraternal enterprises. The army had already figured in this material, so that even before the conclusion of the session at which Watts, Miller and Witthoft had testified, Senator Hennings announced an important change in the Defense Department "loyalty machinery."

HITS BY WATTS

Watts laid the groundwork for the testimony in the cases that followed. He pointed out that when Congress enacted the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the reserve provisions thereof, Congress did not intend or contemplate that the armed forces would exercise the control it did over the civilian lives of young people liable to the draft.

What is wrong with the army position (this applies to all the services, though most of the cases in the Watts report dealt with army personnel) is that it has abandoned "its traditional policy that a person who serves in the armed forces is entitled to a discharge based upon the character of the services rendered."

But the army, said Watts, "gratuitously assumed [the] burden . . . to examine all of the associations and family relationships of any one liable to the draft from his earliest youth up until the time of his induction into the armed forces. It does not stop there, however. It continues during his period of active military service and the subsequent period of reserve duty for the full 8 years of obligated active and inactive service required under the law. Having examined these associations and family relationships and found them wanting in the light of the army's criteria for acceptable association, the army imposes punishment without conviction for crime—and even without a proper administrative hearing—through the instrumentality of a discharge which stigmatizes for life."

Church-State —

(Continued from page 6)

Past history in Britain shows that the two matters are very much connected. When the Church of Ireland was disestablished in the 19th century, it was also "disendowed" of much of its property. More recent is the experience of the Church of Wales. This was disestablished in 1920 and it too lost much of its financial support. The titles and lands which it lost amounted to 2,000,000 pounds and were distributed among universities and county councils for cultural work. The thought of this doubtless weighs heavily upon the minds of many churchmen and probably accounts for the pronounced silence on their part following the sermon in St. Paul's last Sunday.

The rumbles of this row on disestablishment are likely to roll around Britain for some time to come, but at the moment there is little indication that they will develop into any great proportions.

It is true, of course, that a few weeks ago the two papers with the top circulation in Britain, amounting to almost 9 millions, along with a few lesser fry, came out in favor of disestablishment. But that was in the heat of the almost bobbysox emotion generated over the royal love affair. Now that has died and become buried in the newspaper files, and it seems that the question of disestablishment—in so far as these newspapers are concerned—has been buried along with it.

To suggest, as did the *New Statesman* earlier this month, that the archbishops scored a victory in the question of Princess Margaret's marriage which may have been won "at a heavy cost," because of the pressure which it has built up for disestablishment, seems to be reading more into the situation than the facts merit.

The time does not yet seem arrived when the church will be disestablished and all the signs seem to indicate that such a move will come only as part and parcel of much more profound and significant changes in the social order in Britain.

Watts asserted that the situation was complicated by the fact that the army adopted in toto the "criteria set forth in Executive Order 10450 for determining eligibility for employment or retention in employment of federal employees." While that law is restricted to civilian employees of the government, the army, Watts stated, "disregarded the entire theory upon which the Executive Order is based: namely that government employment is a privilege and not a right. Obviously, such a theory has no application to a draftee who is performing his duty as required by law."

As a result, the army set up an entirely new security classification of an "almost subversive," which provides that "an inductee normally will not be discharged as a security risk unless his retention is inconsistent with the interests of national security." The effect of this is that an inductee may serve his two years and an additional period of six years in the Reserves, then receive a discharge no higher than "general under honorable conditions."

This, as in the cases of Miller and Witthoft, would have no relationship to the character of the service which they might render. The services of Miller and Witthoft, for example, were rated excellent by their superiors, but the army disregarded these ratings in their cases.

SYL ISSUE

Watts then went on to point out that the Socialist Youth League had been placed on the attorney general's list together with the ISL, but that the SYL had been a recognized student organization at the University of Chicago just as was the Politics Club (which, incidentally, was on no subversive list). Yet, among the charges against Miller and Witthoft was one that they were members of the Politics Club, which had a distinguished record at the university for the high caliber of its political-educational activities, and for its struggle against the Stalinists on the campus.

The ISL, Watts added, had been placed on the attorney general's list without notice or a hearing, and he pointed out that the organization had been fighting for a hearing for eight years before one was granted. In the case of the SYL and Politics Club, Watts stated that "as a recognized student activity there was no reason for these men to believe that it was not a perfectly legitimate activity for them to participate in."

"What I am concerned with," he added, "is the presumption of the army in not only proscribing recognized student activities, but in accepting into the army men who have admitted participation in these activities and then, after permitting them to serve their full period of active duty, stigmatizing them for life with a general discharge."

Finally, in his concluding remarks, Watts declared: "I have previously stated that this is an unconstitutional assumption of power by the army. That is my opinion. It has not, as yet, been so determined by the courts, although I believe they will reach such a decision in some of the cases now pending before it. It is more than that, however. It is not only unconstitutional, but unconscionable: a condition that cannot be permitted to continue to exist in a free society."

BARRY MILLER CASE

The cases of Miller and Witthoft presumably both grew out of their own voluntary submission of their pre-induction political associations. At the time of their induction, they were both rushed through into the service to hastily sign a loyalty form. In Miller's case, he was asked if he was a Communist and upon a negative reply was hurried to join his company.

Witthoft too had the same experience. He was asked whether he was a "Commie," and he too was sent ahead. Miller subsequently advised the army on his own initiation of his associations; Witthoft did so in filling out his personal history.

Miller took the stand after Watts to give the subcommittee the story of his case, which has been fully reported in LABOR ACTION.

He gave the history of the socialist activities of SYL and the Politics Club and listed, as among the speakers brought to the campus, Jerzy Glikman, Dwight Macdonald, James T. Farrell, and the debate between Max Shachtman and Alexander Kerensky. He told of the activities against the presidential candidacy of Henry A. Wallace in which the

fight naturally developed against the Stalinists in and about the campus.

Miller told the subcommittee that he had been inducted into the army in June 1952, and his case began with allegations made in November 1953, toward the end of his service. He had already been assigned to White Sands, New Mexico, and it was there that he advised his superior officers of the problem created by the manner in which his loyalty form was signed and handled at the basic training service school. The security officers had advised him that if the circumstances of his signing were established he had nothing to worry about. He was to go back to camp at Fort Monmouth, N. J. for a new oath.

Three sidelights developed in Miller's testimony before the subcommittee.

In describing his exchanges with his superior officers, Miller had told the officers that he did know that the ISL and SYL were on the attorney general's list but that he knew that the listing was wrong. He made reference to the leaflet "Stalinism is not Socialism"—signed by August Claessens, Harry Fleishman and Max Shachtman, for the Social Democratic Federation, the Socialist Party, and the Independent Socialist League respectively—which was once dropped over China by U. S. bombers flown by Chinese Nationalist Army pilots.

At this point, Senator Hennings asked for the leaflet, a photostatic copy of which was in Miller's hand while testifying. The senator considered it of considerable importance and had the photostat of the original Chinese leaflet and the translation of it put into the record.

EVIDENCE

Miller then also referred to a letter from the State Department to LABOR ACTION in 1951, requesting permission to use material in the paper for army information centers in Japan. This permission was granted the State Department by LABOR ACTION. He told the army that this was only another indication of why he believed the attorney general to be in error and why he did not accept the designation of the ISL and SYL.

The mention of the State Department letter to LABOR ACTION made a strong impression on the subcommittee and it too was put into the record.

The third sidelight was Miller's report that he had advised his army superiors that while he was at the University of Chicago, he had written a leaflet for the Politics Club denouncing Gerhardt Eisler as a GPU agent which appeared shortly before Eisler fled the country. This leaflet made a sensation on the campus and was given wide publicity in the *Chicago Herald-American*. Unfortunately, Miller told the committee, he did not have a copy of the leaflet nor could he remember the precise date when it appeared.

The subcommittee, however, obtained a bound volume of the *Herald-American* from the Library of Congress and was able to verify Miller's story.

In any case, Miller went on, he was to be discharged at the end of June. He had been a radar instructor at Monmouth and three weeks before his discharge he had received the commendations of John Anderson, chief instructor. On the very day he received his Undesirable Discharge, on June 8, Miller received an excellent character and efficiency rating from the service school. The army refused to give him this rating because it said it was not in conformity with an Undesirable Discharge.

Thereafter the Workers Defense League took over his case with Rowland Watts as his counsel. After a hearing before the Board of Military Corrections, at which time both Norman Thomas and David Riesman testified, Miller's Undesirable Discharge was changed to a General Discharge under Honorable Conditions. This change too is on appeal, Miller told the subcommittee, but seven months have passed and no decision has been received.

WITTHOFT CASE

In the case of William Witthoft, the subcommittee was advised that he was a friend of Miller's; that he belonged to the same organizations in the same period and that everything that held true about the latter's activities were true for him.

Witthoft was inducted in the fall of 1953; took his basic training at Aberdeen; thereafter went to school; but he had never been put on orders and a flagging action was taken against him. He was made a company clerk, in which job he was praised for his work. His captain apologized to him because he was unable to promote him on account of his

case. Yet fourteen months elapsed from the time Witthoft filled out his personal history until allegations were made against him. The summary of his G-2 information was supplied to him only after a request made by his attorney Watts.

Witthoft was charged with being a member of the SYL and sympathetic to the ISL. He told the subcommittee that this was information that he himself had supplied to the army.

Another charge against him was that among his personal references was Professor Early S. Johnson. At this point Senator Hennings read into the record army charges that Johnson was a Stalinist Fellow Traveler, thus casting some doubts on Witthoft. However, Lon Hocker, counsel to the subcommittee, then read into the record an affidavit by Prof. Johnson denying the allegations under oath.

But, Hocker continued, this incident shows how far afield the army had gone in its case against Witthoft, not charging him with a transgression, but using a denunciation against another person who in turn denied the allegations.

SHE WAS LYING LOW

The subcommittee was also astonished to learn that in Witthoft's case he was charged with having a mother-in-law "who was reported to be lying low as a Communist for a long time, and who was supposed to become active in the peace movement again."

Witthoft told the subcommittee that his mother-in-law had died in 1940, nearly 15 years ago, when his wife was 6 years old!

One amusing incident arose during his testimony. It was pointed out by the subcommittee that the charges against Witthoft had been addressed to Private William Witthoft, AKA [also known as] Bill Hickok. He was asked what this means and Witthoft explained that he had written some articles for LABOR ACTION under the pen name of Bill Hickok. At this point Counsel Hocker read into the record a speech by President Eisenhower to the B'nai B'rith in which the president spoke about Abilene and its own marshal, Wild Bill Hocker, and explained how proud they were of Hickok because he was the kind of a man who stood up to his accusers face to face.

Hocker then asked Witthoft if this was the Bill Hickok he had in mind when he used the name and Witthoft replied yes.

ROSS CASE

Witthoft was followed by Harley L. Ross of Fort Ord, California, who had been educated in a religious school and who declined to fill out his loyalty oath on grounds of principle. This, said Ross, caused "the roof to fall in" on him.

He was forced to share a room with a man whom he had never known or seen, and was thereafter charged with "close and continuing association" with a Communist, the soldier with whom he had been ordered to share a room.

When inducted last February, Ross told the subcommittee, he had refused to sign an oath stating that he was not a member of any group on the attorney general's list, because while "I didn't belong to any of those organizations . . . I thought it was an invasion of privacy . . . I thought this sort of oaths proved nothing."

Ross added that he thought the earliest oath he had taken was sufficient, "to defend the country against all enemies, foreign or domestic. . . ." At the insistence of army personnel that he put down something, he wrote "Constitutional privilege." Out of that arose his case and his eventual Undesirable Discharge.

A Basic Pamphlet —

SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY

by
Max Shachtman

Read it! 10 cents

Labor Action Book Service

114 West 14 Street, New York City

THE ZBOROWSKI CASE

The following article appeared in the New Leader of Nov. 21, reprinted here by permission.

By HENRY KASSON

Washington, D. C.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is probing in executive session the case of an important Soviet secret agent, hitherto unknown to the public. He is Mark Zborowski, 48, a resident of New York since 1941 and the author of a widely read book, *Life Is With People*. Zborowski's exposure traces to a former high official of the NKVD, who states that in Paris during the Spanish Civil War he learned of the existence of "Etienne," a Soviet agent then assigned to penetrate Trotskyist organizations. Because of Stalin's obsession with Trotskyism in this period, "Etienne's" communications were read personally by the late Soviet dictator. Now "Etienne" has been identified as Zborowski, and he has confessed to having worked for the NKVD.

Zborowski, born in 1907 in Uman, Russia, was taken by his parents to Lodz, Poland during the Revolution. There he joined the Communist movement, was arrested (in about 1930) and jumped bail to flee to France. There his services to Soviet intelligence seem to have begun.

His first assignment was as secretary of the Paris "Union of Returners," a Soviet-financed émigré group founded to promote émigré repatriation to Russia. The Union also served as a reservoir of Soviet agents for many tasks, including kidnapping and murder.

From 1934 till the war, Zborowski worked among the Trotskyites, gradually moving through the French Trotskyite group into the smaller Russian group headed by Trotsky's son, Leon Sedov. Ultimately Zborowski was let into many important secrets of Trotsky's organization. He read many letters to and from Trotsky, met Trotskyite leaders from various countries, and participated in conferences of the "Fourth International." He regularly reported at length, orally and in writing, to the NKVD on the activities of Trotsky, Sedov and their followers. Regine Zborowski, his wife, was aware of his services to the NKVD.

The NKVD planned to kidnap Sedov and take him to Russia; Zborowski was slated for an important role in these plans. When Sedov fell ill in February

1938, Zborowski notified the NKVD of the hospital to which he had been taken. Sedov died a few days later.

Earlier, on November 7, 1936, Trotsky's archives were stolen from the International Institute for Social History, 7 Rue Michelet, Paris. A long investigation by the French police proved fruitless. Now Zborowski admits that, after helping to bring the archives to the Institute, he informed the NKVD, which organized the burglary on the basis of his report.

Zborowski also figured in the case of Ignace Reiss, high NKVD official who defected in Holland in July 1937 and was murdered by the NKVD in Switzerland two months later. During those months, the NKVD had Reiss shadowed and the assassination organized. Zborowski reported that Reiss would arrive in Reims on a certain day, and the NKVD sent the murder gang to the railway station.

When General Walter Krivitsky, another high Soviet agent, defected in Paris in the fall of 1937, Zborowski met him through Sedov and reported on all his moves. The NKVD tried unsuccessfully to slay Krivitsky at the Marseilles railway station.

Zborowski was probably involved also in the disappearance of former German Communist Rudolf Klement ("Frederick"), secretary of the Fourth International, who vanished in Paris in July 1938. Both Trotsky and the press accused the NKVD of having done away with Klement.

Zborowski and his family were in France when the Nazis occupied Paris.

But in December 1941 they succeeded in reaching the U. S.; they were naturalized in 1948.

Soon after his arrival here, Zborowski contacted the resident NKVD representatives. (According to his version, they located him; more probably, he found his way to them.) His first assignments here were among Russian émigrés and Trotskyites. His exploits during the war included contacts with and reports on Victor Kravchenko, Soviet trade representative whose defection in 1944 was a severe blow to Soviet prestige in the U. S. It appears that only Moscow's wartime need of U. S. friendship prevented the NKVD from taking reprisals against Kravchenko.

In 1945, Zborowski was told by his NKVD superiors to shift from Russian émigrés to the American scene. One of his next jobs was with the Research Project in Contemporary Cultures, sponsored by the navy, in which the study of Russian problems played an important part. In 1952, with a substantial grant from the American Jewish Committee, Zborowski published *Life Is With People*, a history of Jewish community life in Russian villages before the revolution. Zborowski later worked on a research project on hospitals under the Veterans Administration.

Only a fraction of Zborowski's deeds have thus far been revealed, especially those of recent years. But from the known facts it is clear that Zborowski has been a loyal and important Soviet agent for many years. The MVD is not likely to let agents of this caliber go astray.

The Perfect Case — —

(Continued from page 11)

especially wonderful is that he didn't limit his activities to the CP. In 1949 he functioned as an agent of "some civil leaders and leaders of various veterans' organizations" in order to knife the Democratic Party. By running in the Democratic primaries, he claims, he was instrumental in helping to elect the Republican.

But after this coup for god and country, on trying to return to his Maritime Service job, he found he now had to fill out one of those loyalty forms. "Are you now or have you ever been...?" Yes, wrote Markheim, and proudly explained. *This made him automatically a self-confessed ex-Communist and a security risk.*

But, he pleaded, he had become a "Communist" for the very best patriotic reasons, and could prove it. Relates Paul Jacobs, who is telling this tale in the current *Reporter*:

"No matter. The policy is that self-confessed Communists are security risks. After all, if the Officials started looking into the motives of people who had joined the party, all kinds of problems could follow..."

So Markheim wasn't rehired. And since then his "ex-Communist record" has dogged him from job to job, losing him one after the other, just as if he were one of those subversives... .

Obviously a miscarriage of justice. The Markheim case raises a fundamental right, the right to be a stoolpigeon. So Markheim gets lots of publicity in places that wouldn't dream of devoting a line to the government's persecution of Independent Socialists, whose case raises only the issue of the right to be Left. Not that we begrudge him his support; not at all; even rats have civil liberties, you understand. But—

At the same time, this past week, Harvey O'Connor lost his case in court on decision of the judge, who up held the McCarthy Committee in soaking him for refusing to say whether he was a Communist when he wrote books in government libraries abroad. As everybody interested knows, the McCarthy Committee and similar outfits sought to extort such admissions as a preliminary to asking the victim to "name names," i.e., to stool. O'Connor's case, which is definitely not perfect for liberals, has gotten a minimum of support.

New Issue of N.I. Is Out on Stands

The Fall issue of the *New Internationalist*, the leading Marxist quarterly, is out now with distinctive articles. Featured is Max Shachtman's "Socialism in the United States: What Its Past and Present Disclose About Its Future," and Julius Falk's study on "The Origins of the American Communist Movement."

"Right Versus Left in the British Labor Party" discusses the internal party battle in England; and there is another installment of Alfred Rosmer's book, "Moscow in Lenin's Days: 1920-21."

Two book reviews complete the issue. The *NI* is now 50 cents a copy, or \$2 a year by subscription.

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
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

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

Army's New Rules —

(Continued from page 11)

declines to inform the armed services in advance that he is a "suspect" person) he can still be penalized for things he has done before he entered the armed services, as at present.

The armed forces have been forced to retreat from a completely untenable position into which they had been high-pressured at the height of the McCarthyite hysteria. It is likely that they hope this retreat will blunt the edge of the attack which has been made on their viciously discriminatory policies, and will reconcile a larger section of public opinion to them. This must not be permitted to happen.

Even under the revised program, every future prospective draftee who has had any relations with one of the organizations on the attorney general's "subversive list," will have either to brand himself a "security-loyalty" suspect, or face the possibility of later punishment for refusing to do so. If he brands himself for purposes of avoiding the possibility of such future punishment, he lays himself open to all kinds of persecutions and disabilities in civilian life.

(Though some of the data are still missing, it is still possible that he will be given some special and discreditable draft status. Further, government as well as a good deal of private employment will be closed to him, or at least made very hard for him to get and retain.)

If he decides that his political activities or associations were such as not to warrant mention, he lays himself open to future accusation of having "concealed" them from the authorities.

In addition to the attack on the army loyalty-security program by the WDL, the program has been attacked by a number of soldiers accused of Stalinist

associations who have refused to make out their "loyalty certificates" on induction, and whose case against the army is being handled and publicized by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

They won the first round of their legal fight on Monday, November 21, when Federal Judge David N. Edelstein refused to dismiss a motion made by them to enjoin the Department of Defense from issuing them other than honorable discharges. In denying the army's motion to dismiss the injunction motion Judge Edelstein observed:

"It would seem basic that a soldier has a right to an honorable discharge if his military record merits it and that he cannot be held to answer, in the consideration of his discharge, for matters extraneous to that record."

Judge Edelstein held in abeyance the injunction to enable the eight soldiers to supply the court with evidence that they face less than honorable discharges based on pre-induction political associations.

Although the new army procedures would prevent the recurrence of such cases in the future (under the limitations mentioned above), they still leave unclear the status of soldiers who have already received less than honorable discharges under the old rules, or whose cases are still pending. If Judge Edelstein grants the injunction, and his action is sustained by the higher courts, it would certainly set a precedent for legal relief for all those who have suffered under the armed forces' system of political discrimination and penalization.

The fight to eliminate the military's encroachment into the field of the individual's political rights is far from won. But the Defense Department's retreat shows how vital and rewarding it is to keep up the struggle.