

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 22, 1957

FIVE CENTS

REPORTS ON THE UAW CONVENTION

- THE CHANGING FACE OF A UNION . . . page 2
FROM ATLANTIC CITY TO DETROIT . . . page 3
THE VANISHING OPPOSITION . . . page 3

Background of the Gaza Mess: BEHIND THE FEDAYEEN

. . . page 6

A-Bomb Warfare Blasted by Ger. Atom Scientists

By GORDON HASKELL

A major political uproar has been caused in West Germany by a statement issued by eighteen leading nuclear physicists to the effect that they will refuse to cooperate in any way in the production, testing or use of atomic weapons. This statement, coming on the heels of the British government's announcement of its intention to shift the bulk of its military expenditures to guided missiles and atomic weapons, enters as a factor in the West German campaign for the elections this fall.

The eighteen eminent scientists stressed the fact that their special responsibility in the realm of nuclear physics makes it necessary for them to take a public stand on the question.

They insisted that the German people had not been sufficiently informed of the destructive power of modern atom and hydrogen weapons, and of the fact that there are no technical means known now to defend large concentrations of people against the effects of such weapons. In the face of these circumstances, they said that in their opinion a small country like West Germany could best defend itself and world peace if it expressly and freely went without the possession of any kind of atomic weapons.

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and his ministers immediately struck out in all directions in an attempt to minimize the political effect of the physicists' statement. Adenauer's statement said, among other things:

"It appears to me that these gentlemen do not possess the results of the tests made in the United States for the protection of civilians and soldiers. . . . If they meant to say that a small country like the Federal Republic should renounce such weapons then I must say that has nothing to do with physical science. That is a purely foreign policy matter."

INSPIRING EXAMPLE

In reply to this, spokesmen for the physicists stated that Adenauer was still misleading the German people by describing the new weapons as a modern development of artillery. And to Adenauer's assertion that atomic armament was a political matter for which he, as head of the government, was primarily

(Turn to last page)

U.S. Buys a King in Jordan: Mideast Doctrine Wins Auction

By PHILIP COBEN

The kingdom of Jordan joins the select company of Iran and Guatemala in history. It is the third country whose government has been overthrown by force and violence, virtually openly, through U.S. encouragement and connivance. As in Iran, the chosen instrument to uphold America's hand is a monarch repudiated by his people.

The Jordanian crisis broke open when King Hussein dismissed Premier Nabulsi, although Nabulsi, a right-wing socialist, has the solid support of a clear majority of the parliament and the general support of an overwhelming majority. For a few days various political figures tried to put together a cabinet that would be sufficiently pro-Western for the king's taste. That this was impossible even at the very top of the regime, not to speak of the mass sentiment in the country, was shown by the fact that not a single alternative government could be formed, given free choice.

Thereupon Hussein executed a military coup, using the most primitive troops in the armed forces as his support, and overthrew the parliamentary forms of government. The action spoke

for itself as an index to where the wishes of the people of Jordan lie.

Yet, in one of the most heinous demonstrations of journalistic monolithism that has been seen here since Castillo Armas took over Guatemala for the greater glory of United Fruit and the CIA, the American press from liberal-left to Republican-right has been smearing the deposed Nabulsi regime as "pro-Communist" and "pro-Soviet" and hailing the king's coup as a great contribution to justice, progress, peace, liberty, and all good things.

Behind this development in an immediate way lies a bag of \$200 million that is being carried around the Middle East by Eisenhower's "Special Ambassador" James P. Richards. This is the amount that was allocated by Congress under the Eisenhower Doctrine for aid to countries that

BUT...

. . . it's still by no means certain that King Hussein can really deliver the goods, due to the extreme weakness of his base among both the people and the politicians. As we go to press, the Khalidi cabinet, including Nabulsi himself as foreign minister, may still turn out to be a "compromise" government which will be pushed forward by the nationalist left.

agree to play ball with the "anti-Communist" objectives of the system. The whole affair, as a matter of fact, is much cruder than either the Iranian or Guatemalan business.

It happens, as we mentioned in LA last week, that the magic effect of the \$200 million has been freely predicted for weeks. The *Christian Science Monitor* wrote April 3 in a lead article about Hussein's efforts to fire Nabulsi, already then evident: "A possible goal of a new Jordanian government would be to invite James P. Richards . . . to visit Amman to discuss the application of the Eisenhower Doctrine for aid to countries that

(Continued on page 7)

The Budget Fight in Washington: Eisenhower as a 'Fair-Dealer'

By SAM TAYLOR

At the Easter recess of the first session of the 85th Congress, with the exception of the Middle East Doctrine not one major piece of legislation has been passed. Even allowing for the usual leisurely pace at the opening of Congress, this year is far behind what might have been expected.

The Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East should not be considered legislation by any standard since it was at best an expression of opinion. But the Senate took two months in fruitless and

aimless discussion on only the secondary and tertiary aspects of the program because the differences between the two parties over foreign policy are marginal.

The stalemate in Congress, reflecting more of a difference between the liberal and conservative wings inside of each party rather than differences between parties, centers around the budget.

In January, the president submitted the largest peacetime budget in U.S. history, a budget of \$71.8 billions. Since that time the primary interest in Washington has been the attempts to cut the budget by various amounts and thereby open the possibility for a tax cut in time for the 1958 congressional elections.

For the past several weeks, and certainly after the end of the Easter recess, it is bound to occupy the center of attention. It has shoved civil rights and foreign policy into the background at least in the thinking of most congressmen. And the longer Congress is tied up with authorization and appropriation bills of varying importance, the easier it will be for Southern senators to filibuster civil rights later in the session.

The significance of the battle of the budget this year is that it brings out into the open the ill-concealed hostility between the Eisenhower and the old Taft forces inside of the Republican Party. The rift between these two groups roughly parallels the division between the

liberal and conservative forces inside the Democratic Party, though it is not the same. The major difference is that behind the liberalism in the Democratic Party stands the labor movement, while there is no such force inside the Republicans.

The Eisenhower budget for fiscal year 1958 is more than a series of appropriations.

(Continued on page 4)

Chicago May Day

Chicago will have a united socialist May Day meeting.

Participating in the joint May Day Committee are the Socialist Party, Independent Socialist League, Jewish Socialist Verband, Friends of the Jewish Labor Bund, IWW, Workmen's Circle, Young Socialist League, U. of C. Socialist Club.

The meeting, dedicated to the Hungarian freedom fight, will be held Tuesday evening, April 30 at the Hamilton Hotel, 20 So. Dearborn. Norman Thomas and others will speak, followed by entertainment and singing. The committee announces that there will be no admission charge.

It's going to be on Friday, May 3, in New York

Celebrate May Day

with the Independent Socialist League and YSL

Ski! . . . Buffet eats . . . Dancing . . . Talk by Shachtman

At ADELPHI HALL, 74 Fifth Avenue, near 13 Street

Report from the Atlantic City Convention

THE CHANGING FACE OF THE UAW

By BEN HALL

Atlantic City, Apr. 13

As 3000 delegates of the United Auto Workers met here for their 16th convention, they discovered that Chrysler was on the verge of a general shutdown. At Maybank, California, 4000 were already on strike. In Detroit two other plants were close to walking out. The union had banned all Chrysler overtime in support of the strikers.

"If the corporation says we are violating our contract," warned Norman Matthews, UAW Chrysler director, "we'll shut down the whole damn company. When they try to destroy our union we say to hell with the contract."

Within a few weeks, strike votes had been taken in 12 different Chrysler plants. Some disputes had been settled by the time of the convention but others are pending.

It was a fight over speedup. Yet this question, which now threatens to provoke a major walkout, did not come up for discussion at the convention until the fifth day.

UNION PROGRAM

On the third morning, the convention looked toward 1958, a critical year; all major contracts come up for renegotiation. A resolution on 1958 collective bargaining outlined the union's program, as follows.

(1) A shorter work-week with increased take-home pay.

A publicity campaign and an intensive education program begins now in preparation for the next year's fight. (Two days later, guest speaker David Dubinsky, to the accompaniment of loud applause, reminded the delegates that his union, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, had already won the 35-hour week and called on the UAW to lead the next stage of the struggle for shorter hours.)

(2) Protection for workers displaced as a result of plant relocation.

So far the union has been unable to safeguard the interests of thousands of seniority workers already permanently laid off when plants shut down, moved or curtailed operations. A special resolution was distributed but never reported out. The industry faces technological turmoil and convulsion; the union needs an effective program lest its members suffer badly during the transition.

(3) Improved working conditions; better pensions, health insurance; extended Supplementary Unemployment Benefits. A separate resolution on speed-up came up later.

(4) Shorter contracts.

In 1955 the union signed three-year contracts but in 1958 will demand a two-year maximum. Reason: "in view of the rapidity of the technological changes which are having such widespread impact upon the industries within the jurisdiction of the UAW."

(5) Special Convention in January 1958.

The convention did not center on the 1958 demands; it merely announced them. At the special convention they will be formulated in detail and preparations made for big strikes.

POLITICAL ACTION

No one had much to say on political action because it never hit the floor.

Ford Local 600 offered a resolution for a Farm-Labor-Liberal Party. The Resolutions Committee prepared an official statement whose tedious length concealed a failure to explain what happened to the union's declaration in 1956 that the Democratic Party had to choose between labor and Southern reaction. In passing, almost without noticing it, the resolution made some startling statements:

(1) It declared that the "Southerners . . . dominate the Democratic Party in Congress."

(2) It maintained that "the bipartisan coalition of reaction . . . since 1938 has usually controlled most committees and most of the floor business of both Houses . . ."

(3) Without warning and with little fanfare it revived the UAW's distinctive political slogan for a "realignment of political forces in America."

But none of this was highlighted; obviously the leadership was not intensely concerned with it now.

The convention was a chance to examine the Eisenhower victory of '56 and to learn something from the collapse of liberalism in the Democratic Party; it was passed by. The resolution was not reported out.

Without an effective discussion of politics, in fact with no discussion at all, there could be no serious consideration of a key issue of the day: the fight of Southern Negroes for democracy and equality; and there was none.

Two matters were debated at length: (1) dues increase; (2) skilled trades. A half day was devoted to each. In customary UAW style, the chairman scrupulously recognized alternate speakers on each side.

DUES INCREASE

The leadership had asked for a 50-cent monthly increase in membership dues to cover routine union expenses. After listening to no less than 44 speakers from the floor, the convention voted overwhelmingly for it.

All opposition, criticisms and discontent from whatever source and motive invariably crystallizes on the dues issue. This time the combined opposition was woefully weak. In the end it could muster only a few hundred delegates to demand a roll call—800 were required. Although dues was debated at greater length than any other single issue, its actual importance was minor. It was so one-sided that everyone remained quite calm.

SKILLED TRADES

For two years the union has faced a divisive movement among skilled-trades men. The convention acted to reunite production with the crafts in preparation for the crucial 1958 negotiations. At the same time, it worked out new methods and new forms of organization to attract engineers and professionals into the UAW.

A majority resolution, finally adopted with only trivial opposition, made important innovations in union structure, permitting craft and professional representation within the framework of industrial unionism. Skilled trades will be represented as a distinct group on important union bodies; they will vote separately on contract questions affecting them alone; they gain direct representation on bargaining committees and the right to strike under certain conditions for their demands.

A minority resolution, proposed by one member of the committee, rejected out of hand any concessions to the trades, contending that the new departure meant a breach of the industrial character of the UAW. But it got little support. The delegates were convinced that the new set-up was indispensable if the UAW was to avoid being torn apart.

Two years ago, a fight erupted in Flint and Detroit for special recognition to the skilled trades, especially to the tool-and-die workers and machinists. The union leadership at that time met their demands with a point-blank refusal. But the movement could not be ignored, certainly not suppressed.

Soon, a dual union was formed, the Society of Skilled Trades. UAW tool-makers joined it by the thousands. The trend toward it was finally reversed but it is challenging the UAW in NLRB elections.

UAW skilled-trades men, no different from those in other industries, look upon themselves as a group entitled to special

consideration, a minor aristocracy within the working class. But they are not motivated merely by narrow "selfish" considerations.

Wage rates for UAW maintenance men are far below the independent contractors; toolmakers in the big "captive" shops attached to the auto factories get lower rates than those in the job shops. Profits of the big corporations are, as always, scandalously high.

Skilled workers want a chance to use their strategic position; their ability to tie up critical tools and dies, their special power as skilled men to wrest added gains from the companies. If any group of workers is ready to fight for better conditions, any union leadership worthy of the name must open a way within the union structure.

This the UAW has at last done. It took a dangerously long time. But the convention showed that the UAW is able to respond to ferment below. It will not weaken the union but strengthen it.

SPEEDUP

It was in the debate on speedup that the distinctive character of the UAW came through most clearly.

Local leaders, expressing the feelings of the men back home, spoke out for action, as did the locals in their resolutions and in their newspapers. The leaders on top, a little slower than in years before, responded.

Speedup has always agitated the ranks but this year more than ever. Chrysler, in a drive to regain its place, began a national campaign to squeeze out more production from its employees by raising work standards. In the past year, even before the start of the Chrysler drive, the union authorized 74 strikes and processed thousands of grievances on work standards. It was speedup, too, that was provoking the fight at Chrysler on the eve of the convention.

Paul Silver, for the Resolutions Committee, brought out a strong statement endorsing local strike action when necessary to stop speedup. The statement announced a new key demand that would forbid disciplining workers for failing to meet disputed production standards while the dispute is pending. Such a provision is not included in present contracts; it would give the union a powerful new weapon.

For five days, interspersed in every discussion, a running criticism of top officials had come from a tiny but articulate group of administration opponents, who contended that the leaders were deliberately blocking the fight. The administration used the speedup discussion for its reply.

Reuther unlimbered heavy artillery against a young woman delegate who had accused him of "slandering" GM workers and claimed that he did not think they could fight. It was easy for him to point to the record of struggle.

"We have always insisted upon the

right to strike over work standards," he said, accusing her of playing "sectarian politics." And he added: "Our policy is that the workers will decide what is a fair day's work."

Chrysler Director Matthews allowed himself to become publicly enraged by what he called "a tiny group" of delegates from Chrysler locals who had implied that he would not fight. It was then that he threw his bombshell: "wherever a corporation is trying to destroy the union, to hell with the contract. We'll shut down the key plants."

And then looking at his most eager critics, he shouted: "Who's militant now? We'll fight, not to help certain parties that you belong to but for the UAW."

But despite references to "sectarian politics" and "parties"—an echo of a dying oratorical practice that was popular in the heyday of the CP—the leadership was acting in response to demands of the responsible secondary leaders. Union leaders from Studebaker, Briggs, Canada, Ford Highland Park and others voiced the feelings of many others. They wanted more initiative and leadership from the international. Upon suggestion from the floor, the committee agreed to call for a special Study Commission on Speedup.

ETHICS AND DEMOCRACY

This was the first major union gathering since the McClellan hearings; and racketeering in unions came in for a scathing denunciation at every session. Reuther began this in his written report and continued in the keynote speech; an early resolution attacked Dave Beck by name.

Guest speakers added their bit. Joseph Beirne of the Communications Workers sliced away. George Meany ripped into Beck, without mentioning his name. He declared that the AFL-CIO would not wait for action by government authorities; unethical practices may not be against the law, he said, but they are against "trade union law."

Finally David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, reminded the convention of the long struggle inside the AFL for action against racketeers. No one can doubt now that the leaders of the labor movement are determined, at last, to drive crooks out of the AFL-CIO. And they will.

But something was missing.

Dubinsky was addressing a UAW convention for the first time in 20 years; this symbolized the very unity of forces which sounded the doom of thugs and crooks in the federation. It was uniquely his opportunity to arouse the justified pride and self-confidence of UAW militants; it was your struggle for decent unionism and ours, he could have said, that at last is smashing corruption in our movement. He could have said it, but he did not.

Instead he chose to extol government intervention. It was government exposure of racketeering that impelled labor to act, he argued, and without it we would have been able to do nothing. It was a view, superficial and over-simplified, that ignored real trends inside the labor movement itself.

A few days before, Al Hayes of the Machinist Union, head of the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee, had taken quite a different tack; he warned that the anti-labor politicians were eager to use the recent exposés to pass restrictive labor laws.

There was no call for the restoration of democracy in unions where it has been wiped out. No one spoke of a Code of Democratic Rights for union members. At a press conference, Meany was asked for his opinion; it was, he said, not a matter for the AFL-CIO Council but for the affiliates—quite different from his stand on racketeering.

But the convention did take two steps that give a certain measure of protection to membership rights against abuses by the officialdom. Local trial committees which previously were elected and hence



WALTER REUTHER

(Continued on next page)

Two States of Mind: From Atlantic City to Detroit

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, April 18

To leave a shop, go to a UAW convention and then return to all the unsettled problems in the same shop—all within the space of two weeks—gives one the unmistakable impression of being in two different worlds. Yet, the fact remains that the world of the UAW convention and the narrow arena of shop problems are intertwined, and part of the same union and its operation.

Why this feeling of a big gap between the two worlds? In Detroit, on the Friday which was the last day of the Atlantic City convention, a sit-down strike took place—the first in 17 years.

Was this sensational event mentioned at the convention? Who knew about it or cared?

The explosion took place over 46 major unresolved grievances at Federal Mogul. It was an all day sit-down.

At the UAW convention, a sectarian unionist blistered and provoked Norman Matthews, director of the UAW's Chrysler department, into a sharp reply which featured ultra-militant statements, including "The hell with the contract"—while at a major Chrysler plant a vast majority of workers resisted canceling overtime on production to help the strikers at the Los Angeles Chrysler assembly plant.

The once dominant Detroit and Flint delegates at the UAW conventions were just a small segment of the vast agglomeration, and certainly weren't considered leaders of any kind by the convention. The Michigan delegates left, with as much confusion and as many unresolved problems as before the convention.

In the abstract, the UAW convention

adopted a good solid union program calculated to meet automation, plant decentralization, works standards problems, etc.—at least for the 1958 negotiations. In the Michigan area, the acute character of these burning issues overwhelms local union leaders and keeps the ranks in ferment, unrest, and anxiety.

At the UAW convention, the dues and salary-increase questions were a matter of routine to the vast bulk of the delegates, as the discussion on the floor showed. In Michigan, they are major political symbols and very controversial questions. The ranks show signs of being against both. The convention had little impact on the thinking of the people in the plants, worried about other things.

DISAPPOINTED

The confusion in the Michigan area is illustrated by another big decision of the convention. In the winter of 1955, after the wild-cats against the 1955 settlements at Ford, General Motors and Chrysler, a revolt of the skilled trades took place. The Society of Skilled Trades emerged from this crisis. Attempts of loyal UAW skilled workers to make up a counter-program to the Society were denounced, and the very program that today became official UAW policy at the convention was then brutally attacked as "craft unionism" and "dual-unionism."

The UAW convention didn't eliminate the disillusionment that generally prevails in this area, although the program adopted has the possibility of doing so in the next two years.

In all these perplexities, the Michigan delegates hardly found enthusiastic reactions to the decisions of the convention. Many were disappointed.

It should be emphasized that this is not the case in many other sections of the country. For most delegates, the convention was a big success, for it answered

their problems on a sound union basis, obviously because their local problems do not have the sharp character of the Michigan story.

Thus the changing nature of the UAW and the greater weight that aircraft and other allied industries has in the UAW are reflected in a different kind of unionism. Detroit and Flint are the major sore spots on problems. They represent less than 20 per cent of the union. This fact

had a depressing effect on the Michigan delegations, who often felt like fish out of water before a vast gathering where their own acute local problems just didn't make a big enough dent on the consciousness of the bulk of the delegates.

Exactly what effect the convention had on the people in the shop will be indicated soon in the local union elections coming up in May and early June. At the present time, there is little or no evidence that any of the pro-administration local leaderships confidently expect victory. Rather, even in the most favorable situations, the local union leaders are running scared. Perhaps the fact that the UAW leadership changed the convention elections and local union election times, to separate them, suggests that this critical viewpoint is shared everywhere.

Convention Sidelights

Vanishing Opposition

Atlantic City

On Monday night, April 8, a national caucus meeting was called by Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600; Paul Silver, president of Local 351; and others who seem to take an anti-administration line. A handbill listed what purported to be their platform: against a dues increase; against speedup; for democracy; for a shorter work week—and other popular demands.

But they could not hold together. Silver was on the convention resolutions committee but he offered not a single minority report.

Over 300 delegates came to hear their arguments, an impressive number. In past years, opposition caucuses have disintegrated and administration opponents could assemble only a handful of permanent and immovable oppositionists increasingly separated from any general support. For the first time in ten years, critics could interest a big bloc of delegates, even though they could not win their support.

At the meeting were few of the old crowd; the Stalinists have been wiped out and have no influence whatsoever. Here were lots of newcomers, new to conventions, new to caucuses, and some even new to the union.

They were uneasy over problems that the union had not yet solved. They sought a more prompt reply to layoffs, relocation and shutdown of plants. Some wanted to see an expansion of union democracy. Others were against a dues increase. In sum, it was a loose, diffuse assemblage with no united program and incohesive.

The audience were not anti-Reuther; they were listening.

The organizers of the caucus seemed to think they had a united platform. After agitating his audience, the chairman cut the discussion short with this: "We know what we want; we don't have to convince ourselves; let's go to the convention and tell the others."

But they did not really agree on their own proclaimed program. Back at the convention, Stellato spoke clearly against any dues increase. But Paul Silver, who was willing to take the floor on either side, at last explained that he was really for a dues increase, in fact a large one; but he wanted a referendum. Charles Brooks, leader of Canadian Local 444, very articulate at the caucus meeting and reported to be one of its leaders, told the convention that he was for the dues raise.

But this information hadn't leaked out at the caucus. Its collapse on this question was obviously predetermined.

If any of the 300 looked to the caucus for leadership they were disappointed. But more: they must have been at least puzzled and probably a little disillusioned.

The fact remains—and this is what the caucus organizers have yet to understand—that the union is virtually unanimous for Reuther. There is criticism, there is discontent, especially in the big auto centers which are hit by technological change. But no one wants to unite on a general platform of any kind, certainly not on a platform pointed against the union administration.

Hungary and Cyprus

The UAW convention rose in tribute

to Anna Kethly, who spoke on Thursday night, April 11.

"I come before you," she said, "as a representative of the Hungarian workers, in the name of the young heroes of Budapest and of all those who fought against the suppression and colonial exploitation of Hungary. With their rifles and with their bare hands, the Hungarian people stood their ground against Russian tanks and bombers for the sake of freedom for their country, for the sake of their human rights, and for the sake of better living conditions."

When she finished, Reuther introduced Michael Pissas, just released from prison in Cyprus. He is general secretary of the Cypriot Free Trade Union Movement.

Pissas spoke of the struggle of his people "for independence from British colonialism" and welcomed expressions of support from the UAW and from the labor movement in the U.S. It was a living demonstration of the Third Camp against imperialism on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

In an interview with this reporter, Pissas explained that the labor movement of Cyprus, like the people as a whole, is solidly united behind the movement for self-determination represented by the National Front, a universal, if amorphous, body formed by all associations, community groups, sports associations, unions and including local officials.

There are, he reports, no organized political parties except the Communist Party, which claims 3000 members but which is actually far smaller. The CP-controlled unions, however, claim 20,000 members while the Free Trade Unions enroll 10,000. Sixty-two per cent of the population are farmers and 32 per cent workers.

In Pissas' opinion, the population is virtually unanimously in favor of socialism and democracy so that if independence is achieved one major party will emerge, a socialist labor party.

Noisy but—

Floor demonstrations aren't what they used to be.

Once, when elections were hotly contested, there were enthusiastic demonstrations for the respective candidates for all posts. Floor banners carried slogans on the issues of the day, proclaiming the principles and platforms of the rival campaigners.

But now only Reuther can work up an impressive demonstration. The other top officers are definitely in a secondary category. Even Emil Mazey, remembered by a dwindling minority for his role as an active, fighting strike leader adored by rank-and-file militants, is now seen by the majority merely as a responsible guardian of the treasury.

This year, one group of administration supporters dragged in an obnoxious siren, carried by two men and wound by another to emit an ear-piercing screech in approval of what they approved. Others shot off cap pistols. It was, it must be admitted, noisy.

When the convention opened, the Kohler strike had just entered its fourth year.

Kohler Local 833 distributed the picture of little Mark Krepsky, who was born on April 5, 1954 as the strike began. He is now three years old; and all

(Continued on page 4)

The Changing Face — —

(Continued from page 2)

dominated by majority factions are now to be chosen by lot.

Highly publicized was the decision to choose a Public Review Board of prominent private citizens with two main rights and duties: (1) to investigate corruption and recommend action against it; (2) to act as an appeals board to hear the complaints of members against decisions of the International Executive Board.

Neither of the above measures can give any absolute guarantees to democracy and no one suggests that they can. They can serve, however, to supplement and invigorate an internal life which is basically healthy. Above all, the setting up of a Public Review Board shows that the union leadership and membership is especially sensitive to preserving the UAW's record and reputation for democracy and decency. It is this sensitivity that is one of the most important guarantees.

There is another side, however. The first session adopted convention rules. Up to now, nominees for office had been permitted to make extended speeches upon accepting or declining. Regardless of how hotly or how mildly union elections were contested, they always became a point of high interest; critics could make a rounded presentation of their views. This practice was ruled out.

Later Dave Dubinsky, tongue-in-cheek, was to say: "I read this morning's newspapers and I was informed that Reuther was elected president unanimously. Well, Walter, you have joined my class. When the UAW has a president for ten years and re-elects him unanimously, I believe you have adopted our program."

The unanimity is there in fact; it comes not because oppositions are repressed but because the union is solidly united behind the Reuther administration. Yet, if the air is charged with the spirit of democracy, one wonders: why should the expression of dissent at election time be turned into a

slightly off-color violation of decorum if not of union unity?

Salaries of top officials were increased upon recommendation of the Constitutional Committee. Reuther, who received \$18,000 annually, now gets \$22,000. Other officers get raises in the same amount. Executive Board members go up from \$10,000 to \$12,500.

The committee justified its proposal by pointing to other large unions and arguing that the UAW paid lower salaries than most of the largest 16 unions in the United States—an undoubted fact.

But in the past, like progressives traditionally, the UAW measured its officers' salaries not against those of other officials but against those of the highest-paid workers in the industry. It was the boast of the UAW that its officials, in their mode of life and income, were within striking distance of the rank and file.

But slowly, as years pass, the distance between the two increases.

Reuther has led the union now for more than ten years. In that time the UAW has been changing.

The militant activists that dominated it in the big centers, Detroit and Flint, are now surrounded by a vast majority of new unionists who experienced neither the great sit-in strikes nor the historic internal caucus struggles. Their confidence in Reuther seems boundless. They are satisfied to let him suggest the major decisions without hindrance.

Hundreds of capable men who once spoke for the ranks at conventions and conferences are now on the appointed staff where they work efficiently, vigorously and quietly. The UAW represents now not a militant minority but a cross-section of the organized, industrial working class, still its most democratic and progressive wing.

In politics it is standing still. In industry, it faces the Big Three next year preparing to open the way for shorter hours in mass production.

Eisenhower as Fair-Dealer — —

(Continued from page 1)

ation bills or just a part of the Eisenhower program. It is the program itself, and it represents a turn in a liberal or Fair-Dealish direction.

Although the overwhelming share of the expenditures are for the military, payment for past wars and for carrying out of a military-oriented foreign policy, at the same time it represents a modest increase in some welfare programs. For example, there is a modest and altogether inadequate expenditure for education; but an increase rather than a decrease, as might have been expected according to the canons of old-line Republicans.

This budget represents the final ratification of the New and Fair Deal in that it runs against the traditional Republican program of smaller federal governmental expenditures and economy in order that there be a greater surplus, thus making tax cuts possible. Instead the Eisenhower administration has proposed almost a \$3 billion increase.

REAL SHIFT

Not only that but it also ran against Republican campaign promises. It has produced an outburst of conservative criticism inside the administration and in Congress. It was led off last January by Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey's statement that the budget was inflationary and that it would lead to a depression that "would curl your hair." And only recently Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona called the budget "a betrayal of the public trust."

When the Eisenhower administration came to office in 1953 it promised economy in government and lower taxes, and set its sights upon a \$60 billion budget as against the last Truman budget of \$78.6 billion, which was entirely beefed up by the Korean War. The budget did decline during fiscal '54 and '55 but for the last three years there have been increases. In 1954 there was a major tax cut benefiting primarily the upper-income brackets and corporations.

In the meantime, while Eisenhower's popularity went virtually unchallenged, the Democrats captured control of Congress in 1954 and 1956. At the same time there began a shift in emphasis, less talk of economy and more of the obligation of the federal government to provide necessary services. This went virtually unnoticed in the heat of the 1956 presidential campaign; it was discounted as merely campaign demagoguery.

But the shift has been real, although limited in sweep and vacillating in execution.

In the budget message of 1955, the old attitude is expressed: "We will increase the scope of private activity by continuing to take government out of those things which the people can do better for themselves, and by undertaking on a partnership basis, wherever possible, those things for which government action is necessary. Thus, people will be able to keep more of their earnings to use as they wish."

The next year's budget message, however, is in sharp contrast: "For years, many activities which are desirable for fostering sound economic growth have been postponed because of the overriding needs of war and defense. . . . However, budget revenues now permit us to undertake some new and expanded programs for enhancing opportunities for human

well-being and economic growth."

And the last two budgets have begun to reflect this emphasis. The nature and cause of this political re-evaluation are obvious and reflect a defeat or at least a setback for the more conservative forces inside both parties.

The Eisenhower administration is learning the lesson which Franklin D. Roosevelt learned 20 years earlier. Roosevelt in his first presidential campaign in 1932 called for lower governmental expenditures and a balanced budget. Under the pressure of the depression, it was only a matter of months after taking office that this orientation became a pipe-dream, and what later became the New Deal began to emerge.

Not being under the pressure of similar events, it has taken the Eisenhower administration several years to reach a similar conclusion. It has reached it reluctantly, half-heartedly and without having its heart in it.

CASE OF NIXON

Its leaders now know that there are certain minimum levels of welfare legislation which have to be provided if any party wishes to gain or remain in office. In any showdown between economy in government and the minimum welfare programs which the people regard as necessary, economy and lower taxes have to give way.

In this sense the Eisenhower administration is "Fair-Deal." It has tipped the political scales in this direction much to the chagrin and even bitter opposition of the conservatives in both parties, and some on the Eisenhower "team."

It is a coolly calculated political decision, that if the Republican Party wishes to remain in control of the presidency and of Congress, then it must put forward its liberal face. It is the recognition that the 1952 victory was a "freak" in that the conditions which gave rise to it—the Korean War primarily and secondarily the corruption issue—are not likely to occur again in such a way as to permit the luxury of the "old guard" type of campaign.

The belwether of this change—and it is as real as the conversion of many Democratic politicians to the Fair Deal—is the case of Richard Nixon. Despite charges to the contrary, Nixon is probably as "sincere" as a politician can be in his newly donned liberal garb. It may be demagoguery and opportunism, something of which Nixon has no monopoly, but nevertheless it is real in that it is a recognition of a political fact of life for any successful candidate for national office in the mid-1950s.

Nixon, the fair-haired boy of the conservative wing of the party in 1952, has been won over to the liberal wing of the Republican Party. Is it any wonder that Arthur Schlesinger Jr. finds it difficult to distinguish himself from "modern conservatism" and finds that the differences may be merely a matter of semantics.

It is this shift, real yet modest and incomplete, if it ever will be completed, which is the meaning of the "modern Republicanism" of the Eisenhower administration.

GOP WELFAREISM

Some liberals around the Democratic Party feign an inability to understand its meaning. But the meaning is all too

apparent to the Knowlands, Bridges and Byrds. But even Senator Knowland, who has presidential aspirations and is the leading conservative critic in Congress, has been extremely cautious in coming to a head-on-assault against "modern Republicanism."

Looking back on the budget we can see how modest has been the shift. Of the \$3 billion increase, \$2.4 billion falls into the category of "major national security" expenditures—that is, for the army, navy, air force and atomic weapons. Most of the welfare increases are made up of a series of small increases for various education, public assistance and health programs totaling about a half billion dollars. The war economy's increases are therefore about five times more than the welfare economy's.

The biggest welfare increase is \$250 million added to school construction. But the U. S. Chamber of Commerce is directing its major fire against it, and Washington reports are that it is likely that school construction will be sharply reduced.

On the other hand, there is a sharp cut of about a third in the proposed expenditures of various federal aids to housing which just about cancels the proposed increase in educational funds. However, on the whole, the budget is characterized by slight increases or holding the line on welfare expenditures.

What we see developing, perhaps, is the drawing together of both parties in terms of their approach toward domestic legislation, although there is no identity between them. With the exception of a dollar here or a few cents there, this budget is a direct steal from Adlai Stevenson's proposals for a "New America" issued during the presidential campaign.

WEDGES

If the Democrats came to the White House last year, this could well have been their budget and it would then have been heralded as a return to the Fair Deal.

The common ground between the two parties is growing at this moment. Both accept the staggering expenditures for the military which has come to be accepted as the normal state of affairs since the Korean War, and both are for continuing a certain minimum level of welfare-state expenditures.

Except the Democrats are a little more for it, with a little greater enthusiasm, and with a little more foresight. What is new today is that the Republicans are accepting it too.

The old orthodoxy of smaller budgets and cutting taxes is on the wane, and a new orthodoxy is developing. Neither party is prepared to challenge the basic assumption of the military-oriented foreign policy, and this fact precludes any significant cut in federal expenditures even for George Humphrey. And neither party is prepared to propose any really substantial increase in party housing, education, health services or to tackle the rising cost of living.

Differences between the parties remain since there are more (and more genuine) liberals inside of the Democratic Party, liberals by inclination and belief rather than convenience; but they are a small minority. The differences reflect themselves in attitudes toward civil rights, immigration policy, public power and assistance toward the underdeveloped nations.

But fundamentally the difference is found in the fact that the two parties try to appeal to different social classes and groups in American society. Operating inside of the Democratic Party are the trade unions, with a liberal program which stems not from convenience or inclination but from necessity.

Today we see the leadership of the Republican Party attempting to get itself into the position where it can insert wedges between the trade unions and Negroes and the Democratic Party. It is attempting to break up the alliances and allegiances which were built during the 20 years under Roosevelt and Truman. The Tafts, Bridges and Knowlands cannot do it, but Eisenhower "modern Republicanism" is making the attempt.

**GIVE
to the Fund Drive!**

Muste vs. Hoover

In a press release giving the text of a letter to J. Edgar Hoover, A. J. Muste has rebuked the FBI head for smearing him as one "who has long fronted for Communists."

The FBI's sacred cow, who commonly claims that he keeps out of politics and does not evaluate the facts he gathers, had said in a statement publicly issued last month that the non-party observers at the recent Communist Party convention were, most of them, "hand-picked before the convention started and were reportedly headed by A. J. Muste, who has long fronted for Communists and who recently circulated an amnesty petition calling for the release of Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act."

Hoover went on to claim that Muste's report on the convention was "biased" whereas that of observer Carl Rachlin "whom the party did not hand-pick" was more "objective," being more critical of the CP's pretenses to democracy.

Muste's letter, addressed to Hoover, cites his own long record of opposition to united fronts with the Communists, particularly as secretary of the Christian-pacifist group Fellowship of Reconciliation. At the same time, he stresses, he and the F.O.R. have favored support of civil liberties for Communists as well as all others, and opposition to the Smith Act. But their activities in favor of civil liberties, he adds, have always been conducted independently, not through or with any Communist fronts.

On the question of observers at the CP convention, Muste makes clear that the idea originated with him, not with the CP. He goes on to describe how all the observers were selected in the same way, including Rachlin, none of them being picked by the CP itself in any way.

Muste adds: "It should be put in the record that a number of persons who were approached [to act as observer], who thought it a good idea and wished to participate, declined to do so because they feared there might be precisely the kind of comment which you have in fact made, and they did not wish to expose the institutions with which they were connected to the embarrassment which this causes in the atmosphere which still largely prevails in this country. . . ."

In conclusion, Muste raises two questions:

"In the first place, I am under the impression that according to your own statements it is the function of the FBI to gather information, not to deliver judgments or to attempt to 'give the party line,' so to speak, to congressional committees or the general public. . . ."

"In the next place. . . . To what pass have we come if a single individual—and he the head of the FBI presumably—charged in a special and delicate manner with the protection of citizens against attack and the defense of our liberties—can make charges against an individual in the casual manner that you have used in this case?"

**STALINIST
RUSSIA**

**A
MARXIST
ANALYSIS**

By Tony Cliff

\$2.00

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

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

April 22, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 16

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. Business Mgr: L. G. SMITH.
Associate Editors: GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL.

Convention Sidelights — —

(Continued from page 3)

his life, his father has been on strike.

A chorus of strikers' children entertained the delegates with "Hold the Fort," "There is Power," and of course "Solidarity Forever."

One convention observer was Max Shachtman, chairman of the Independent Socialist League. A number of visitors and delegates who met him expressed great interest in the possibilities of socialist unity and regroupment. On Tuesday evening, therefore, a meeting was arranged for him to report on the results of his recent national tour.

Shachtman replied to questions from supporters of the Socialist Party, the old

Social Democratic Federation and the American Socialist. Thirty people, having just finished a long convention session, remained till close to midnight to hear the discussion.

A note on automation:

A little crowd of delegates gathered outside the window of one Atlantic City boardwalk shop to watch a tricky little machine mix, cut, wrap, and package salt-water taffy—all in one continuous operation. The performance probably fascinates and amazes the regular summer trade.

But none of the delegates was impressed. One delegate turned to his friend and commented, "Pretty slow, isn't it?" The reply: "Yes, it sure is crude."

The Campus Shows Signs of Perking Up

Within the last few months, a student awakening has occurred in New York City. Compared to the youth activity of the thirties and Forties, it is a minuscule phenomenon; but when contrasted to the almost universal apathy of the past five years, it stands out in sharp relief as a real step forward. Two recent meetings, one at City College, the other at Brooklyn, gave a focus to this new development.

The meetings last week were in the context of the attempt to ban John Gates from the City campuses. This action of the Board of Higher Education had set off a sizable student protest, and the momentum generated led to a series of meetings. Three of them—the two forums at Columbia, the one sponsored by the Debs Club, the other by the John Dewey Society, and Buell Gallagher's debate with Doxey Wilkerson at City—have already been described in *Challenge*. The recent meetings grew naturally out of the same situation.

At Brooklyn College, Students for Democratic Action sponsored a meeting which was similar to the Debs Club protest at Columbia. Michael Harrington, national chairman of the Young Socialist League, Joseph Clark, foreign editor of the *Daily Worker*, and Sheldon Ackley, representing the American Civil Liberties Union, spoke on academic freedom to a gathering of well over two hundred students.

All three of the speakers at Brooklyn opposed the banning of Gates and the general witchhunting atmosphere in the colleges during the recent period. But both Harrington and Ackley added to this a defense of the rights of the students under Stalinist rule and an attack on the oppression of academic freedom there.

On a whole series of questions, Clark maintained the *Daily Worker* view, i.e. the extreme formulation of "criticism," including opposition to the Russian intervention in Hungary, a position adopted by the *Worker* months ago but not repeated since.

Clark also came down very hard for a "coexistence" line. In reply, Harrington stressed the opposition of the YSL to a Third World War and any actions leading toward it, but challenged the no-

tion that "coexistence" represented peace.

In particular, the socialist spokesmen emphasized that there could be no agreement to allow Russia to murder revolutions within its own "sphere," and called for a policy of political struggle against Stalinism. He raised the demand of a withdrawal of all troops from Europe, both Russian and American, and attacked American foreign policy sharply for its inability to find any but a military and reactionary method of struggle against totalitarianism.

Most of the questions from the audience were addressed to Clark, and he made a remarkably effective defense of his contradictory position. But, as noted before, this was often done through stating the most extreme attitudes of the Gates tendency as if they were the official party line.

The meeting was limited to two hours, and many issues were left in the air, but the discussion provided an excellent opportunity for students to hear a confrontation of controversial points of view.

FREE FOR ALL

The City College meeting was part of Academic Freedom week. Held on the lawn of the college's new South Campus, the event drew an audience of over four hundred students. Harrington and Clark both spoke at this meeting, and with them Bayard Rustin of the War Resisters League, Myra Tanner Weiss of the Socialist Workers Party, and Eric Hass of the Socialist Labor Party.

Rustin, who concentrated on discussing the relationship between non-violence and the struggle for civil rights, received the most sympathetic hearing. It was clear that the overwhelming bulk of the audience was committed to support of a militant Negro struggle.

Harrington spoke of the necessity of creating a labor party in the United States, especially to effectively fight for civil rights, and offered a Third Camp analysis of the international scene. At one point during the discussion period, Harrington seconded Rustin's speech on supporting the fight for civil rights and called upon the City students to join in

and support the coming March on Washington. This appeal was greeted with considerable interest.

Clark was again confronted with sharp questioning on the issue of democracy under Stalinism. In his presentation, he had referred to the fact that he believed Bulganin's statement that Eisenhower wanted peace. In the question period, a student asked him if he had believed Bulganin when he said that he was in favor of recognizing the demands of the Hungarian Revolution. Even the intricacies of the Gates tendency position were not up to handling this query, and Clark was obliged to give an evasive answer.

ATTENTIVE LISTENERS

Myra Tanner Weiss of the SWP laid particular emphasis upon the necessity of creating a worker's government in order to abolish war and capitalism. She told the audience that she opposed Khrushchev and Company, that she solidarized herself with "the Leninist youth of Leningrad" in their struggle for freedom. Hass presented the Socialist Labor Party point of view, calling for the abolition of capitalism through the building of socialist industrial unions.

In part, the audience was composed of students who had come to heckle a freak show (including a group of fraternity members who attended in kilts). But the general attitude was one of attentive listening, and the seriousness of the large crowd in an open-air meeting was quite unusual.

These two meetings, and the meetings at Columbia and City in the weeks before, represent a break in the atmosphere on the New York campus. In part, they symbolize the effectiveness of the student protest over the Gates banning. That Clark and Wilkerson should speak in the city campuses—on this technical ground that, not having been indicted or convicted under the Smith Act, they are not covered by the Board of Higher Education ruling—is a victory for academic freedom. And in three out of the five meetings, the Communist spokesmen were confronted by a spokesman for the point of view of Third Camp socialism. At the same time, it would be a mis-

take to overestimate the importance of the change in attitude among the students. The issues on which they have rallied, primarily those of academic freedom and civil rights, are basic ones, and do not require a high degree of politicalization before they can be supported. Indeed, it was obvious at all the meetings that a politicalized student body does not exist on any campus in New York, although there is a great deal of general sentiment against the witchhunt, for civil liberties and the Negro struggle.

And yet the meetings this spring represent a tremendous advance over the situation that has prevailed in the past four or five years. During that period, the thought of students going out and aggressively fighting for the right to hear Communists and socialists was foreign to the student scene. There was a dearth of any kind of serious meetings. And that atmosphere, at least, is breaking up.

This is not to say that there will be an easy and automatic return to the student political activity which was the rule in the late forties. A long road has to be traveled before that comes to pass—but the process has begun.

Finally, one other fact should be stressed. During the last period, over a thousand students in New York have heard the presentation of a Third Camp socialist point of view on the questions of peace, academic freedom, civil liberties, civil rights. In this context, that means that not only are general possibilities for student political life opening up, but specific possibilities for growth on the part of the socialist youth movement.

It is significant that, in New York, as the road has opened up toward student activity, socialists have played a prominent role—in the struggle for academic freedom over the Gates banning, in working for civil rights on the "Enroll for Freedom" campaign. They have done so as part of a large student movement composed of various political tendencies. And to us, the growth of the socialist youth movement can only take place through the development of a healthy student movement throughout the United States.

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

Sundays at 8:30 p.m.
**WORLD POLITICS:
1917 to World War II**

The following sessions of this class are still to be held:

- (5) April 21 . . . George Rawlings
NAZISM IN GERMANY
- (6) May 5 . . . Cy Jackson
REVOLUTION IN CHINA
- (7) May 12 . . . Max Martin
CIVIL WAR IN SPAIN
- (8) May 19 . . . Sam Taylor
WORLD WAR II

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

BC Regime in the Old Groove

By TOM KAHN

Academic freedom at Brooklyn College, already at a notoriously low ebb, receded even farther last week. Three editors of the college paper, *Kingsman*, were suspended from their positions on the newspaper because of a fear on the part of the Dean of Student Life that their decision to print no editorial in the issue of April 12 would be an embarrassment to him.

The suspension of Editor-in-Chief

Anatole Levkoff and Associate Editors Phyllis De Sena and Ronald Meyers actually came as a result of their refusal to accept faculty interference with the paper. Explaining that *Kingsman* is the only campus newspaper, the administration demands that it print multiple editorials on controversial subjects.

School regulations call for "pre-publication consultations" with the faculty advisor who may advise the students on the contents of editorials and letters and who has the final say on whether the nature of the editorials demands the invocation of the multiple-editorial policy. On April 11, however, Dean of Student Life Thomas Coulton gave a new twist to the term "consultation" and interpreted it as giving the faculty advisor the right to read copy in advance.

In a letter to *Kingsman*, Editor-in-Chief Levkoff stated that while "school regulations call for pre-publication 'consultation' with the advisor on news, editorials, and business 'policies and practices' . . . nowhere in the Publications Committee regulations does it call for copy to be read in advance. It appears to us that Dean Coulton is demanding not

a consultation, but a sermon."

The editorial which had been planned for last week's issue concerned the state of "critical thinking in the college"—a harmless philosophic subject to be sure, at any school but Brooklyn. At Brooklyn, a discussion of "critical thinking" necessarily implies an anti-administration point of view.

Dean Coulton, sensitive to any subtle currents which might waft independent student opinion onto the campus, was not satisfied that the faculty advisor be given a general idea of the proposed editorials, but insisted, instead, that he be given the right to read the copy, so that all the details, possibly pregnant with rebellion, might be searched out and countered with an opposing editorial.

The editors of *Kingsman* decided they could not accept this interpretation of the role of an advisor, but, as Levkoff explains in his letter:

"We informed the Dean we could not violate the ruling this week, and that we would print no editorial. This, he felt, would put himself and others in an 'awk-

(Turn to last page)

SPRING WEEKEND CAMP—N.Y. YSL

WHEN? From lunch on Sat., Apr. 27 thru supper on Sun., Apr. 28.
WHERE? Mountain Spring Camp, Washington, New Jersey.
WHAT? Educational program, recreation, sports, Sat. Nite Social.
HOW MUCH? \$11 per person (includes room and 5 meals).
WHAT TO DO: Call N.Y. YSL at WAtkins 4-4222 for details, reservations (which are necessary) and travel information.

Part of the Background Of the Mess in Gaza . . .

BEHIND THE FEDAYEEN

By HAL DRAPER

The second big point made by A. J. Liebling in his dispatch to the *New Yorker* entitled "Letter from Tel Aviv" concerns the tale that Israel's primary consideration in invading Egypt was the need to stop the attacks by Egyptian *fedayeen* from the Gaza Strip.

To go by Abba Eban's much-praised elocutions in the UN, or N. Y. *Post* editorials and columnists, or other apologists for the Ben-Gurion regime, the Israeli leaders were simply forced into the invasion by this pressure.

"This is a complete myth, and one of Liebling's services is that he shows it up. This is what he writes, and it is worth quoting at length.

SCORE CARD

"The question of whether or not raids and reprisals are resumed—and of who raids and who reprises—is not a matter of such dramatic import as the press here contends. During the two years of scraggly border warfare that preceded the Israelis' decision to raise the ante last October [the invasion of Egypt], the 'crimes of the fedayeen' claimed considerably fewer victims in Israel than the Israelis bagged on the Egyptian side of the line. The score kept by the UN observers of the Egypt-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission shows that between Jan. 1, 1955 and Sept. 30, 1956 the Israelis killed 239 Egyptian soldiers and 91 civilians, while the Egyptians killed 42 Israeli soldiers and 24 civilians—a ratio of just under 6 to 1 in the first category and of just under 4 to 1 in the second. The discrepancy is a measure not of comparative ill will but of comparative efficiency. . . . As for the widely photographed peaceful Israeli settlers of Nahal Oz, who work their fields under the menacing shadow of the fedayeen-haunted Gaza ridge, they are members of a paramilitary farm colony planted there about six years ago to catch raiders. Border kibbutzim, or collective farms, like this one are an institution copied from the Roman *coloniae* of ex-soldiers, who received land and livestock as an inducement to settle at points on the imperial frontier where they could be of the most utility when war came. The young Israelis go to these kibbutzim straight from army service. It's a good old-fashioned procedure that provides lightly fortified *Stützpunkte* along the frontier at minimal expense, since the colonists grow their own vegetables and dig trenches in their recreation time; the czars planted belts of Cossack colonies along the Tatar and Polish borders for the same purpose. The kibbutzim at points where action seems most imminent are favored not only in equipment but in the allocation of farm machinery and livestock; they are like army units being beefed up for action. A young farmer I talked with at Nahal Oz while the Israelis still occupied Gaza said, half regretfully, 'We've been making great progress here, but if the Egyptians don't come back soon, the kibbutzim on the Syrian frontier will be getting the pick of everything.' Recruiting for the more sheltered kibbutzim is falling away with the waning of the young Israelis' romanticism about the land; the persisting attraction of the border establishments is the opportunity to protect the fatherland from attack. (The only genuine romantic enthusiasm in Israel now, it seems to an observer from outside, centers on the armed forces. The popular line is that the army won the victory and the government threw it away—or Eisenhower or Hammarskjöld or the oil companies stole it away.) The Israelis are far better qualified than their opponents for an indefinite game of cowboys-and-Indians. It is highly unlikely that

This is the second of two articles discussing A. J. Liebling's "Letter from Tel Aviv" in the March 30 issue of the *New Yorker*.

the country will bleed, to death because of the measly 'incidents' that the local press is already trying to blow up, like the theft of 3000 dollars' worth of farm machinery, of an unspecified nature, from the Israeli-governed Bedouin tribe named Abu Grab (in this case, more grabbed against than grabbing)."

BEFORE AND AFTER

Now this, of course, is not a rounded account of the fedayeen episode of the last couple of years, but it is a salutary corrective to the one-sided nonsense that has been written about it. Liebling is on solid ground in taking a fall out of the inflation of the fedayeen problem, for purposes of justificatory propaganda, to which it lends itself so easily.

Thus, in its issue dated just one month before the invasion of Egypt, *Commentary* magazine carried an article on Israel by Benno Weiser, who reported with emphasis that the Israelis themselves shrug off the fedayeen raids and don't take it as seriously as do foreign visitors. Among other things he quotes an "old friend" of his:

"'Look,' he said, while we sipped coffee . . . 'there have been about three thousand casualties among both Arabs and Jews in border incidents since the conclusion of the armistice in 1949. That means roughly a yearly average of two hundred Jewish casualties. Every other day a Jew is wounded or killed because of the absence of peace. Compare this with the average number of casualties from our traffic accidents. What the Arabs take is perhaps 5 per cent of the toll of the Fords, Kaisers, Hillmans and Chevrolets. Does it occur to anyone not to walk on the streets or not to use cars? . . ."

"This sort of thing, which sounds callous, was all very well before the invasion, when it was a question of protesting that Israel could never, never even think of starting a preventive war—except for bad people like the Herut gang; it was mainly after the aggression that the fedayeen attrition was converted into a matter of life and death for Israel.

EXPERT AT WORK

Or take the *Reporter* magazine, whose staff writer Claire Sterling, like its editor and publisher, is violently pro-Israel. In the May 17 issue of that magazine last year, Miss Sterling revealed from Jerusalem that, fortunately, it was now definite and irrevocable that Ben-Gurion would never, never invade Egypt: "The Israelis will not invade Egypt, now or a year from now." So overwhelming was her relief at this intelligence that she found it possible to reveal, as a moment of aberration happily long passed, that the preceding November "Ben-Gurion was strongly tempted to embark on such a war" and "he might well have tried it" except for warnings from Britain and the U. S.

(In that November of 1955, Israeli troops had forcibly moved into the demilitarized zone of El Auja on the Sinai frontier. Many believed at the time that Ben-Gurion was hoping to provoke the Egyptians into official military retaliation so as to be able to claim that it was the Egyptians who had started the war.)

The point is that Miss Sterling discusses in the very same article how the fedayeen raids had just been intensified in April; indeed they had reached a climax on April 11 when three children and a teacher were killed at evening prayers in a synagogue in Shafir. Yet it does not occur to her, not even to her, that there is a connection worth discussing between this and the pressure on Israel to attack Egypt.

After the invasion, Miss Sterling's equally authoritative article in the *Reporter* could have been esthetically appreciated only by staff writers for the *Daily Worker* before and after the Hitler-Stalin Pact.

BOTH THEIR HOUSES

But there is much more to the fedayeen story than simply the question of its mythical role in forcing Israel to its aggression.

What is not controversial, but indisputable and well publicized, is the viciously reactionary character of the fedayeen policy of the Egyptian regime—i.e., murderous sneak attacks by *kamikaze* raiders on Israeli civilians as well as soldiers. What is concealed by so many of the gentlemen who make heart-rending denunciations of these crimes is the equally reprehensible policy of the Ben-Gurion regime which, in point of fact, eventually elicited the fedayeen as a reactionary riposte.

The story of the border fighting begins with the very establishment of the borders—which are not national borders in many places, anyway, but simply the armistice lines established after the 1948 war to end the shooting. These lines were drawn higgledy-piggledy right through many a Palestinian Arab village, frequently separating the peasants' homes from the land which gave them their sustenance.

Israel proceeded to implement a grab of every inch of territory on its side of the temporary line, outside the territory allotted by the UN partition plan. Palestinian Arab villagers found themselves stripped of their ancestral fields and reduced to seeing their property worked by the occupiers under their noses.

At the same time tens of thousands of Palestine Arabs had fled the war as refugees—partly in fear of the fighting and of the invading foreign-Arab forces, partly stimulated by the departing but bitter British, and last but not least, partly driven out of villages or terrorized out by Israeli forces. The Israelis grabbed their property and land wholesale and then, not illogically, refused to let them come back to their homes.

These too piled up behind the barrier of the "armistice lines" which Israel was converting into hard frontiers while their lands, crops, houses and livestock were expropriated by the occupiers.

Thus began the chapter of the "infiltrators."

WAR WITH WHOM?

The infiltrators were—overwhelmingly—some of these Palestinian Arab refugees or expropriated villagers who, living in seething misery and frustration, slipped over the lines now and then for various reasons.

Often the reason was simply to visit friends or relatives still there. Not infrequently it was to secretly continue tilling fields which belonged to them and were lying fallow. Or it might be to "steal" back from one of the settlements some piece of property which they still considered to be theirs. Or, working up the scale, to harass out of simple reprisal a settlement that was now planted on their own land, say, by dismantling a pipe. . . .

So it started, a process that jaeked itself up automatically.

The paramilitary colonies that Israel

*This part of the story is documented in the *New Internationalist*, Summer 1956; the land-grab, in the Winter 1957 issue.

started feverishly planting along the "armistice lines" were in the first place designed to prevent such infiltration. Infiltrators could be and were shot on sight. The toll mounted.

This was a "war" between the Israeli regime and the Palestinian Arabs who had been robbed. The Egyptian or Jordanian regimes were not at first involved—except of course that the infiltrators came from across the line, in their territory.

But even as far as this is concerned, the evidence piled up by the UN agencies established to supervise the armistice is that both of these governments made sincere efforts during this chapter of the story in order to police the infiltrators and put a stop to the border harassment of Israel by its victims.*

LESSON IN BLOOD

The response that emerged from the Israeli government to the problem was the old one of "Teach 'em a lesson." Out-of-hand shooting of infiltrators when they were caught was not enough. Paramilitary squads from the border *coloniae* began to make terror-raids across the lines at refugee centers and Arab villages in order to "teach 'em a lesson," by shooting them up.

The Arabs thus killed (as "lessons") were, of course, chance-selected by bullets; they themselves were not infiltrators, necessarily. The theory was that of collective punishment (well known to the Israelis from the former British rule).

These paramilitary raiders cannot be called Israeli fedayeen because that word means "self-sacrificers" and implies a suicide operation.

Thus the jacking-up process on both sides reached a new level. Or, to change the metaphor, the Israelis raised the ante again. The war was still with the Palestinian Arabs, not with Egyptian or Jordanian forces.

It is this chapter of the story that reached its climax with the infamous Kibya massacre in 1953, when a well-organized and efficient Israeli military operation struck at the Arab village across the Jordan border, sprayed machine-gun bullets around, blew up houses wholesale, indiscriminately slaughtering over 50 men, women and children in the streets and in their homes. This was supposed to be an "answer" to the preceding murder of three people in an Israeli village, presumably by infiltrators. The ante was now being raised to near "Lidice" proportions. There were many smaller "Kibyas."

TURNING POINT

By 1955 the spotlight focused on the Egyptian border.

In the Gaza sector, the infiltration problem was complicated also by raids into Israel by Bedouin tribes which had been driven out of Israel into the Sinai area. In February, the Israelis pulled off a military raid inside the Gaza Strip, killing about 40 Arabs. (This turn was heralded by the immediately preceding return to the defense ministry of Ben-Gurion, who had been in "retirement" since the outcry over Kibya.)

The jacking-up process was under way along the Gaza border. On August 31 it reached a climax with an Israeli strike against Khan Yunis, in the southern end of the Strip. This became a turning-point.

Another focal point was the El Auja demilitarized zone on the Sinai frontier. Israel established a military camp there under the guise of a kibbutz; Egypt protested the presence of soldiers. Israel rebutted that the Egyptian check-post just outside El Auja was in fact a few yards inside the lines. Clashes started. In October an Israeli force destroyed an Egyptian post on the border further south.

(Continued on next page)

*This border happens to be the only one in the history of the world which has been under constant military observation for a number of years by an impartial, international organization of supervisors—the UN truce commissions. Their reports have never gotten any currency in the U. S. press. A recent book by one of the UN observers, Commander E. H. Hutchison, "Violent Truce" (Devon-Adair, N. Y.) reflects the findings of the UN agencies on the spot. It has succeeded in getting reviewed practically nowhere, with one exception, but is "must" reading for anyone trying to get acquainted with all sides of this story. The exception is a bitterly hostile review by Hal Lehrman in *Commentary*, which proves (by what it does not say) that Lehrman can find nothing to refute in the general factual picture drawn by Hutchison.

*For a more general discussion of what has been happening to the Israeli kibbutz, see the interesting comments by Stanley Diamond in the current *Dissent*.

U.S. Buys a King — —

(Continued from page 1)

hower Doctrine to Jordan."

Since this delicate reference, the N. Y. Times has twice put it very indelicately indeed. Said a Washington dispatch by Dana Adams Schmidt on April 12:

"Jordan's need for outside economic support, and the proximity of former Rep. James P. Richards, as special envoy in charge of explaining [sic] the Eisenhower Doctrine and using \$200,000,000 where it will do the most good in the Middle East, is believed to have been the catalyst that precipitated a showdown between the anti-Communist king and his leftist premier."

And to make it official the Times editorial said the same day:

"But the future of Jordan remains problematical because the country is not viable economically and is wholly dependent on outside aid. This is the decisive factor behind the present conflict and it

makes the Eisenhower Doctrine the touchstone of Jordan's course. Under pressure of Arab nationalism King Hussein [in 1956] dismissed General Glubb as commander of the Arab Legion, agreed to the abrogation of the alliance with Britain, which meant the end of British subsidies, and agreed in the name of Arab solidarity to accept substitute aid from Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia. But Egypt and Syria are both in a precarious financial condition, and King Saud may not like to bankroll Jordan alone.

"In these circumstances both the king and the ousted premier looked for other sources of aid. Nabulsi looked to Soviet Russia, with which, against the king's public warning, he sought to exchange ambassadors. But the king looked to the United States and the Eisenhower Doctrine with its \$200,000,000 aid fund for the Middle East, which Nabulsi scorned. This precipitated the showdown which, for good or ill, could lead to a showdown over the whole Middle East."

U.S. ROLE

That's clear enough; except that, incidentally, there has never been any report, in the Times or elsewhere, that Nabulsi "looked to" Russia to make up the cash subsidy, as Hussein looked to the U. S. kitty. It was with the Arab states that the Jordanian government had arranged to replace the British subsidy; though it may be true that this wouldn't have been able to work out.

There has even been an indiscreet statement, by Hanson W. Baldwin in the Times (Apr. 16), that U. S. agents in Jordan have been pushing the king in the direction of his action: "United States officials in Jordan have been trying for a long time to encourage and strengthen the king's slow acquisition of somewhat greater power."

That is, "greater power" as against the constitutional setup! Envoys of democracy, indeed.

Even before the explosion of the present crisis, an article in Commentary (March) by Ray Alan reported:

"Spokesmen for King Hussein have assured strictly Arab gatherings that the statement [Hussein's anti-Communist statement in February]—like the decree issued two days later banning the circulation of Communist propaganda media in the country—was considered advisable in order to induce the U. S. Point Four administration to hasten consideration of a Jordanian request for 30 million dollars in economic aid. It did not mean that the king favored a political or military rapprochement with America, though he would be pleased to go to Washington, if invited, to do what he could to speed up the flow of dollars."

Well, Hussein is still doing what he can to speed up the flow of dollars. King For Sale—Cheap!

PRO-COMMUNIST SMEAR

As against these idealistic and lofty considerations of the king, whose royal heart grieves for both his people and exchequer, the newspapers have had no difficulty "proving" the pro-Soviet character of the Nabulsi government. In the first place, Nabulsi wanted to establish diplomatic relations with Russia. Who but a crypto-Communist would want to do a thing like that? Of course, it was done in the U. S. by none other than F. D. Roosevelt; but then, has it been completely proved that Roosevelt wasn't really a Communist? One can ask.

In the second place, Nabulsi abrogated the shameful treaty with Britain which made Jordan its paid lackey-state: Who but a Communist could be something less than enthusiastic about this degrading relationship? Besides, every single politician in Jordan without exception was for abrogation too, by that time; but can you prove that Nabulsi isn't an agent of Moscow?

Thirdly, Nabulsi spurned American money. This is the final proof.

All three of these reasons, shamelessly put forward day after day all over the American press, would be enough to make anyone a Communist if he didn't know better—both about the Communists and our own journalistic liars.

In point of fact, Nabulsi is a right-wing socialist—or probably more accurately, a leftish bourgeois nationalist.

(The left-wing socialists are in the Baath, or Arab Resurrection Party, which was also backing the Nabulsi cabinet.) His socialism is, if at all, only a bit redder than Nehru's, which isn't saying much. The Nehru example is a good thing to keep in mind, also, in evaluating the ambiguous attitude toward Moscow taken by the various Arab socialists, anti-Communist though they are.

LEFT AND RIGHT

One thing that is beyond any shadow of doubt is that the overwhelming bulk of the Jordanian people are with the nationalist trend represented by Nabulsi, as already indicated.

The repulsive hacks of the daily press are now referring, as a matter of course, to Nabulsi as "leader of the mob"—reducing public opinion in Jordan to this derogatory phrase. But Nabulsi came to power as the result of the general election of October 21 of last year—an election notable in this country for its relative freedom from rigging. His government was a solidly constitutional one. Nobody has ever seriously challenged the validity of that election's reflection of the national temper.

Moreover, the demonstrations that covered Jordan in the last week in support of Nabulsi have been orderly, peaceful and disciplined ones—not disorderly mobs running riot. If anything, the Jordanian nationalists have shown remarkable restraint and maturity rather than the reverse. This is what all the dispatches describe at the same time that editorial commentators refer contemptuously to the mass of people as the "mob."

Furthermore, it is clear that it is the more advanced sections of the Jordanians—the better educated Palestinians in particular—who are behind Nabulsi and the nationalists, while it is the more primitive Bedouins upon whom the king depends for effective support almost exclusively.

The Palestinians—who more than doubled Jordan's population when the remnant of Arab Palestine was annexed by Abdullah in 1949—are largely literate. "The high literacy rate and accompanying political consciousness," wrote Kennett Love from Amman (N. Y. Times, Apr. 2) before the crisis, "have begun to engender real political parties based on political, economic and social programs as well as on personalities."

The people this refers to are overwhelmingly the supporters of Nabulsi and the nationalists, not the supporters of the king.

Or consider the difference between Good Old King Hussein and the bad old premier from the point of view of their Arab allies. The hacks of the press, when they are not smearing Nabulsi as an agent of Moscow, point out—quite truly—that his friends in the Arab world are Syria and Egypt; actually Syria, primarily. Backing Hussein on the other hand are Iraq and Saudi Arabia. Compared with the latter two regimes, Syria is a progressive democracy. Even the Nasser dictatorship can begin to look good if you concentrate real hard on the slave state of King Saud.

WASHINGTON'S FRIENDS

Socially, inside Jordan, there is no doubt of the contrast. Wrote Kennett Love, for example, in the language of his profession: "Since there are few large landowners in Jordan, conservative support comes from business and professional circles. The Leftists are supported by the urban mobs and the Palestinian refugees." —The second category of course virtually means the whole people minus the Bedouins.

The above-mentioned article by Ray Alan says: "Union with Iraq has many advocates in the upper strata of Jordanian society, but it would only find favor with the masses if the present Iraqi oligarchy were overthrown and replaced by a 'left-nationalist' Syrian-type regime."

One of the most disingenuous bits of obfuscation now poisoning the press stories is the one about "Jordanian nationalism." According to this, the king stands for "Jordanian independence" while the nationalist left wants union with Syria.

It is true that the left advocates union with Syria. Behind this fact is another:

A Liberal Zionist

In his regular N. Y. Post column of April 15, Max Lerner removes all stops in a paean of praise for King Hussein's royal coup. For complete abandonment of all shame, this "liberal" spokesman leaves every other hatchetman in the press far behind.

He calls on the Eisenhower administration to "rally opinion behind the legitimate government of Hussein." He wonders why Washington doesn't speak up. "We were not so silent in the case of the Communist threat in Iran, at the time of the Mossadegh episode," writes this disgusting liberal-imperialist.

"Uneasy rests the head that wears a Jordanian crown today. I wish the young King well because his enemies are our enemies," he says.

Nabulsi is a "Nasser pawn," that's all. Every other paragraph sneers at the "mob" in Jordan. After a while, Nabulsi becomes the "Nasser-Communist forces." The king is the real spokesman for "Jordanian nationalism." And "The shouting, howling street mobs are creatures of foreigners, and their slogans are manufactured in Cairo and Moscow."

This liberal doesn't shrink for one minute from clapping his hands raw for the military overthrow of the constitutional government: "If Hussein wants a government that will not betray him it will have to be a non-parliamentary government of temporary martial law. It will have to reckon with the street mobs in Jerusalem, Nabulsi and Ramallah. . . ."

This vile stuff does not stem solely from Lerner's "liberalism," though that article is dubious enough; and in fact at the time of the U. S.-sponsored overthrow of the Guatemalan regime Lerner stoutly defended the action as a good chauvinist. On the subject of Arab nationalism and anti-imperialism, Lerner has written ravaging columns before. His explicit motivation is the threat of Arab nationalism to Israel. As a long-standing and hard-bitten Zionist, Lerner follows in the crudest way that tradition of Zionism which is willing to endorse the worst crimes of imperialism as long as these crimes are directed against the joint enemy.

As the best known and most authoritative spokesman for organized Zionism writing in the general press, Lerner reflects the deeply reactionary character of this chauvinist movement.

the artificiality of Jordan as a state in the first place.

It was carved out of the region by British imperialism after the First World War as a simple satrapy, handed over to Abdullah, and put on London's payroll. A Jordanian nation as such scarcely existed within the Arab people. Today, in addition, between a half and two-thirds of the population are the Palestinians who have even less relationship to any concept of a Jordanian nation.

"Today more and more Jordanians speak of themselves as 'South Syrians,'" wrote Kennett Love.

"Jordan's strategic reason for existence, as a British protectorate and site for British bases, ended with the recent abrogation of the British-Jordanian treaty," wrote Hanson W. Baldwin.

The pro-Syrian sentiment of the left, therefore, cannot simply be equated against the pro-Iraqism of the upper classes and the king. The former has real national roots.

This trend toward union has disagreeable consequences for the king other than social and political. Writes Ray Alan:

"This section of Jordanian opinion is increasingly republican in sentiment, considering Hussein's expensive court, cars and capers an unjustifiable burden on the country's economy. . . ."

Of course, union with Syria could probably be accomplished only on a republican basis.

From every angle the United States dollar is lined up with the most reactionary forces in Jordan, socially and politically, as against all those trends which, with all their many defects, represent well or ill the stirrings of the Arab people toward freedom from imperialism and toward social progress.

Once again Washington puts its money on the crumbling past.

Fedayeen — —

(Continued from page 6)

Then in November (as we have already mentioned) Israeli troops moved in force against the Egyptian position and took over the demilitarized area in open battle.

This is where, as Claire Sterling later admitted, Ben-Gurion was ready to provoke a war. There were no fedayeen as yet.

To quote from the Jewish Agency's Digest of Nov. 22, 1956 on "The Fedayeen—Nasser's Secret Weapon":

"Some time last year the prestige of the Egyptian occupation authorities in the Gaza Strip and in Egypt proper was at a low ebb because of their apparent inactivity against Israel. The public demanded military action. Fearful, however, that an all-out offensive by the regular Egyptian army may meet with failure, the Egyptian dictator hit upon an ingenious scheme . . ."—i.e., the Fedayeen.*

This makes crystal-clear from unimpeachable sources what has been treated as a well-known truth by many other observers: it was at this time, after at least seven years of Israeli ante-raising, that the Egyptian regime riposted by organizing the fedayeen forays in response to what "the public demanded."

(The long-sufferance of Cairo should not be ascribed to overweening kindness. As Liebling observed in a similar connection, it was basically due to disinclination to risk another military debacle.)

THE MONSTER

The "teach 'em a lesson" policy had been raising the ante in order to bring the Arabs to their knees with pleas to the conquerors to kindly stop murdering them. The chauvinist-militarist mentality of its protagonists (spearheaded by Ben-Gurion) saw it as the way to make impudent aborigines grovel before their masters. Although it was initially directed against the Palestinian Arabs, it could naturally be carried through only in complete contempt of the Egyptian and Jordanian states.

The monster that this monstrous policy created is called the fedayeen. It was sired by Israeli chauvinism upon the body of Egypt's reactionary Nasserism. The fedayeen themselves were recruited from desperate Palestinian Arab refugees.

When Israel invaded Egypt last October, it was raising the ante again. There is a line that goes straight from Kibya to the Sinai aggression, and that goes, in the other direction, back to the expropriation of the Palestinian Arabs.

It is not the only line that delineates the politics of the Middle East mess, but it is the one most often left out of the picture. It is also a line which serves to cross out the pretense that the Israeli regime's role in that shameful aggression was basically a defensive one against intolerable harassment.

*The J. A. Digest article, says a note, "is based on an article by Shabetai Tevet in Haaretz," which is the leading daily of Israel. The information in it is "based on official Egyptian documents" captured, and on testimony by captured fedayeen.

German A-Scientists —

(Continued on page 7)

responsible, they responded that they had a duty, as citizens, to take a stand and warn the people against the dangers of atomic weapons.

Though the American press has been very sketchy in reporting the reactions of the opposition political parties to this controversy, it appears that they were featured by attacks on Adenauer for his attempt to soften the impact of the scientists' statement by claiming that they were entering into a field of policy in which they were no experts.

Exactly what attitude the Social Democrats, among others, have taken to the plan to organize the West German army as a force designed to fight primarily with atomic weapons is as yet unclear.

One reason the scientists' statement has aroused such attention is that, without the fanfare of the British White Paper, the Adenauer administration quietly decided, some time ago, to scrap its original plans for the creation of twelve conventional motorized and tank divisions as part of NATO, and had decided on a much smaller force organized for atomic war. This decision involved a shift from a largely conscript army to one which would be made up in large part of professionals.

The issuance of the British White Paper has simply made it possible for the West German government to make pub-

lic what it had decided to do anyway, without appearing to be taking the lead in scrapping NATO concepts.

The action of the West German scientists could serve as an inspiring example to scientists all over the world.

Their decision to personally refuse cooperation in the production and testing of atomic weapons could be either an act of personal moral choice, or a political act, or a combination of the two. By announcing it publicly, they converted it into a political act of great importance, and have no doubt contributed measurably to the clarity of the debate on military and political policy which will take place during the election campaign.

In stating that a decision whether or not to use atomic weapons is "a purely foreign matter," and "has nothing to do with physical science," Adenauer is quite right. (Actually, of course, it is as much a matter of "domestic" as of "foreign" policy. By confining it to the latter, Adenauer just seeks to make it seem more mysterious and complicated to the average citizen.)

The scientist, in his professional capacity, may simply be in a better position than the average citizen to realize the social implications of the projects on which he is asked to work. This special knowledge does not necessarily endow him with greater political or social sagacity than others, even in the realm of

the social application of his own scientific work.

INTO POLITICS

But ever since the atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, there has been a growing awareness among scientists of the fact that their profession is now of such vast importance to society that the old attitude of political abstention which was so common among scientists has become untenable and even dangerous. Ingrained habits of thought have been hard to change, and the first tendency among them has been to shift to the idea that scientists should take a personal, moral responsibility with regard to the application of their work.

But the fact remains that the application of scientific discoveries and developments tends to become increasingly a political question. That is, major decisions with regard to it are made at the political, governmental level. To exercise any effective political influence over the application of their special work, scientists are finding that, like other citizens, they must link their special interests with the more general interests of large masses of people.

Thus, the eighteen German nuclear physicists have done what they could do, as physicists, to enlighten West German public opinion on certain aspects of the implications of the decision of their government to form an "atomic army." By stating that they will take no part in implementing this decision, they have dramatized their views and the gravity with which they regard the issue. From here on in, however, the decision of what to do about it is in the hands of the West German people, and that decision can only be exercised through the existing political parties in the next election.

CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 5)

ward' position. He advised, instead, some 'innocuous' editorial which would be read by the advisor. We refused to print such innocuous editorials—not if the rule stood!"

And so the Dean suspended the editors not because they disobeyed the school regulations governing publications, not because they ignored the requirements for "consultation," not specifically because they violated the Dean's ruling, but—credible as it sounds—because they declined to print any editorial at all in their own paper, and thereby embarrassed the Dean.

To quote again from Levkoff's letter: "We are suspended but we ask no sympathy. We merely ask for an awareness on the part of the student body and of the faculty, an awareness for a principle that is very much at stake. Free press or house organ. Which shall it be?"

What lies behind the action of the Dean and, in general, the policy of the administration toward *Kingsman*, including the multiple-editorial ruling, is an effort to neutralize *Kingsman* as an independent force on campus, and to extend "responsible" faculty control into every possible area of student life. The administration is greatly aided in its endeavors by the pathetic apathy of the student body.

It is to be hoped, however, that the recent wave of student protests over such infringements on academic freedom as the banning of Gates from the city colleges, a wave which shook many previously lethargic student groups into action, will move the students at Brooklyn College to agitate more effectively for campus democracy.

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

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

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

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

I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

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

Please enter my subscription:

1 year at \$2. 6 months at \$1.

Payment enclosed. Bill me.

New sub. Renewal.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

ISL FUND DRIVE

We Have to Keep It Up Like This

By ALBERT GATES

Coming some weeks later than they should, contributions to the Fund Drive took a big jump this past week and vastly improved the standings in the campaign.

This was the biggest week in the drive, with payments totaling \$1398 and, though short of the necessary average to finish at the top by May 1, it is the most promising sign we have yet seen of an upswing.

St. Louis, Bay Area and Seattle are over the 100% mark and several areas are within striking distance of that goal.

We know that we are still far off the mark, with a little less than \$4000 to go yet, but that situation can quickly change,

particularly if those branches still below the 75% mark get above it.

New York made the best showing during the week with a contribution of \$615, which certainly improved its position in the drive but left it still far behind other areas. The city with the largest quota, it has the longest haul ahead of it.

Chicago is moving faster than at any time before. It sent in \$285 for the week. This has placed it in a good position to finish at the top; it is now \$500 short of its goal of \$2000.

Twelve cities made payments this week—the largest group of contributors in such a period. That is the only way, however, that our goal can be reached. Every area has to make consistent weekly payments to overcome the lag of the drive thus far, and if the past week is a sign of a faster pace in the closing weeks, we should have no trouble reaching the national goal.

We still need a stronger effort from Cleveland, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and New York. They are the important quotas that are farther behind than they should be at this stage of the drive.

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE			
City	Quota	Paid	%
	\$10,000	\$6101	61.1
St. Louis	25	30	120
Seattle	100	115	115
Bay Area	400	440	110
Nat'l Office	1,250	1143	91.1
Buffalo	100	85	85
Detroit	400	293	75.7
Chicago	2,000	1455	74.7
Newark	450	312	69.4
Cleveland	150	85	56.6
Philadelphia	200	98	49
Los Angeles	650	300	46.1
New York	3,800	1694	43.4
Streator	25	10	40
Pittsburgh	200	55	27.5
Reading	75	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
Mass.	25	0	0

CONTRIBUTE TO THE ISL FUND DRIVE

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the ISL's Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE

(Make checks out to Albert Gates)

Labor Action FORUM
New York

Thursday, April 25 at 8:30 p.m.

JULIUS FALK
Managing Editor of the New International, reviews Theodore Draper's new history of the early years of the CP—

"The Roots of American Communism"

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