

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 20, 1950

FIVE CENTS

**ANOTHER DETROIT RACE RIOT?
KKK Forces Fight Negro Housing**

... page 2

How NOT to Fight a Purge

... page 6

CP Youth Licked at Student Meet

... page 7

The Socialist Left and the BLP

... page 5

GM Profit Set All-Time Record But Workers Just Got Wage Cut

In this year of growing unemployment and attacks on the labor movement—

General Motors announces that its profits for last year were not only the greatest in its history—

Its profits were 49 per cent GREATER than the greatest in its history, this previous peak being just the year before, 1948—

And this sets an all-time record for the whole history of the profit system in the United States!

This is the figure that will be remembered by the GM workers who took a cost-of-living wage cut just a little while ago while their bosses were figuring up the take: \$696,434,232.

Here's another figure that will be remembered by them when the United Auto Workers begin negotiations with GM for a new contract, due soon: the corporation's sales were three and a half times the 1936-41 average.

Here's a figure to be remembered by the man in the street if and when GM starts putting those advertisements in the papers about how the unions are ruining the country by their exorbitant demands (as Chrysler is doing now): profit on EACH car or truck produced was near \$250.

For worker or consumer, the GM record lights up the issues in the coming battles which the labor movement will have to fight to get a few cents more for the men who produced the cars. The banker looking at the news item in his suburbanite train coach will merely be green with envy, and murmur that GM has the "right" to make hay while the sun shines, just like "every other" enterprising American. The workers will understand whose pockets are filled by their sweat and toil. The little people who want to buy a car ought to subtract \$250 mentally from the price tag and think how much easier it would be to reach the figure.

Karl Marx once commented that the workers never do know to what extent the capitalists exploit their labor power. But they can get an idea even from the portion of the profits which are revealed.

**We Need NOT Choose Between FBI-ism and Stalinism
In Truman's Cold War on Civil Liberties—**

Lift the Lid on the FBI Loyalty Purge!

What can be done about the government's witchhunt operations which have been eating away like an acid at the fabric of civil liberties in this country?

This question has been raised, publicly or privately, by scores of liberals and labor liberals who are shocked and frightened—and getting more and more frightened—by the development of police-state methods under the present administration.

It is not the decimation of the Stalinists which perturbs them or us in the slightest. It is the fact that the methods coming into force are equally decimating civil liberties for all dissenting political ideas and creating a stifling climate of fear and insecurity.

The question is now more and more insistently raised even by elements who had gone along a certain distance under the belief that anything was good which clubbed the totalitarian agents of the Kremlin. But FBI-ism and loyalty-oath purges have broadened out to include the per-

Democracy Gets the 1-2-3: Feinberg, Picasso, Gubitchev

Three actions this past week lit up the shape of things to come in the United States—and the shape will be that of a monster as long as labor and liberals continue to go along with the trend, either by active approval or passive toleration. One involved the courts, one the State Department and one a united front of both.

• New York's Feinberg Law was held constitutional by the state Appellate Court, reversing two previous decisions by lower courts. The court's argument was a flat invitation to a "dangerous thoughts" purge freed from the Bill of Rights and other inconvenient bars to witch-hunting. The spirit of the decision is sufficiently indicated by one sentence: "The most important qualification [for a teacher] is loyalty to our government." They are no franker in Stalinist Russia!

• The State Department's decision to exclude from this country a delegation of the "Partisans of Peace," led by Pablo Picasso, a Stalinist front group which would be more adequately described as Partisans of Russian Imperialism. But even the New York Times was editorially shocked by the government's decree. Is our vaunted democracy so weak as to fear these men's voices?—it asked in effect. On what grounds, then, do the U.S. "defenders of democracy" object to the Russian dictator's Iron Curtain? Where is the well-advertised difference in "principle" between this democracy and that totalitarianism?

• A federal judge, sentencing the convicted Russian spy Gubitchev, openly stated that "it is beyond my province to question the reasons for or the wisdom of" recommendations by the State Department and the attorney general that Gubitchev be permitted to choose deportation rather than a jail sentence.

Prostituting a Court

We are not at all interested in what the government does with or to spies—this is strictly the professional business of the various imperialists themselves, all of whom play at the same game—and we are therefore as little interested in demanding punishment or no punishment for any individual spy. We are interested, however, in the deliberate prostitution of the judiciary as a diplomatic instrument in the cold war.

We are interested when a judge openly says that he cannot even "question" what the government desires him to do in his own court, where presumably justice and not imperialist diplomacy holds sway.

The president, who is the boss of both the State Department and the attorney general, has the power of pardon, if he thought good to use this power for the same purposes. Let him take the responsibility himself and not ask the "independent" judiciary to be his shill, whore or stooge.

"Judges in uniform" indeed!

secution of teachers from elementary schools through universities—the discharge of government filing clerks who are avowed anti-Stalinists—attempts to force people to become spies and agents-provocateurs inside the CP against their will—discharge of factory workers for subscribing to Stalinist or even anti-Stalinist radical publications—axing of government employees with no explanation and terrorization of the rest—stifling of scientific work—prostitution of the courts—the list is much longer than this.

The process and methods have been carefully and cleverly calculated. No "Palmer raids," no government-sponsored hysteria

on the surface. As the New Republic has pointed out, the government's course has been planned so as to leave no opportunity for recourse to the courts to stop it. It has been neither legal nor illegal, but extra-legal.

On Truman's say-so, the attorney general, for example, drew up a "subversive list." On the attorney general's say-so, all government departments proceeded to the purge. All kinds of administrative instruments have been set up to carry it out—without a single law passed by Congress to be challenged even in the government's courts.

By cooperation between government secret-police agencies, notably the FBI, and private

(Turn to last page)

Kafka in the U.S.: How CIA Purges

By MARY BELL

The New York Post is currently serializing the story of Edward P. Daniel (name fictitious for obvious reasons) who was dropped from the Central Intelligence Agency, the government's top-secret intelligence group, without any charge, without trial, without appeal.

LABOR ACTION considers the Post story eminently worthy of summary since the Post has little out-of-New York circulation, and particularly since it exposes to public view an aspect of the totalitarian trends inside the U. S. government. The newspaper guarantees the authenticity of the

story and the integrity of the writer, who offers to give testimony to any Congressional committee which will investigate the CIA.

Mr. Daniel found that life was imitating art in his experiences with the government's CIA, to which he went from a job in the State Department where he had already undergone many loyalty checks as well as several in the army. He felt like the hero in Kafka's novel "The Trial" who was apprehended, sentenced and punished without knowing the forces ranged against him, and he was reminded of a Koestlerian

(Continued on page 7)

Earl Browder
Former General Secretary
of the Communist Party

DEBATES

Max Shachtman
National Chairman
Independent Socialist League

on

**"IS RUSSIA
A SOCIALIST
COMMUNITY?"**

THURSDAY, 8 p.m.

MARCH 30

WEBSTER HALL
119 East 11 Street
(near Fourth Avenue)
New York City

Admission: \$1 plus tax
Students: 50 cents plus tax
Auspices: E. V. Debs Society
of Brooklyn College

Is Another Race Riot Nearing in Detroit? KKK Forces Mobilize Against Negro Housing

By WALTER JASON
DETROIT, Mar. 12—Warning signals that Detroit's racial tensions were reaching an explosive point came from important sources this past week as bigotry, race hatred and anti-unionism broke out into the open at an agitated public hearing of the city's Common Council on the question of a proposed cooperative housing project.

The pattern of today so closely resembles the tragic events which preceded the anti-Negro riots of 1943, that even such a conservative group as the Detroit Interracial Committee sounded the alarm, declaring flatly that Detroit has reached another crisis period.

An open manifestation of the mounting tension developed because of the cowardly action of the council in calling the public hearing to reconsider its twice-approved decision to permit the Schoolcraft cooperative housing project on a site in Northwest Detroit.

More than 500 violently partisan persons tried to squeeze themselves into the council chambers for the hearing. It was a clearly divided crowd, with the rabid enemies of the Negro people there in considerable numbers.

Why did the city council decide to reconsider its previous action? Because the tightly organized and highly vocal real-estate and "home improvement" groups, fighting cooperative and public housing, and the prejudiced home owners in that area banded together and put pressure on the petty politicians who comprise the overwhelming majority of council.

Only recently this same council

turned down the presentation of a United Nations flag at a special ceremony, under the pressure of some crackpot groups which argued against any foreign flag being put by the American flag.

IT'S THE KKK'S VOICE
What caused the alarm over the Schoolcraft project? Out of the first 54 units, three are to be owned by Negro families!

At this hearing, the AFL, prominent spokesmen of the Catholic, Jewish and Protestant churches, and other civic leaders spoke in favor of the project going on according to plans.

Against them stood the usual assortment of home owners, embittered individuals, and the smooth if vicious spokesmen for the neighborhood real-estate organizations. (They seem to spring up by the minute in Detroit.)

In spite of every effort to conceal the flagrant prejudices which they hold, these spokesmen revealed their ideological forefathers were the Ku Klux Klan, the Black Legion, and the fascist fringe which once worshipped the silver voice of Father Charles Coughlin.

The evidence was overwhelming and indisputable. Prominent churchmen in Northwest Detroit told the council how the campaign had been carried out among their congregations. The individual would be called at home by a member of the neighborhood improvement association: "There's a n - - - r housing project moving into our neighborhood." Other variations on the theme of alarm were: "There's a Communist project moving out here. There's a slum project coming in. Do you want our neighborhood to look like Paradise Valley [the Negro ghetto of Detroit]?"

Hatred of the Negro was rampant. The evidence was overwhelming and indisputable. Prominent churchmen in Northwest Detroit told the council how the campaign had been carried out among their congregations. The individual would be called at home by a member of the neighborhood improvement association: "There's a n - - - r housing project moving into our neighborhood." Other variations on the theme of alarm were: "There's a Communist project moving out here. There's a slum project coming in. Do you want our neighborhood to look like Paradise Valley [the Negro ghetto of Detroit]?"

Only recently this same council

preached by these elements, along with the dire warning of "what will happen to your property values if they move in." This grew to such alarming proportions that it disturbed almost every minister in that area, since it agitated the neighborhood. One minister pointedly reminded the council that its action in calling the hearing was a victory for the organized campaign of the race-baiters.

RACE-HATERS IN SADDLE

The flavor of the discussion in Northwest Detroit was indicated inadvertently by another minister who declared: "After checking the facts I told my congregation that this was a decent project even though the labor unions were connected with it."

Another explained that his difficulty came from the fact that a distribution of the Stalinist Michigan Worker in that area had excited his middle-income church members. "The Communists are trying to foment this and exploit it for all its worth."

Vic Reuther and Frank Marfel, AFL spokesmen, used as the main theme in their speeches the idea that denial of this project would be a blow at American democracy and a boon to Communism if the Negro people were deprived of their rights.

The opponents of the project were determined in their manner, and blunter than they thought. A gentleman from the South—"I came here 20 years ago with just a suitcase and I made good"—was one of the chief spokesmen. With a fine Southern drawl he explained, "I have nothing against the colored folks. I was raised by a colored mammy. I have 17 colored men working for me, and only five whites. That shows how I treat them. I have no prejudices. But I wouldn't move into Grosse Point where I don't belong, and where I am not wanted. I don't see why anyone would want to do otherwise." Then he indignantly denied accusations that "this is a Black Legion or Ku Klux Klan move. Everyone in our neighborhood knows I helped break them up out there."

Of course, he is one of the key organizers against the housing project, and he did not understand what he had revealed by his remarks. Nor did he understand that he had tipped off the audience that now KKK elements and others were no longer working in their own organizations

Only recently this same council

but through these front organizations. (The city interracial committee points out that these real-estate improvement groups are joined together in a tightly-knit city federation and act together, as when they crucified George Edwards by their race-baiting campaign.)

The second main attack on the Schoolcraft project took the form of defending the sanctity of the private home against the first step towards socialized housing. Spokesmen included the "mothers" type, speaking emotionally and ignorantly for the children and "family life."

POINTS THE FINGER

Who is directly responsible for the deepening of the crisis? George Schermer, director of the Interracial Committee, ascribed it to "mounting organized resistance from neighborhood property improvement associations to the spreading out of the Negro population into new areas, and a strong tendency in our city government to act in relationship to group pressure rather than in terms of over-all good of the community or in terms of certain basic principles of justice."

It's very unlikely that he will last very long after that statement. Only last week Mayor Cobo fired a prominent Negro minister, The Rev. Bradby, from the Detroit Housing Commission after Bradby blasted the failure of the commission to carry out improvements in housing for all the people of Detroit.

What factors make another crisis in race relations inevitable? As seen from the standpoint of the terrible housing shortage, Schermer reports:

(1) The Negro population is now near 300,000, having doubled in the past ten years.

(2) This population was terribly crowded into existing Negro communities during the war years, with only some small expansion at the edges and with a small fraction accommodated in temporary war housing.

(3) During and since the war Negro buying power has been increased, even though the patterns of racial discrimination in employment change very slowly.

(4) The increased purchasing power has made itself felt on the housing market.

(5) Most of this is being expressed in older sections of Detroit where population shifts are becoming very noticeable. However, a considerable number of

Negroes are trying to get newer, better-quality homes in outlying areas.

(6) The trend of the federal courts and agencies to limit racial discrimination has intensified the drive of Negroes for decent homes.

A CITY OF FEAR

Such factors do, of course, indicate how situations like the argument around the Schoolcraft housing project arise, in which the cooperative movement, carrying out the ideas expressed by the UAW-CIO, makes some concessions no matter how small to the insistence of the Negroes that they have the right to decent housing.

Even where the housing situation ostensibly has been settled, like the Sojourner Truth Project, the situation has a tinder-box character. Schermer reported that this particular area is the most tense in all of Detroit, although by no means the only one!

All of these violent antagonisms are aggravated today by the overall atmosphere in Detroit. The city is nervous and edgy. It has 200,000 unemployed. They are sharpened by the Chrysler strike, with embittered workers smoldering under the pressure of prolonged hardship. It is a city of fear, of insecurity, of clashes, of depression, memories, and guilt complexes over race riots.

The Negroes grow more bitter in Paradise Valley. The bigotry of the South roots itself into the minds of the anxious home owner of the lily-white areas. The ideas of the Ku Klux Klan find fertile soil among the uprooted and unemployed workers from the South. And the housing scandal remains a terrible sore spot, in which fester the tensions of an already tense city, geared to the ruthless demands and needs of the industrial octopus that feeds on the lives of the restless masses.

Here we have pure social dynamite, and only a blinded city government of small minds and small men to grapple with it, a labor movement that makes the record against the growing crisis and tries inadequate measures to resist the impending events, and social institutions like the churches whose spokesmen talk of brotherly love while their audiences practice race hatred.

Time is running short in Detroit. The UAW leaders know it. Unless the UAW faces up to the test, it will find itself in a deep-seated crisis too.

Grand Jury Keeps Hearings Closed on Fenner Murder Case

By GEORGE WHITNEY

AKRON, Mar. 11—The Summit County grand jury this week began considering the case involving the murder of Ernest Fenner, Negro veteran, by two Akron cops.

The jury took testimony from more than a score of witnesses of all types, including some pretty disreputable figures from the office of the local police department. All testimony was taken behind closed doors and no news releases were issued concerning what transpired in the way of testimony. Five days have elapsed since the hearings began and the still no announcement has been forthcoming from the jury.

Fenner was shot in the abdomen and in the back early this month by a cop named Robert Wilcox. Wilcox and his accessory, Don Pohl, have remained on active duty though Chief of Police Lynett finally did find it judicious

to remove them from roaming the streets in a prowling car and put them to work at "desk jobs" inside the police station. Lynett, the mayor and the county prosecutor have steadfastly refused to take initiative in suspending the two murderers because it might "prejudice" their case before the grand jury and, as Lynett told Attorney W. Howard Fort of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, because it might lower the morale of the police force!

STALL EXPECTED

The only news that came out of the hearings of the grand jury was lists of those who testified. Among them, of course, were the eyewitnesses who have signed statements taken by Attorney Fort for the NAACP and the Frontiers Club to the effect that Fenner never even reached the police car before he was murdered. The local paper also carried a long list of

witnesses from the police department and the detective bureau. Among them were the names of a number of infamous out-and-out sadists of the most primitive order, whose reputations are known throughout Akron.

The grand jury is not required to report on its finding officially until March 24 and it is a safe bet that it won't hurry itself.

The handling of the entire affair by the authorities has been marked by the most obvious attempts both to string out the proceedings to allow public opinion to cool off a little and to conduct the case in such a way as to infer that the two murderers have done absolutely nothing wrong.

Wilcox and Pohl have been given every break possible by Chief Lynett to help them elude the charge of murder that would automatically have been placed against anyone other than a couple of Lynett's gunmen.

Chrysler Strike Front Is Firm; UAW Heads on Spot

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Mar. 13—As the Chrysler strike goes into its eighth week, the United Auto Workers (CIO) leadership has begun the kind of counter-propaganda campaign against the corporation which may build up the morale of the embittered workers and may win concessions from Chrysler.

The Reuther leadership has never been quite on the spot as much as it is in this strike, among other reasons because of the action of John L. Lewis in offering to help the auto workers and because of the victory of the coal miners' union.

Within UAW ranks, the longer the strike lasts the more critical the rank and file is for evidence that its sacrifices are not in vain, even though these same ranks fervently desire a quick ending to the strike.

At the first major strike rally held last Tuesday at the State Fair Coliseum with over 20,000 Chrysler

workers present, the mood of the workers was clearly seen. They had hoped to hear news of progress in negotiations and were disappointed when UAW leaders told them the company was standing pat.

They cheered the mention of John L. Lewis when Norman Mathews, UAW Chrysler director, told them: "I take my hat off to John L. Lewis." The spontaneous tribute to Lewis in the ranks was not lost on the UAW leaders sitting on the platform.

Although the UAW leaders made militant speeches, the applause at best was perfunctory, because the disappointment over not getting a pension plan without a strike has by no means disappeared. The failure to prepare the ranks for first the possibility and then the probability of strike action has been costly to morale.

The purpose of the sharp attacks on the corporation now—as shown in a full-page advertise-

ment in the Detroit papers today by the UAW-CIO—is to build up the spirit of the strikers, and it is already succeeding.

FRONT IS STILL FIRM

The failure of the UAW leaders to explain a thousand times over where the nation-wide strike assessment is going has had widespread repercussions. At some local unions where the yearly elections have been held since the assessment began, the leadership has been defeated because they were for the assessment to help Chrysler strikers!

Among the strikers, incessant demands for more and more welfare from the "millions we are collecting" tends to emphasize the fact that they have not been educated either to what strikes involve, or how the union functions. Since it seems the popular thing to do, some local union politicians keep demanding that the international union give cash grants to all strikers, in the manner that small craft unions are able to do.

Of course, the welfare setup is by no means adequate in many locals and this aggravates the problems, so that the dissatisfaction with the international union mounts as the strike continues.

These difficulties of an internal character indicate that the Reuther leadership is no longer on the solid ground it has held since it assumed power at the 1947 convention. They will reflect themselves in the internal politics of the UAW.

In terms of the settlement of the strike, the UAW is so strong—and any dissatisfaction with the conduct of the strike so confined internally—that there is no possible excuse for it not to gain major concessions from Chrysler.

Before the auto workers stands the picture of John L. Lewis and the victory of coal miners, who faced far greater difficulties and odds. His entrance into the picture has been helpful in putting more backbone into the strike.

OHIO LABOR NOTES

Judge Calls Strikes 'Outmoded'

By JOE HAUSER

CLEVELAND, Mar. 13—Suppose you were an immigrant: You came to the United States to seek a better life. You decided to become a citizen of your new homeland. The moment when you would be inducted into the rights and privileges of citizenship would be a memorable one for you. But if you were a resident of Cleveland and appeared before Judge Paul Jones, chief jurist of the U. S. District Court in Northern Ohio, you would be in for a great disappointment.

For last month this official took advantage of such an occasion to tell a group of newly naturalized citizens that the right to strike is "outmoded" and should be restricted. This was Judge Jones' method of introducing the group to the advantages of American democracy.

The working people among the audience must have wondered if this was the goal they sought in their immigration.

The judge argued that the states and Congress had enacted so many laws to benefit and protect the workman that now employees no longer had any inequities or grievances and so did not need the strike weapon to force needed remedies. While Judge Jones did not say so, the logic of his argument would not stop at outlawing strikes but could easily go on to include the elimination of unions and the right to organize—for what is the need of organization when there is nothing left to complain about?

The worst part of this affair is that while the speech was reported in the newspapers, neither the AFL nor CIO central body took any action of protest, neither of the weekly labor papers took any notice of this outrageous speech, nor was there a report or any other objection raised. The preservation of labor's rights demands that all such sentiments be exposed to the working people and that effective protest be made by labor's organizations.

The handling of the entire affair by the authorities has been marked by the most obvious attempts both to string out the proceedings to allow public opinion to cool off a little and to conduct the case in such a way as to infer that the two murderers have done absolutely nothing wrong.

Wilcox and Pohl have been given every break possible by Chief Lynett to help them elude the charge of murder that would automatically have been placed against anyone other than a couple of Lynett's gunmen.

P.O. WORKERS FIGHT ON

The case of the suspended Cleveland postal workers drags on.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own Labor and Socialist Library...

Send for free book list
4 Court Sq., L.I.C., New York

GUDERIAN'S M-DAY

Dictatorship Plan for U.S. Nazi General Draws Up War

The U. S. News, conservative businessman's weekly, reveals that Washington is giving "serious consideration" to a new plan for full militarization of the home front in case of war, drawn up by one of Hitler's generals at the request of the U. S. army.

Says the magazine's report (February 10): "This plan, revealed in broad outline by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy (Rep.) of Wisconsin, and disclosed here in detail for the first time, is important as an indication of the trend in U. S. military planning."

"This concept, based on the German wartime pattern, is of an all-powerful military top command to direct a war effort. The blueprint for a U. S. General Staff has been prepared, at the request of the U. S. army, by General Heinz Guderian, former chief of staff in the German high command."

"General Guderian's blueprint is designed to remove defects in a staff plan under which the Germans lost two world wars. It is being studied by military planners here for the solution it might offer to problems of unification."

"Centralization of power in professional military hands is at the heart of the Guderian plan. There would be no layers of civilian authority between the military and the president as commander in chief."

"Top military command would exercise authority over every activity related to the military services. The give-and-take of the joint chiefs of staff also would be replaced by a single chain of command. Army, navy and air force all would jump at the word from above...."

"It is not to be adopted now by Congress. But it shows the direction of present thinking, the possible end result of more and more centralization in the defense structure...."

The rest of the article gives a host of details. The comment that it is most important as showing

"the direction of present thinking" in Washington is entirely just, whether the plan is adopted in its present form or not, either secretly or publicly. The trend of capitalist government today is toward the bureaucratization and militarization of all social life, under the guise of "defending democracy" once more.

Further planning for wartime authoritarianism comes from the National Security Resources Board, whose projects are likewise reported by the U. S. News (February 24). In this case the M-Day plan, "just released from a confidential classification," is being put in the form of legislation, but is not to be presented for adoption until the war breaks out. There will be no chance of debate before hysteria hits.

Those who console themselves with the thought that the M-Day controls in the last war were not as bad as was expected, and who pool-pool, crying "Wolf," again, can read that "In World War III, all will be different, under assumptions of the NSRB plan." And "Restrictions decided upon for the next war make those of the last war seem mild by comparison.... War next time, as officials see it, cannot be dealt with in the leisurely way of war last time."

The NSRB plan includes a labor draft, forced savings, and a "drastic crackdown on civilians" right away. Civilian consumption will be cut about 20 per cent. Wages will be frozen (also, prices, theoretically). "Taxes will be greatly increased, to soak up most of the dollars that people no longer will be able to spend on civilian goods," as much as 35 per cent.

"For individuals, the NSRB plan means a sharp drop in living standards when war comes.... For the average worker, taxes will take three times as much of his income as they did in World War II. Compulsory buying of war bonds will take another share.... His luxuries will largely disappear. And his way of living will be regulated in detail by new agencies."

CHICAGO PUSHES FUND DRIVE TO 42%

By YETTA BARSH
Fund Drive Director

MAR. 13—Chicago is largely responsible for the big jump forward this week. Last week Chicago wrote: "We will do our darnedest to get you \$1,000 or thereabout on the 12th." On March 7 we received Chicago's initial contribution of \$1,000, representing 67 per cent of its quota!

Our Chicago comrades are doing their best to hit the 100 per cent mark early, and although we know that it will be more difficult to achieve the last few hundred dollars of their quota, we have every confidence that they will come through with flying colors. They have only \$125 to go next week to meet the 75 per cent mark.

Buffalo continues its excellent pace by sending in another \$100 this week, raising its percentage to 60 per cent. New York City, which sent in \$250 during the last week, seems to be slowing down a

bit; it will have to make an extra strong push this coming week to hit the 75 per cent mark and to regain the lead it had previously. The remainder of this week's \$1545.60 receipts was from the following: Akron \$10; Baltimore \$12; Cleveland \$13; Philadelphia \$27; San Francisco Bay Area \$91; and General \$42.60, representing \$20 received from one friend and \$22.60 from Connecticut.

The Socialist Youth League has achieved 79 per cent of its total \$350 quota. This week we have separated its total quota into its various component units. The Chicago SYL, which has achieved 200 per cent of its quota, heads the list with no close competitor in sight.

Berkeley SYL has hit the 83 per cent mark and promises to oversubscribe its quota. New York City SYL has fulfilled 40 per cent of its quota. But the SYL units in Newark, St. Louis, Detroit, Buffalo and SYL at large have still not made their initial contribu-

tions. Our guess is that they will all be in the race before long.

Three and one-half weeks of the ten and one-half week drive have elapsed, a total of \$5,007.60 (42 per cent) has been collected to date. While this represents an excellent showing, not enough of a

lead has been accumulated to guarantee easy achievement of the \$12,000 goal. That is why we are urging all branches to press for collection of 75 per cent of their quotas by next week. It will require hard work but it can be done.

Fund Drive Box Score

Branch	Quota	Received	Per Cent
Chicago SYL	\$100	\$200	200
Streator	25	22	88
Berkeley SYL	30	25	83
Youngstown	100	70	70
Chicago	1500	1000	67
Buffalo	1000	600	60
St. Louis	100	55	55
New York City	400	205 1/2	51
Newark	\$250	125	50
Los Angeles	500	216	43
Cleveland	300	121	40
New York City SYL	125	50	40
Philadelphia	400	136	34
Boston	75	25	33
San Francisco Bay Area	500	150	30
Baltimore	75	20	27
Reading	100	25	25
Akron	200	46	23
Pittsburgh	150	15	10
General	1525	55	4
Detroit	500	0	0
Seattle	300	0	0
West Virginia	50	0	0
Newark SYL	15	0	0
St. Louis SYL	15	0	0
Detroit SYL	30	0	0
Buffalo SYL	30	0	0
SYL (at large)	30	0	0
Total	\$12,000	\$5007	42

Give Now to the ISL!

Fund Drive Director
Independent Socialist League
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$..... my contribution to the Tenth Anniversary Fund Drive of the ISL.

NAME
ADDRESS

Editorials

Speak Up, UAW!

Last week and this week our Akron correspondent has reported on the situation in Local 853 of the United Auto Workers in that city in regard to a company proposal for a loyalty-oath witchhunt in the Goodyear Aircraft plant. We have sought to fix the attention of the labor movement, and of the UAW in particular, on this type of menace to the labor movement and to civil liberties, and the Akron case is educational.

The company proposed a loyalty check of certain workers. The local leadership countered with a proposal that all workers come under the plan. It appears that they viewed this move as a "smart" way of stopping the company from engaging in discriminatory witchhunts. Needless to say, whatever the well-intentioned but muddled thinking behind this tactic, such a position meant only the expansion of the witchhunt and would not even serve to stop discriminatory action in practice.

Since then—the local's counter-proposal was for an "unofficial" agreement—a new local administration has taken office and the present president has declared against the shocking procedure. That is good. But what stands out, over and above the mistake made by the previous local leadership, is something else.

The local leadership knew of no clear policy by the international office of the UAW on this question. Neither do we. It had no guiding line from its parent organization, and had to think up a line for itself (except for the fact that UAW International Representative Fowler approved the procedure, we are credibly informed).

This purge-in-the-plant proposal of management has now struck in three different areas of the country. All the indications are that unless it meets with determined resistance from the labor movement, it will spread further and be taken up more widely as an avenue to union-busting and the victimization of militants. It certainly should be clear by now that the UAW needs a line, a policy statement.

How such company moves are to be fought in each instance cannot be fixed in advance by the Reuther leadership or by anyone else. But that they are to be fought in any variation, and fought as determinedly as any other major attack on union rights, is something that can be laid down in advance—clearly, unambiguously—and the membership and secondary leaderships educated to understand why.

What's the attitude of the UAW on agreements (official or unofficial) between the union and management for loyalty-oath conditions of employment or other forms of the witchhunt in private industry? Tell the ranks, and tell them why—out loud!

Murray Says No

Phil Murray has turned down John L. Lewis' proposal for "a mutual aid pact for common defense" between the miners and steel workers against the great corporations.

Why did Murray say No? Probably for the reason we gave in our editorial last week. He is afraid that in this kind of setup John L. Lewis would play too powerful a role that is, a role more powerful than that of Phil Murray.

Lewis Stark, N. Y. Times labor correspondent, pointed out last week that for some time Lewis has been playing a balance-of-power game. He has thrown his weight towards the AFL or CIO in accordance with what seemed the weaker at the time. And Stark says that the thing which terrifies the CIO leadership most is the possibility that Big John might reappear for membership in the CIO.

Would this weaken the American labor movement? Of course not! Would it lessen the possibility of wage gains and better conditions for the workers in the mass production industries? Quite the contrary! But it would upset all power relations in the CIO, for a United Mine Worker alliance with either auto or steel would be the power in the CIO.

So petty personal considerations of petty men are standing in the way of greater labor unity and strength. Let the rank-and-file militants put this down in their books. That's one more item for which the Murrays will have to give account on the day of reckoning.

You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of L.A., "Readers Take the Floor." It's YOUR forum. Our policy is to publish all letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

Youth Student Corner

and

News and Views from the Socialist Youth

News and Views from the Socialist Youth

By MAX MARTIN

The best student magazine to hit this country in a long time is enjoying an enthusiastic reception and a large sale for its second issue. We are referring, of course, to Anvil, published by the New York Student Federation Against War.

The federation, which is composed of socialist and anti-war clubs in the colleges and universities of New York City, published the first issue of Anvil in the fall of 1949 in mimeographed form. The large and favorable response to that issue led the editors to publish the second issue as a 32-page printed magazine.

This issue contains many political and cultural articles of interest to students, including feature articles by guest contributors. One is by the French existentialist writer Simone de Beauvoir entitled "The Sexual Initiation of Women"; another is a discussion of naturalism and supernaturalism by novelist Isaac Rosenfeld. Among the political contributions from students are "Education Behind The Iron Curtain—a Factual Analysis of Russian Educational Techniques," and an article on the recent CIO split entitled "Cold War in the Labor Movement." Additional political articles, editorials, book and movie reviews, and poetry round out this very fine issue.

Copies of the magazine can be ordered from the New York Student Federation Against War, 247 Lexington Ave., New York City. Single copies sell for 15 cents. Bundles of ten or more can be ordered for 12 cents per copy, although the federation urges all clubs ordering such bundles to turn in the full 15 cents to help cover the publication cost.

Plans are afoot to merge Anvil with Student Partisan, the magazine of the Politics Club of the University of Chicago. The next issue will probably be the first result of that merger. This will give all socialist and anti-war students an effective nation-wide publication expressing a militant viewpoint and responding to the needs of the campus. It is a welcome beginning towards organizing a militant student movement in this country.

Orchids from Roosevelt College

The Socialist Club of Roosevelt College (Chicago) recently got a boost in the school newspaper. The club is composed of students who adhere to various socialist tendencies as well as unaffiliated students and has a program of education for socialism. It is for the Third Camp in opposition to Russian and American imperialism and has adopted Anvil as its official publication.

The club has held many interesting and well-attended forums this past semester: on the Kutcher case, with James Kutcher as the main speaker; a symposium on the Third World War; a debate on the split in the CIO; and others.

The February 20 issue of the Roosevelt Torch, school newspaper, carried an editorial, "Socialists Aware," in which the paper congratulated the club for its "willingness and ability to provide timely and stimulating material for the benefit of RC."

The editorial went on to say that the Socialist Club "has consistently made an effort to keep the Roosevelt College community aware of important issues of the day," and that "it has maintained discussions of these issues on a high intellectual level." By presenting views that often do not coincide with its own point of view," it continued, "it has illustrated an ignored phase of practical democracy." The editorial ended on a note of sincere wishes for continued successful and useful work. To these wishes we say a hearty amen.

Marx and Mead

Despite a last-minute change of hall and insufficient publicity, nearly 50 University of Chicago students and other friends heard the Chicago SYL's educational on March 5. David MacKinney, an instructor at the university, spoke on the lessons Marxists can learn from the philosophy of George Herbert Mead. MacKinney discussed mainly the relation of Mead's psychology to social change.

After the educational, a hat was passed to raise part of the fee for the hall, and \$6 was collected.

The Chicago unit also reports a very successful social at the house of a comrade on March 3.

The Berkeley unit of the Socialist Youth League has been publishing a neat mimeographed bulletin, "The Student Socialist." A new issue has just come out; it includes discussion of local campus problems at the University of California, militarism on the campus, and the record of Stalinism in the Negro movement. "The Student Socialist" is published in large quantities and distributed to the student body. If you're interested in keeping tabs on what's going on in the student movement get a copy of it. Write to Socialist Youth League, 466 Tenth Street, Room 218, Oakland 7, California.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 12 March 20, 1950

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. GENERAL EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117. Subscription rate: \$1.00 a year; 50 cents for six months. (\$1.25 and 65 cents for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Reading from Left to Right

JOHN DEWEY, KARL MARX, AND DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM, by Jim Cork. (Antioch Review, Winter 1949-50.)

In this featured article of the issue, Jim Cork admits to being profoundly puzzled. The puzzle, as he sees it, is this: (1) Sidney Hook is entirely correct in asserting that Deweyism and Marxism are "basically similar," converge in their views, and ought to be legally married. (2) The various Marxist movements have attacked Dewey's pragmatism, but that (we gather) is because they're not as good Marxists as Cork. In any case, the puzzle does not lie here. (3) What does "bewilder" him, however, is the fact that Dewey from his side has insisted on attacking Marxism, just as if the Marxists were right in making their claim.

"Dewey's conception of Marx represents one of the rare occasions when he has forsaken the usual scientific caution and genial objectivity with which he deals with opponents." Cork explains this deviation by a "highly speculative psychological reconstruction" of Dewey's reaction to Trotsky in Mexico, an explanation which would be highly unflattering to Dewey as a sci-

entific and objective thinker in proportion to the amount of truth it contains.

Cork is not only puzzled by Dewey's coldness to Marxism but "In addition, there has been on Dewey's part no forthright public espousal, to my knowledge, of democratic socialism." So he wrote a letter to Dewey "confessing my bewilderment," and finds the answer encouraging. He is obviously easily encouraged.

In addition to a number of reservations of unclear import, Dewey's statement was: "I think that on the basis of *Liberalism and Social Action*, and to some extent *Individualism Old and New*, I can be classed as a democratic socialist. If I were permitted to define 'socialism' and 'socialist' I would so classify myself today. . . ."

Exclaims Cork: "That 'permission' . . . is definitely granted!"—which is big-hearted, but one notes that the bulk of the article was on the convergence of Deweyism and Marxism, not merely some variety of socialism. Certainly Marxists have no reason to question Dewey's adherence to general socialist views, and rather have reason to welcome it; but the underlying theoretical bases are another matter.

WORLD POLITICS

Tito Speeches Aim to Convince People He's Not Bowing to West

By SAM FELIXS

In the past weeks Marshall Tito has made several speeches which served to point out the tensions that exist in Washington-Belgrade relations. Tito served notice on the world that he is determined to exist as an independent force, or as nearly so as he can manage, against the major cold-war blocs.

Ostensibly pointing his guns at Washington, Tito announced that he is not going to allow the pre-war political leaders to come back into active political life; that he is going to recognize whoever he wishes (meaning Ho Chi-minh of Viet-Nam); and that he will turn down loans and machinery if it means foreign control of Yugoslavia.

The immediate setting for these developments is the national elections that are to take place on March 26. The "electoral reforms" that were to serve as window dressing were discussed in the February 20 issue of LABOR ACTION.

This outburst from Tito appears to be the result of pressure being brought to bear by Washington, though this is not to say that similar speeches might not have been forthcoming if this pressure had not been exerted. Developments in the satellites and at home as well as the organic necessity for Tito to play an independent role would have brought on such declarations anyway.

In developing his policy, Tito has to walk a tightrope between the two opposing camps. He has to convince the other satellites that he is not a mere tool in the hands of the Western imperialists and that he is still a Stalinist, and at the same time convince Washington that he is worthy of financial assistance.

WASHINGTON PRESSURE
The Washington pressure for the return of bourgeois political elements has centered about the release of Catholic Archbishop Stepinatz. Stepinatz was jailed in 1946 for anti-Titoist activities before the split with the Cominform in June, 1948. This was wanted as an indication of Tito's "good faith," or rather his suppleness to U.S. pressure. But to have released Stepinatz would have made Tito appear to the Stalinists as a mere agent.

The greatest emphasis in the February 21 speech by Tito was on the delay in the granting of loans by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The negotiations for the \$25 million loans started last December but the U.S. hedged on the granting of the funds.

In the meanwhile, the U.S. was

making the inquiries about the release of Stepinatz. Also, soon after George Allen became the new ambassador to Yugoslavia, the question of Yugoslavia's joining the Marshall Plan was hinted at through the British ambassador. This meant to the Titoists that the U.S. was making an attempt to steer Yugoslav affairs.

Therefore, when Tito and Ho established diplomatic relations it served to cut the ground from under the facade which the U.S. has been trying to mask its support of French colonialism. The U.S., hearing of the pending recognition, tried to prevent it but did not succeed.

Also to be considered are the broader implications of Tito's diplomatic relations with Ho. Ho is known as a supporter of Mao Tse-tung, and it is difficult to believe that Ho would have taken this step without Mao's approval, especially after the February 7 warning by Moscow against Titoism in the Far East. This action appears as part of the larger game in the Far East of Stalin-Mao relations.

In all of these statements by Tito, the attack is ostensibly directed against the U.S. due to definite pressure being brought to bear. However, a major target for these speeches is the satellite area of Eastern Europe. Tito's main theme is: We are still Stalinist!

This is important in light of the wave of purge trials that is soon to sweep through the satellites.

In every one of the satellites—with the possible exception of Bulgaria, which has just gone through a purge—various sections of the bureaucracy are being purged, or being readied for trial. Immediate trials are expected in Czechoslovakia, Poland and Rumania, and in Hungary Premier Rakosi has called for a purge of the CP. And Tito is attempting to exploit the manifestations of national-Stalinism which are thereby indicated.

TITO INSISTS ON HO
The third point of attack by Tito was his statement that if it came to a question of "establishing relations with someone or other" or accepting machinery, he would establish the relations. This was clearly applicable to the initiation of diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia by Ho Chi-minh, Viet-Nam Stalinist leader, which was announced on February 22.

In recent months the cold war has shifted to Southeast Asia with the U.S. attempting to establish a new area in which to "contain Communism." The U.S. is backing the French-sponsored puppet Bao Dai on the premise that Ho is a

A British Correspondent Takes the Floor—

THE SOCIALIST LEFT AND THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY

To the Editor:

I feel I must answer the criticism which you level at me in your issue of February 13, not so much to put forward my view but to clarify the points concerned and hear the opinions of American comrades on the subject.

Firstly, I DID support the Labor Party against the Conservatives in this election. Nevertheless I am fully aware that there IS little difference to choose between the two.

This view was based on the following facts. In the election address, Labor was busy showing how like the Conservatives they were. Heaven forbid that they should want anything revolutionary! The ONLY progressive features of their policy were nationalization of cement, sugar and insurance. These they did NOT stress.

All the members of the government who were considered slightly left—e.g., Bevan the health minister, Shewell the war minister, Strachey the food minister—of the last government were not given any radio time in the Labor Party schedule. From a perusal of their weak "Let Us Go Forward Together," which was more like a Sunday School sermon than a political pamphlet, one can see that this party has lost most of its militancy and is settling into the warmth of bureaucratic government seats.

The unfortunate truth, however, is that Labor DOES represent the mass of the working class of Great Britain. But since they gave them few more votes than the Conservatives they cannot easily differentiate the two groupings. There has undoubtedly been a right swing. I am very glad to see that this has involved the chucking out of the half-dozen Stalinists and fellow travelers. Still there are at least three genuine leftists in Parliament under Labor's flag.

To return from the digression. The fact that the Conservatives have been given such support shows a certain amount of disillusionment, particularly among professionals, whose help had always hitherto been taken for granted. The King's speech—given today—shows that the Opposition will allow all reactionary or non-controversial bills through Parliament, but will be able to stop any progressive measures at all. In other words, Labor will get all the failure of half-hearted legislation, for any real recovery will be sabotaged.

Even if it were not true on February 13 that Labor politics—as opposed to their tradition and support—were not militantly left, it has become now abundantly clear. The formation of the cabinet—in England it has far more executive power than in the USA—has elevated all those who are considered right-wing, and brought in many more. Those with left leanings have been demoted or left where they were. Further the King's speech—the government announce-

ment of its future policy—has abandoned ALL nationalization measures until the next election, expected in autumn.

By that time, Labor will have had the headache of balancing the budget, of financial and industrial crisis due to the end of "wage freeze" and the tactics of industrial magnates. In my opinion, Labor will then go to the country with a similar unimaginative approach as this time. With the "middle of the road" Liberals, who polled two and a half million out of about 28 million votes, out of the running, the Labor Party will be chucked out. A Conservative government will be formed, and there will be severe industrial trouble.

This is only forecast. But I believe that the next election will result in a similar deadlock, because Labor has not the courage to appeal to the country with an alternative, even vaguely left policy to that of the Conservatives, as they did in 1945.

The simple truth is that the present Labor government will NOT carry a SINGLE NEW progressive measure, either because it is frightened or it can't. I think many American comrades get the idea that it must have some good features because of the fulminations of the U.S. right-wing press against it. I agree that Labor has the tradition, the support and the potentialities, but it is fast pawn-ing these for bourgeois respectability.

D. ALEXANDER

The Editor Replies—

Only a 'Loyal Left Wing' Can Keep Labor on the Track!

In our February 13 symposium on the British election, Comrade Alexander's article expressed the view: "Although politically there is not much to choose between Labor and Conservative, left-wingers would feel a little disappointed emotionally if the Tories were returned. Although the Labor Party has betrayed the trust of Keir Hardie and other giants of the Second International, they nevertheless HAD inherited it."

Editorially expressing our own views in the same issue, with a reference to Comrade Alexander's approach, we stressed: "The Conservative Party is the political army of the capitalist class. With every one of our criticisms (and more) of its policy and leadership, the Labor Party is the political army of the British working class."

We are glad to present Comrade Alexander's clarification on his support of the Labor Party against the Tories in the election. Without seeking to overstress areas of disagreement, we would still comment, however, that it is hard for us to see how this most basic class difference between Labor and Toryism can persistently be described as a "little difference."

All or most of Comrade Alexander's criticisms of Labor policy, both before and after the election, have been fully covered in LABOR ACTION articles. Our articles (including articles in the same February 13 issue) pointed out that the line of the Labor leadership in the election was to soft-pedal the party's program. These facts, once again adduced by Comrade Alexander, point the road for left-wingers to fight for a real socialist policy inside their own political army, the Labor Party. They do not, however, point to Comrade Alexander's approach in summarizing the issue of the election as between Labor and Tory.

The aftermath of the election, we think, reinforces our own view. Labor's loss in parliamentary strength has not made the going easier for Labor left-wingers; if anything, it has put an obstacle in their path. Another sweeping majority in Parliament would have made it possible for the left wing to yell twice as loudly for a thoroughgoing socialist program in both domestic and foreign policy. As we said on February 13: "If the British workers will learn through experience and through the aid of the vanguard socialists that they have to change their leadership and its policies, this will take place on the healthiest basis through seeing their leaders in power and responsibility, and not through days of defeat under a Tory revival with Attlee and Bevin in opposition."

It has not come to the latter situation as yet, though continuation of the present Labor policy bids fair to bring it there. All the more reason for left-wingers to have mobilized the Labor vote twice as enthusiastically as the right-wing—and not lay the stress in the election on the "little difference" between the two contending class forces.

Such enthusiastic and whole-hearted support for a Labor victory is, in our view, not in the slightest degree in contradiction with the counterposing of a consistent socialist program and criticism to that of the official leadership. What betwixts the thinking of some British left-wing socialists—as we see it from our end of the Atlantic, with all due allowance for the caution enforced by distance from the scene—is that they persist in thinking in terms of what policy should be followed toward the reformist leadership of Labor if there were in existence a revolutionary socialist party which could contend with the Labor Party leadership for the adherence of the working class.

The "IF" is a tremendous one. No such party effectively exists

in England, or even looms on the present horizon. Its creation in the future will depend on how vanguard socialists fight now. Today their task is to be the loyal left wing of Labor's political army. We use the term "loyal" advisedly in these days under the shadow of Stalinism—it does not mean "loyal" to Attlee or Bevin but to the interests of building the power of the Labor Party as a prerequisite for going forward or "keeping left," a left wing which opposes the reformist leadership not as a disruptive group "boring from within" for a membership raid but as a socialist vanguard in the mass movement.

"The unfortunate truth," says Comrade Alexander, "is that Labor DOES represent the mass of the working class of Great Britain." Given the fact that no effective left-wing alternative to the Labor Party exists, how "unfortunate" is that? Given this all-important fact in the situation, one of the most heartening things about the election was precisely the fact that the working class DID continue to vote en masse for the Labor Party! It is the fact that no revolutionary-socialist party alternative effectively exists which is the "unfortunate" thing! And it will not come into existence if the elements which ought to play a part in its formation in the future permit themselves today to be swayed by any remnants whatsoever of a "plague on both your houses" approach when the class lines are as sharply drawn as they are now IN SPITE OF Attlee and Bevin.

Which brings us finally to one "fact" cited by our correspondent which is not so at all: "But since they [the working class] gave them [the Labor Party] few more votes than the Conservatives, they cannot easily differentiate the two groupings." It is, on the contrary, abundantly clear that precisely the working-class vote for Labor was

Not in the Headlines

Purged

Another hatchman has bit the dust. Since the beginning of the year, Joseph Starobin, till recently foreign editor of the Daily Worker, has been dumped. Starobin wrote his own obit in the January 13 issue of the Worker, explaining that he was going to be busy with the Sunday edition, but he is no longer listed as an editor. No explanations have been given.

His successor as foreign editor is Joe Clark. Seems as if alumni of the old National Student League have a stranglehold on the job. But whereas Starobin has been noted as a smoothie double-speaker artist both in his student days and as foreign editor, Clark is the brass-knuckle type.

Distinction

The Copenhagen (Denmark) newspaper Social-Demokraten has been conducting a polemic with People and Country, organ of the Communist Party of Denmark. The issue has been anti-Semitism in Russia.

Social-Demokraten cites an interview between Nerassimoff, director of Soviet Art, and Baulder Killian Laksent, CP leader in Iceland. The Russian told Laksent: "I can't stand the sculptor Mark Shalov because he is a Hebrew."

The CP paper (which recently published an anti-Semitic cartoon) charges that Social-Demokraten distorted the interview and argues that "Hebrew" does not mean the same as "Jew." The term "Hebrew," according to the Stalinists, refers only to the Hebrew people in Israel while "Jew" refers to the Jewish people who live throughout the rest of the world.

D. ALEXANDER

The Editor Replies—

Only a 'Loyal Left Wing' Can Keep Labor on the Track!

It has not come to the latter situation as yet, though continuation of the present Labor policy bids fair to bring it there. All the more reason for left-wingers to have mobilized the Labor vote twice as enthusiastically as the right-wing—and not lay the stress in the election on the "little difference" between the two contending class forces.

Such enthusiastic and whole-hearted support for a Labor victory is, in our view, not in the slightest degree in contradiction with the counterposing of a consistent socialist program and criticism to that of the official leadership. What betwixts the thinking of some British left-wing socialists—as we see it from our end of the Atlantic, with all due allowance for the caution enforced by distance from the scene—is that they persist in thinking in terms of what policy should be followed toward the reformist leadership of Labor if there were in existence a revolutionary socialist party which could contend with the Labor Party leadership for the adherence of the working class.

The "IF" is a tremendous one. No such party effectively exists

in England, or even looms on the present horizon. Its creation in the future will depend on how vanguard socialists fight now. Today their task is to be the loyal left wing of Labor's political army. We use the term "loyal" advisedly in these days under the shadow of Stalinism—it does not mean "loyal" to Attlee or Bevin but to the interests of building the power of the Labor Party as a prerequisite for going forward or "keeping left," a left wing which opposes the reformist leadership not as a disruptive group "boring from within" for a membership raid but as a socialist vanguard in the mass movement.

"The unfortunate truth," says Comrade Alexander, "is that Labor DOES represent the mass of the working class of Great Britain." Given the fact that no effective left-wing alternative to the Labor Party exists, how "unfortunate" is that? Given this all-important fact in the situation, one of the most heartening things about the election was precisely the fact that the working class DID continue to vote en masse for the Labor Party! It is the fact that no revolutionary-socialist party alternative effectively exists which is the "unfortunate" thing! And it will not come into existence if the elements which ought to play a part in its formation in the future permit themselves today to be swayed by any remnants whatsoever of a "plague on both your houses" approach when the class lines are as sharply drawn as they are now IN SPITE OF Attlee and Bevin.

Which brings us finally to one "fact" cited by our correspondent which is not so at all: "But since they [the working class] gave them [the Labor Party] few more votes than the Conservatives, they cannot easily differentiate the two groupings." It is, on the contrary, abundantly clear that precisely the working-class vote for Labor was

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
The Independent Socialist Weekly
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL
 Six months (26 issues) at 50 cents
 One year (52 issues) at \$1.00

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)
CITY ZONE STATE

ADDRESS APT.
 Bill me Payment encl. (stamps, currency or postal note)

as solid or even more solid than in 1945. They did differentiate, and easily, more easily than some left-wing critics! This is the nub of the important questions raised by Comrade Alexander's views.

How NOT to Fight a Purge

U. of Calif. Faculty Wins a Battle—and Loses the War for Academic Freedom

By ROBERT MAGNUS

The struggle between the regents and faculty of the University of California over the imposition of a special loyalty oath has gained nationwide importance. For over eight months a barrage of resolutions, statements, charges and counter-charges has torn the university from its usual paths. The exact nature of the fight and its implications for the future of academic freedom in the United States, hitherto obscure, has now become perfectly clear: *academic freedom or thought control.* This and no other is the issue, and the lines are drawn.

The University of California is one of the largest and most distinguished institutions of learning in the world. Its many campuses sprawl across the face of California: it has divisions in Berkeley, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Davis, Riverside, and Santa Barbara. The university has a virtual educational monopoly of the entire state, and its position in the American world of higher education give its decisions national importance.

The constitution of the state of California places control of the university in the hands of twenty-four regents appointed by the governor for terms of 16 years each. A rollcall of these regents includes some of the most powerful business and monopoly interests in the state, including the Bank of America, the Fleishhacker interests and the California Fruit Growers Exchange, although the state constitution explicitly states that "the university shall be entirely independent of all political or sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its regents and in the administration of its affairs..."

Sign or Resign!

This "little band of willful men" has, by its decisions and behavior over the last eight months, shown itself completely incompetent to handle the affairs of a great university which has, up to now, allowed a considerable degree of freedom of inquiry and opinion on its campuses.

Intent on proving their hysterical fear of all academic freedom, the regents have trampled over all the objections of the faculty, and now demand 100 per cent obedience to their decision. No amount of opposition has so far had any effect. On February 24 the regents laid down their ultimatum: *Sign the loyalty oath or get out.*

The events which have led up to the present impasse indicate perfectly well who is at fault.

In 1940, ten years ago, the regents announced a policy excluding members of the Communist Party from employment at the university. This policy, dangerous in its implications, was not seriously opposed by the faculty and the situation remained unchanged all during the war years. The regents were quick to accept the implications of the cold war with Russia and, according to President Sproul of the university, they began to discuss ways of further implementing their anti-Communist policy in March 1949.

According to Sproul, "this discussion was stimulated by the critical international situation, by the increasing participation of the university in research for the federal government, especially in the field of nuclear fission, and by a proposal in the state legislature for a constitutional amendment to change the form of government of the university."

Tenny Defeated, Threat Remained

That the cold war and the atomic-secrets scare had much to do with the decision is indubitable. Everyone knows, however, that the constitutional amendment introduced in the California legislature by Jack Tenny, the head of the state's odious un-American Activities Committee, was resoundingly defeated when it came up for a vote. Sproul has attempted to use the threat of control by the legislature as a club to force the faculty to accept his little amendment to the loyalty oath.

The members of the faculty, like all state em-

ployees including the governor, had been signing, for many years, a standard oath swearing loyalty to the Constitution. The amendment introduced by President Sproul and passed by the regents on June 24, 1949 further stated that the person signing was not a member of the Communist Party "or under any commitment that is in conflict with my obligations under this oath."

The faculty rightly considered this an insult, since it singled them out from among all the state employees as a suspect body, and that furthermore the amendment to the oath put the entire oath in question in the first place, since it reaffirmed in the second part what was already contained in the first.

The administration very cleverly sent the new oaths around after the summer vacation had begun so that most of the faculty were away and there was no possibility of concerted action. Many faculty members with no tenure, fearing for their jobs, were forced to sign, but a considerable group of the oldest and most respected members have refused to sign the oath.

Equivocal from Beginning

These non-signers have stuck fast and have forced the more conservative members of the faculty, the deans, department heads, and those who have just been passive and resigned, to continue the fight, for if the non-signers (around 1400 persons of whom 400 are faculty members) are fired the university will be ruined.

The faculty's attitude on academic freedom has been equivocal from the very beginning. Believing that it was impossible to fight the regents' policy of 1940, which excluded persons from teaching solely because of their political beliefs, they foolishly accepted the demagogic red-baiting premise of the regents: *that Communists have to be kept out of the university.* This anti-Communist battlecry has been raised, at this time, for obvious reactionary purposes; for the regents have not been able to find a single member of the Communist Party on the faculty and if they had found one they could have fired him without the loyalty oath.

Instead of sticking to their guns the faculty accepted the regents' proposal (to kick out the non-existent Communists) and only argued about means to that end. They argued that Communists would sign the oath anyway, that the oath was unconstitutional, that it "insulted" the "loyal and patriotic" faculty, etc., etc.

Students Turned Out in Force

Almost all of the big daily papers in California (except the Hearst press) supported the faculty on the basis of these arguments and began to look for a harmless compromise by which both sides could save face. They pointed out how the regents themselves were split 6 to 12 on the issue and how President Sproul and Governor Warren had voted against the oath. It looked as if the faculty would win the battle if they continued to oppose the oath and if the non-signers remained firm. This is how the situation stood up until the mass meeting on March 6 called by the student government.

The student government of the university is in the hands of the fraternities and is controlled in all essentials by the administration. It has utterly failed to give the students any leadership in the present crisis. After eight months of bitter controversy between the faculty and the regents, during which the students remained completely passive, the student executive committee was finally forced to call a general meeting.

Much to the surprise of their servile and timid "leaders," the students responded with a real fervor. Ten thousand of them crowded the big Greek Theatre to hear the issue presented by three faculty members. They booed the regents and cheered when the oath was attacked. The president of the student body, Dan Coelho, outraged the students by taking a neutral stand in the fight, and was vigorously booed when he criticized both sides and asked for a "compromise."

At this meeting a statement by John Francis

Neylan, the most influential regent and the person most responsible for the oath, was read. This statement contained the germs of a compromise, for it shifted the issue from the loyalty oath to the regents' previous anti-Communist policy. This policy had never been endorsed by the faculty, only passively accepted. Neylan now demanded that, since both sides were interested in keeping out the Communists, the faculty unconditionally support this policy.

The faculty was caught in as neat a trap as was ever devised. The San Francisco Chronicle took up the hint and demanded "compromise." The other papers followed suit. The faculty, having argued all along that they only opposed the method of the loyalty oath and not its purpose, was put completely on the defensive. At the March 7 meeting of the Academic Senate the conservatives were able to push through a motion for a write-in vote on the question of whether the faculty would endorse the regents' policy. At the same time there was a unanimous vote to oppose the loyalty oath.

That is where the situation stands today. It looks as if Neylan will now remove the oath as soon as a majority of the faculty votes in favor of the anti-Communist policy, and will thereby pull the skids out from under the non-signers, many of whom also oppose the regents' red-baiting drive.

Will It Be a Precedent?

The danger of this entire situation is evident. While previously the faculty was merely, at the worst, acquiescing in signing an oath imposed by the regents, they are now going to voluntarily support and endorse a policy which strikes at the very roots of academic freedom. *The faculty has won a battle—and lost the war.*

The trend in American higher education is toward state-financed and controlled universities. The Universities of Washington and California have in different ways been attacked by the beginnings of a totalitarian drive for monolithic university education. The importance of the University of California in the academic world may well make this type of "compromise" seem an expedient way for university faculties to maintain their "independence." But this is only an apparent victory.

Just as the trade-union movement has begun to succumb to the anti-red hysteria, so have the universities. Some trade-union locals, by accepting the responsibility of policing the attorney general's extra-legal subversive list, have placed themselves in the dire position of taking the offensive in denuding themselves of their best militants. So in the universities: the faculty, by endorsing the hysterical and demagogic attacks of the regents, is paving the way for the complete strangulation of independent thought.

If You're—

- Against capitalism
- Against Stalinism
- For a Socialist Democracy

You belong with the—

**INDEPENDENT
SOCIALIST LEAGUE**

You should read—

**Max Shachtman's
"THE FIGHT FOR
SOCIALISM"**

For information and literature, write to:
Independent Socialist League
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

CP Youth Licked at Student Conference; Majority Plans Fight for Campus Rights

By JULIUS FALK

The Student Conference on Democracy in Education was held over the weekend of March 11-12. Attending the conference were almost 400 student delegates from clubs on most of the major campuses in the New York area. Each club was entitled to four delegates. From the very beginning the conference was split into two caucuses: the anti-Stalinists on the one side and the Stalinists on the other.

In previous issues of LABOR ACTION the history of the conference has been presented in detail. The conference was initiated by a group of Stalinist students who planned on drawing in a large number of "innocents" and turning the conference into one of their regular shindigs; a tightly run affair in which they use legitimate issues to make political capital for their own reactionary totalitarian ends.

At the second of these pre-conference planning meetings about eight clubs from the New York Student Federation Against War participated. The federation then convinced other anti-Stalinist groups that they must participate in order not to abandon the fight for academic freedom to the Stalinists. The federation was successful in this and at a subsequent planning meeting the anti-Stalinists had a majority of delegates.

From that point on the anti-Stalinist caucus had a clear-cut majority in all the planning meetings and at the conference itself. The CP students then resorted to slander in the usual way. Among other things they abused the conference executive committee by charging that nine out of its fifteen members were "ROTTEN WHITE SUPREMACISTS" (emphasis in original leaflet distributed by the Labor Youth League).

But these lies only served to embarrass the Stalinists. The nine students accused of being "rotten white supremacists" were militant liberal and socialist students and few, not even many of the Sta-

Ceylon's Jim Crow

In Ceylon the native ruling class has gone in for discriminatory racism in as crude a fashion as has Prime Minister Malan of South Africa or as prevails in the U. S. South. There, however, the edge is directed against Indians, who are the major sector of the island's working class, especially in the tea and rubber plantations.

By law Ceylon now does not recognize citizenship by birth but only by descent and registration. Obtaining citizenship by registration is limited to 25 persons a year and so bound up with requirements that only the very rich could afford to go through the procedure. The great body of workers are disfranchised.

Some months later, he did hear and was given a series of intelligence tests. After this, he waited a year for an interview. In January 1949, he was finally hired—and yet not quite hired, since he had not yet been "cleared" completely. He was given a "temporary indefinite, non-security cleared status."

For a definition of "i, n-s-c," one must consult the government's Newspeak dictionary. Every so-called "sensitive" government agency requires some sort of investigation. For ordinarily "sensitive" agencies only a "loyalty check" is necessary. For the CIA, however, a "full field investigation" is required. Mr. Daniel found that most people in the know estimated that it takes a full nine months for a "full field investigation."

Before learning the meaning of "i, n-s-c" it is also necessary to distinguish between "eligibility" and "suitability." A plain "loyalty check" can establish both for

Definition

The publishers of the Little Rock Gazette, where the Newspaper Guild of Arkansas is on strike, have announced that they will hire none but "high class" scabs. The CIO-PAC has defined this category of scab as one who shines his shoes before kicking an old woman in the teeth.

Bitter Pills

The government anti-trust men have brought charges against two of the largest drug manufacturers in the country for trying to gain a monopoly in the making of hard-gelatin capsules for pills. The two companies, Parke Davis and Eli Lilly, control the pill-making machines and so produce 90 per cent of all sold.

linists, could take such vicious accusations seriously.

At the conference itself the Stalinists were much better organized than at the planning meeting but they were nevertheless at all times in a minority.

The conference was called to order on Saturday afternoon. Following the invocation there were two excellent keynote speeches—one by Roger Baldwin, former executive secretary of the American Civil Liberties Union, the other by Harold Taylor, president of Sarah Lawrence College. The speech by Baldwin was particularly

embarrassing to the Stalinists when he attacked the Communist Party for refusing to defend the civil liberties of the Minneapolis Trotskyists convicted under the Smith Act.

President Taylor made a sharp criticism of the American educational system and of the intellectual stagnation in American life. On the academic front he maintained that students have the right to organize their own clubs without faculty supervision and defended the right of students to hear speakers of their own choosing.

Stalinists Fight on Rules

Following the speeches the conference began to bog down in a parliamentary fight. It took several hours before the rules were adopted, and this was only after a roll-call vote. The Stalinists were opposed to accepting the rules on the ground that the 15 executive members, each of whom are entitled to a vote apart from their club representative, would give some clubs extra representation.

This might have been a legitimate point to raise in the pre-conference planning meetings but to accept it at the conference itself meant disfranchising the leaders of the conference or forcing new elections in all the clubs to which the executive committee member belonged. This would have meant disrupting the conference, which would not have particularly bothered the Stalinists who were in a minority. Even though the Stalinists split their vote (by design) on the question of accepting the rules it was clear that the democratic forces had a 3-to-2 majority.

The next point on the agenda was the credentials report. The Credentials Committee refused to give delegates to six Stalinist clubs on the ground that they were not legitimate student organiza-

tions and were actually "ringers." Most of these charges by the Credentials Committee were undoubtedly true. The Stalinists were demanding delegates for clubs which were non-existent. Nevertheless a number of anti-Stalinists voted to give all the Stalinist clubs their claimed delegates in order to prevent the conference from collapsing at that point and also to prevent the Stalinists from demagogically claiming that they were defeated only because they were denied their "rights." Consequently a Stalinist motion to grant voting rights to all the disputed clubs was accepted by the majority of delegates.

By this time, however, the conference was many hours behind schedule. It then divided into three panels on academic freedom, discrimination and economic difficulties. The panels were continued the following morning. Resolutions were brought in, discussed and voted upon and minority resolutions prepared for the plenary session.

At two of the panels the Stalinists had a majority or near-majority on Sunday morning, and as a result one or two of the disputed resolutions were carried by them. In the Academic Freedom panel,

embarrassing to the Stalinists when he attacked the Communist Party for refusing to defend the civil liberties of the Minneapolis Trotskyists convicted under the Smith Act.

President Taylor made a sharp criticism of the American educational system and of the intellectual stagnation in American life. On the academic front he maintained that students have the right to organize their own clubs without faculty supervision and defended the right of students to hear speakers of their own choosing.

Following the speeches the conference began to bog down in a parliamentary fight. It took several hours before the rules were adopted, and this was only after a roll-call vote. The Stalinists were opposed to accepting the rules on the ground that the 15 executive members, each of whom are entitled to a vote apart from their club representative, would give some clubs extra representation.

This might have been a legitimate point to raise in the pre-conference planning meetings but to accept it at the conference itself meant disfranchising the leaders of the conference or forcing new elections in all the clubs to which the executive committee member belonged. This would have meant disrupting the conference, which would not have particularly bothered the Stalinists who were in a minority. Even though the Stalinists split their vote (by design) on the question of accepting the rules it was clear that the democratic forces had a 3-to-2 majority.

The next point on the agenda was the credentials report. The Credentials Committee refused to give delegates to six Stalinist clubs on the ground that they were not legitimate student organiza-

tions and were actually "ringers." Most of these charges by the Credentials Committee were undoubtedly true. The Stalinists were demanding delegates for clubs which were non-existent. Nevertheless a number of anti-Stalinists voted to give all the Stalinist clubs their claimed delegates in order to prevent the conference from collapsing at that point and also to prevent the Stalinists from demagogically claiming that they were defeated only because they were denied their "rights." Consequently a Stalinist motion to grant voting rights to all the disputed clubs was accepted by the majority of delegates.

embarrassing to the Stalinists when he attacked the Communist Party for refusing to defend the civil liberties of the Minneapolis Trotskyists convicted under the Smith Act.

President Taylor made a sharp criticism of the American educational system and of the intellectual stagnation in American life. On the academic front he maintained that students have the right to organize their own clubs without faculty supervision and defended the right of students to hear speakers of their own choosing.

Following the speeches the conference began to bog down in a parliamentary fight. It took several hours before the rules were adopted, and this was only after a roll-call vote. The Stalinists were opposed to accepting the rules on the ground that the 15 executive members, each of whom are entitled to a vote apart from their club representative, would give some clubs extra representation.

This might have been a legitimate point to raise in the pre-conference planning meetings but to accept it at the conference itself meant disfranchising the leaders of the conference or forcing new elections in all the clubs to which the executive committee member belonged. This would have meant disrupting the conference, which would not have particularly bothered the Stalinists who were in a minority. Even though the Stalinists split their vote (by design) on the question of accepting the rules it was clear that the democratic forces had a 3-to-2 majority.

The next point on the agenda was the credentials report. The Credentials Committee refused to give delegates to six Stalinist clubs on the ground that they were not legitimate student organiza-

tions and were actually "ringers." Most of these charges by the Credentials Committee were undoubtedly true. The Stalinists were demanding delegates for clubs which were non-existent. Nevertheless a number of anti-Stalinists voted to give all the Stalinist clubs their claimed delegates in order to prevent the conference from collapsing at that point and also to prevent the Stalinists from demagogically claiming that they were defeated only because they were denied their "rights." Consequently a Stalinist motion to grant voting rights to all the disputed clubs was accepted by the majority of delegates.

By this time, however, the conference was many hours behind schedule. It then divided into three panels on academic freedom, discrimination and economic difficulties. The panels were continued the following morning. Resolutions were brought in, discussed and voted upon and minority resolutions prepared for the plenary session.

At two of the panels the Stalinists had a majority or near-majority on Sunday morning, and as a result one or two of the disputed resolutions were carried by them. In the Academic Freedom panel,

embarrassing to the Stalinists when he attacked the Communist Party for refusing to defend the civil liberties of the Minneapolis Trotskyists convicted under the Smith Act.

President Taylor made a sharp criticism of the American educational system and of the intellectual stagnation in American life. On the academic front he maintained that students have the right to organize their own clubs without faculty supervision and defended the right of students to hear speakers of their own choosing.

Following the speeches the conference began to bog down in a parliamentary fight. It took several hours before the rules were adopted, and this was only after a roll-call vote. The Stalinists were opposed to accepting the rules on the ground that the 15 executive members, each of whom are entitled to a vote apart from their club representative, would give some clubs extra representation.

This might have been a legitimate point to raise in the pre-conference planning meetings but to accept it at the conference itself meant disfranchising the leaders of the conference or forcing new elections in all the clubs to which the executive committee member belonged. This would have meant disrupting the conference, which would not have particularly bothered the Stalinists who were in a minority. Even though the Stalinists split their vote (by design) on the question of accepting the rules it was clear that the democratic forces had a 3-to-2 majority.

The next point on the agenda was the credentials report. The Credentials Committee refused to give delegates to six Stalinist clubs on the ground that they were not legitimate student organiza-

tions and were actually "ringers." Most of these charges by the Credentials Committee were undoubtedly true. The Stalinists were demanding delegates for clubs which were non-existent. Nevertheless a number of anti-Stalinists voted to give all the Stalinist clubs their claimed delegates in order to prevent the conference from collapsing at that point and also to prevent the Stalinists from demagogically claiming that they were defeated only because they were denied their "rights." Consequently a Stalinist motion to grant voting rights to all the disputed clubs was accepted by the majority of delegates.

By this time, however, the conference was many hours behind schedule. It then divided into three panels on academic freedom, discrimination and economic difficulties. The panels were continued the following morning. Resolutions were brought in, discussed and voted upon and minority resolutions prepared for the plenary session.

a resolution which included a condemnation of campus military training in the United States and also in Franco Spain and Russia was amended on a Stalinist motion so that reference to all foreign countries was taken out, 74-68.

At the plenary session which was to decide on all panel resolutions the anti-Stalinists were in a decisive majority. This was made clear in a vote on a motion to include a special point of business on the agenda: a motion that the conference go on record condemning the Stalinists for the publicly issued leaflets which falsely accused the majority of the Executive Committee of being "rotten white supremacists." As a special point of business it was necessary to have a two-thirds vote to place the motion on the agenda. The vote fell about 20 short of two-

Looking Ahead to Next Conference

Everybody indeed WANTED to discuss the panel resolutions, but there was no time. To discuss the resolutions would have meant failing to elect a committee to carry on the work of the conference. At this point the Stalinists broke about every rule in the parliamentary book in order to prevent the majority from completing the conference. However, the majority was not upset by the Stalinist provocations to riot. The panel discussions were tabled and a Continuations Committee elected.

A major lesson to be learned is that the Stalinists can be beaten in the student field, even in conferences which they themselves organize, by a militant anti-Stalinist coalition. For the first time in the history of the New York student movement the Stalinists were beaten in a conference of this nature and size. This is an important POLITICAL event which even many of the liberals do not recognize.

thirds, but the tally was 184 to 139 in favor. This was a test vote which showed the Stalinists to be in a definite minority.

The plenary session had to be held in a city high school and a strict time limit placed on the duration of the conference—until 8 p.m. Midway in the discussion on the first panel the anti-Stalinists pressed for tabling all points on the agenda except the last, which was the question of a Continuations Committee. Unless this was done the conference would have been forced to conclude without electing any instrument to continue its purposes. But this was not an ugly prospect to the Stalinists, who knew that they would not control the Continuations Committee, and they therefore pressed to proceed with the discussion on the panel resolutions.

Looking Ahead to Next Conference

Everybody indeed WANTED to discuss the panel resolutions, but there was no time. To discuss the resolutions would have meant failing to elect a committee to carry on the work of the conference. At this point the Stalinists broke about every rule in the parliamentary book in order to prevent the majority from completing the conference. However, the majority was not upset by the Stalinist provocations to riot. The panel discussions were tabled and a Continuations Committee elected.

A major lesson to be learned is that the Stalinists can be beaten in the student field, even in conferences which they themselves organize, by a militant anti-Stalinist coalition. For the first time in the history of the New York student movement the Stalinists were beaten in a conference of this nature and size. This is an important POLITICAL event which even many of the liberals do not recognize.

How the CIA Purges--

(Continued from page 1)

Balkan story in the manner he was quizzed to determine the degree of his loyalty.

In 1947, when Mr. Daniel became interested in a job with CIA, he spoke with friends, who somehow had never mentioned directly that they were employees of the intelligence outfit, but were, nevertheless. One day he was handed a brown envelope by one of them and told he would hear the results later.

IN—BUT NOT QUITE

Some months later, he did hear and was given a series of intelligence tests. After this, he waited a year for an interview. In January 1949, he was finally hired—and yet not quite hired, since he had not yet been "cleared" completely. He was given a "temporary indefinite, non-security cleared status."

For a definition of "i, n-s-c," one must consult the government's Newspeak dictionary. Every so-called "sensitive" government agency requires some sort of investigation. For ordinarily "sensitive" agencies only a "loyalty check" is necessary. For the CIA, however, a "full field investigation" is required. Mr. Daniel found that most people in the know estimated that it takes a full nine months for a "full field investigation."

Before learning the meaning of "i, n-s-c" it is also necessary to distinguish between "eligibility" and "suitability." A plain "loyalty check" can establish both for

his family and everyone he might have known. There were questions on communist theory, if he had ever read Das Kapital, whether he advocated reforms, the political affiliations of all his relatives, etc. The most dangerous radical behavior the questioner elicited was that he had once joined the AVC, where he participated in a movement against the Stalinists, and had once been a subscriber to "In Fact."

In two weeks, Mr. Daniels learned from Mr. K. that the results of the test were against him, but he was not informed why. Inquiring about his future course, he was told by Mr. K. "Now, under the law creating this agency, the director has the right to remove anyone who does not meet the standard of employment, and we are asking you to resign—without prejudice of course—to save us the other alternative."

Mr. K. was right. Under the National Security Act of 1947, the director of the CIA is authorized to "terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the agency whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States" without regard to any existing laws affecting ordinary Americans. Thus the law violates the law; the law-makers, receiving their authority under the Constitution, remove constitutional rights from those for whom they are supposed to guarantee them.

HE'S A DEAD DUCK

Mr. K. "supposed" there was an appeal. But Mr. F., to whom

his family and everyone he might have known. There were questions on communist theory, if he had ever read Das Kapital, whether he advocated reforms, the political affiliations of all his relatives, etc. The most dangerous radical behavior the questioner elicited was that he had once joined the AVC, where he participated in a movement against the Stalinists, and had once been a subscriber to "In Fact."

In two weeks, Mr. Daniels learned from Mr. K. that the results of the test were against him, but he was not informed why. Inquiring about his future course, he was told by Mr. K. "Now, under the law creating this agency, the director has the right to remove anyone who does not meet the standard of employment, and we are asking you to resign—without prejudice of course—to save us the other alternative."

Mr. K. was right. Under the National Security Act of 1947, the director of the CIA is authorized to "terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the agency whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States" without regard to any existing laws affecting ordinary Americans. Thus the law violates the law; the law-makers, receiving their authority under the Constitution, remove constitutional rights from those for whom they are supposed to guarantee them.

Mr. Daniels resigned. In a "debriefing" process, he was made to sign a statement that he had read documents he hadn't read. Then he was asked to put the finger on others. "Is there anyone in the CIA you would like to tell us about whom you feel is a poor security risk?" This questioner didn't know the reason for Daniels' resignation, so Daniels told him. He felt himself a "poor security risk" in order to tell anything about others.

In answer to his letter to the president, Daniels received a reply from Harry Mitchell, president of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, informing him that what had happened was entirely legal. It was. And it happened in Washington, D. C.

Daniels was referred on this matter, told him the truth. There was no appeal. He simply didn't meet the standards. He was being asked to resign, without charges, without a hearing or trial, without any recourse or appeal. Daniels asked, "Will you tell me the standards I don't meet?" The answer: "No." So far as references for the next job were concerned, it was up to Daniels to explain his severance from the CIA. A Colonel Burns told Daniels that there was at least one case a week such as his in the CIA.

Daniels wrote a letter to Truman. He saw a top Washington lawyer. The lawyer, told the whole story, said, "Daniels, you're a dead duck. You might as well resign." Daniels saw a top politician. After hearing the case, his advice was, "Young man, what you need is a good lawyer."

Daniels resigned. In a "debriefing" process, he was made to sign a statement that he had read documents he hadn't read. Then he was asked to put the finger on others. "Is there anyone in the CIA you would like to tell us about whom you feel is a poor security risk?" This questioner didn't know the reason for Daniels' resignation, so Daniels told him. He felt himself a "poor security risk" in order to tell anything about others.

In answer to his letter to the president, Daniels received a reply from Harry Mitchell, president of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, informing him that what had happened was entirely legal. It was. And it happened in Washington, D. C.

CITY COUNCIL BOWS TO REAL-ESTATE ATTACK ON PEOPLE'S NEED—

ISL Demands Public Housing in Berkeley

By ARLENE WILLIAMS

BERKELEY, Mar. 8—After going through the old sham-battle routine with all the flourishes usually attending these performances, the City Council has taken a firm and decisive stand in opposition to any future public housing for this city.

Although the issue was centered around the allocation of funds to the City Planning Commission for the purpose of conducting a "sample survey" to determine the housing needs of the area, the real-estate interests on the council shed the disguise they had temporarily donned and forced a vote on the basic question: for or against public housing as such.

Act I, Scene 1 of the prepared drama took place at an open City Council meeting on February 30, where the "voice of the people" was to be heard. The "people," heaven help them, were adequately "represented" by such reputable organizations as the Chamber of Commerce, Home Builders Association, Alameda County Apartment House Owners Association, Berkeley Realty Board, etc.

These self-styled "representatives" performed their task with such choice remarks as:

"Rent decontrol is the answer to the housing problem."

"Private housing is solving the housing shortage."

"With the high wages made during the war people who now need housing could have bought their own homes."

"Public housing presents problems of children, animals, drunks, parties and loose women."

And the final point that should have clinched their argument: "There are a lot of people who would rather live all cooped up than make the effort to live decently."

ISL HEARD

However, their blatant remarks did not have exactly the desired effect on the close to 400 people present in the audience. Although no type of applause was permitted, the "pulse of the people" was felt when one of the real-estate interests commented on the losing battle fought in neighboring Oakland against public housing through the means of a recall election of city councilmen there who had supported the measure. The mayor had to rap for order when the audience reacted joyously to the news of the defeat of the real-estate interests in Oakland.

Although there were many other organizations present that took a wishy-washy "liberal" stand in favor of a survey but with no commitment on public housing, the one organization which presented a clear and firm stand in the interests of the people of Berkeley was the Independent Socialist League through its representative Stanley Weir, East Bay Area organizer.

Replying to an inquiry by the mayor about the membership of the organization, he presented a statement outlining the unfair method used to place the ISL on the attorney general's "subversive list" and pointed out that therefore in the interests of the membership of his organization he could not give any organizational information. The ISL local

organizer then proceeded to outline the League's stand on public housing.

He showed that private industry had failed miserably in providing adequate housing nationally, that people were in dire need of proper dwellings, and therefore it was the responsibility of the government to provide it for them.

TO REOPEN ISSUE

"People who came here during the war were needed then and it is not their fault that there is no work for them now. They cannot afford to pay high rents and they should not be relegated to slums because of that fact. They cannot go back to the farms or other areas they came from because the same conditions of unemployment exist there. The thing to do is to create employment and a high standard of living for them here," he stated.

"We are definitely in favor of public housing in general, and we want it here. And furthermore we want this housing non-segregated. Codornices Village, a project built along these lines, has stood out as a light to give the lie to all who claim that people of different races cannot live together in harmony. The Independent Socialist League of the East Bay urges the City Council of Berkeley to adopt this type of housing action."

Several other organizations such as the Students for Democratic Action, the League of Women Voters, the Young Democrats, etc., pointed out actual conditions existing in the city that would warrant public housing,

but took no stand on the question. The National Association of Colored People did issue a statement in support of public housing. The Stalinists, usually "widely" represented through their various front groups in actions of this kind, were conspicuous by their absence.

As a result of the unfavorable action by the City Council on this question, all reports would indicate that there is a likelihood of a spontaneous movement developing throughout the city of Berkeley

and on the University of California campus to reopen the issue as soon as city charter provisions will allow.

Along with this, faced with the possibility of having their homes torn down in January 1951 unless the City Council issues a favorable request to the Federal Housing Authority for their maintenance, the residents of the Codornices Housing Project are attempting to form their own housing council to put pressure on the City Council.

Notes on Iron Curtain Culture: Or—How Prague Apes Moscow

Notes on culture behind the Iron Curtain:

(1) The Russian "humor" magazine Krokodil has pronounced "The Merry Widow" dead along with other Viennese operettas and informed the literati that the only operettas worth listening to are Russian ones about life under Stalin.

(2) A Czechoslovakian organ of the "trade unions" in Prague branded the samba as a capitalist device to get the Brazilian worker's mind off his troubles, winding up the article with "Long Live the Czech Polka!" The polka does NOT get the Czech worker's mind off his troubles.

(3) In Moscow, writers of children's literature were told they were a bad influence on Russian toddlers because they didn't in-

spire the kids to become factory and mill workers in the "glorious Soviet working class."

(4) Czechoslovakia has banned the sale or distribution of any books, music or other such publications issued before May 5, 1945, when the new democracy dawned.

(5) In Moscow, the Literary Gazette for November 30, 1949, gave a concise formula for the role of art: the Russian citizen "expects from art an active interference in his private life." And it's not only art that he expects that from.

(6) In Czechoslovakia the government has ordered palm readers, fortune tellers and other occultists out of business as remnants of capitalism. Most frequent question asked fortune tellers has been: "When will the Communist regime come to an end?"

Lift the Lid on FBI Purges - -

(Continued from page 1)

agencies, employers and institutions, the government has spread its own procedures throughout American life. And the New Republic, like so many others less openly, has asked: Assuming we want to stop this trend, how can

Here's the Liberal Dilemma

It has been widely asked: What is happening to liberalism and liberals in this country? We socialists have never had any illusions about either the ideology or representatives of liberal capitalism, but one need only compare our modern crop with that of a few decades ago to see the difference. How many liberal voices are even actively raised today against government practices which—a few decades ago—would have brought outraged cries of indignation and protest?

The reason is not far to seek. The liberals are used to fighting the onset of reaction from the right wing of capitalism. They are getting the dose now from the "left wing" of capitalism, its Fair Deal wing, THEIR OWN wing. It is taking place under the administration of the more liberal of the two capitalist parties. And it is small comfort for them to know that a Republican regime would be even worse — if perhaps less skillful about it.

The acid is being poured over the foundations of civil liberties by the very president and party that has the overwhelming support of the labor leadership and the majority of anti-Stalinist liberals. It is not being done by the traditional enemy—the "reactionary capitalists"—and the liberals are disconcerted, bewildered . . . and largely silent.

They look upon it as some regrettable lapse on the part of otherwise progressive political forces, and do not see their way to upsetting the political applecart by attacking . . . their "friends." And so the acid eats away, and they are frightened.

this insidious process be taken hold of and fought?

With full realization of the knottiness of the problem, we wish to make two suggestions for a starter. The first is a matter of approach; the second is concrete.

This is the most striking POLITICAL fact about the purge operation. It is not the result of a wave of "reaction" from the right, as the liberals usually see it. And they do not see that what this means is that it is developing as an integral part of the general process of the decay of the capitalist system today.

The purge is a symptom of this decay. A healthy society, one which is confident of its own ability to retain the loyalty and support of the overwhelming majority of its citizens, does not need today's scale of snooping and spying, political police and dangerous-thought investigators. But the American government does not feel secure. It has the jitters. It is looking under its bed every night before retiring.

Precisely that feature of the witchhunt which most frightens the liberals is the one which is most characteristic of the assault on civil liberties by a liberal capitalist administration, rather than a reactionary right-wing one, using these terms as the liberals see them. The post-World War I reaction frankly raided radical meetings, jailed workers' leaders for their dissenting views, passed suppressive laws. Truman opposed the Mundt-Nixon bill of a couple of years ago, in the name of democracy. The liberals cheered him. He put a good part of it into effect in the name of national security through the Department of Justice without any law at all. Liberals are beginning to shake their head in a daze.

We Independent Socialists point out that this road to the police state is an integral part of the needs of capitalism. It can, we

believe, be effectively countered only by building a fighting political force through the labor movement, through the organization of a militant labor party, and can be reversed for the full flowering of democracy only by building a strong movement which fights both capitalism and Stalinism—and for a socialist democracy.

But we do not think that labor's leaders or liberalism's leaders have to agree with that before their hands are freed to uphold elementary democracy in the midst of the contemporary slide to police-state forms. They need decide only one thing:

Shall they keep silent—or limit themselves to "deploring" excesses, or actively or passively condone what is happening today—for the sake of political loyalty to the administration and party which they support in the name of reforming capitalism? Which is higher—loyalty to democracy and

Here's a First Step

Once having made a choice for freedom, what practical steps can be taken?

All liberals and radicals who are concerned with the problem have been searching for some legal device with which to challenge the loyalty purge. To date, none has been successfully established. The procedure of rule by executive order has one advantage: it is almost impossible for a private citizen or organization to bring the president of the United States into court, and every subordinate officer in the government machine can and does contend that he is simply carrying out the boss's instructions.

Further, even should it be possible to bring the legality of the loyalty purge before the Supreme Court, there is little reason to be confident that the outcome would be a blow for freedom. The same president who has issued the loyalty purge orders has also appointed many of the justices. To place much reliance on them is to lean on a very slender reed.

civil liberties, or loyalty to the Fair Deal?

Labor, the backbone of American Fair Deal liberalism, could raise the mightiest stink of the century over the vicious undermining of civil liberties in the country today. It is not doing so because its leaders want to be "practical politicians." They are supporting Truman and his party, and for the rest—they are afraid.

Make your choice then, you who head the great trade unions, you who head the Americans for Democratic Action, you who head the Liberal Party: not yet the choice which you refuse to recognize, socialism or capitalism, but the more elementary one—cowardly drive against democracy this country has ever seen, out of loyalty to Truman and his party, or a determined and open fight against it, out of loyalty to your own liberalism!

Is there, then, nothing that can be done to bring the whole loyalty purge before the bar of public opinion, to place it in the pillory, to expose the machinations and intimidations and lawlessness of the FBI?

Recently the New Republic proposed a grand jury investigation of the FBI. They are not too sure of their proposal, and we are even less sure of its efficacy. The chances of an open grand jury investigation are slight indeed. And the selection of blue-ribbon aristocrats of money and position for grand jury panels is too well known to give us much confidence in them.

But something should be done, and immediately—if only as a starter. Last year the Workers Defense League held open hearings into the problem of slave labor all over the world. During the '30s the Dewey Commission held open hearings into Stalin's charges against Leon Trotsky.

Why not hold an open hearing, organized and presided over by

some of the outstanding liberals from the universities, the professions and the labor movement? Such a hearing could take personal and expert testimony on the methods and effects of the loyalty purge in the government and industry. If courageous people can be found who are willing to testify openly to their intimidation and persecution by the FBI, such a committee could give them a degree of protection against reprisals.

We do not say that such hearings would stop the police-state development in its tracks. But it could awaken many to a realization of what is going on under the surface in these United States.

It could focus national attention on the abuses of the police powers of the FBI. It could help in the development of something which is a necessity before any great political change can take place—a deep understanding of the fact that if our society is permitted to continue on its present tack it will end with the destruction of all democracy and freedom.

WEEK by WEEK...

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism.

A sub is only \$1 a year!

The BEST recent book on the labor movement—

"The UAW and Walter Reuther"

by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick \$3.00 Random House

Order from: Labor Action Book Service 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.