

LABOR ACTION

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

SPECIAL 4-PAGE ISSUE

Nuclear Weapons and Peace

1. THE ONLY REAL WEAPON IS PEACE
2. THE H-BOMBS ARE OVER AMERICA
3. CIVIL DEFENSE: A GRISLY JOKE
4. DEPTH OF THE CRISIS IN EDUCATION
5. SPUTNIK SPLITS THE "VITAL CENTER"

December 16, 1957

TEN CENTS

AFL-CIO Convention Defeats Racketeers; Clears Way for New Advances by Labor

Danger: Government Intervention

By JACK WILSON

Atlantic City Dec. 9

In the coming months, a major and new problem confronts the labor movement in the form of legislation intended to regulate not only the relations between unions and employers, but also the internal functioning of the union movement.

This became clear to most union leaders here with the speech of Secretary of Labor Mitchell who brought before the AFL-CIO convention a set of proposals the Eisenhower administration will present to the next session of Congress.

Union leaders expected to hear some views on the Eisenhower administration on amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. Among the important changes suggested by Mitchell were elimination of the non-Communist affidavits and the elimination of the statutory prohibition which bars strikers from voting in representative elections, a provision which helped break the Sullivan rubber heel strike, among others.

Nor was there much surprise that Mitchell advocated the passage of new laws regulating more strictly the function and operation of welfare and pension funds.

What is new and different is his proposal that says the following: "We are going to propose that these unions be required to show by appropriate reporting that their members have the right and opportunity, at intervals of not more than four years to elect their local officers directly by secret vote, and their national or other officers either directly by secret ballot or through delegate bodies elected directly by the membership by secret vote."

A NEW DILEMMA

This proposal places not only the union leadership but every active unionists in a dilemma, for it is a different kind of regulation than heretofore existed on the statute books. It clearly defines by law certain limits of formal, constitutional bureaucracy which is evident in far too many unions, notably of the old AFL.

Obviously, if the labor movement hadn't gotten into a mess with the racketeer problem—only partly answered by the expulsion of the Teamsters Union—neither the climate nor the opportunity for this kind of legislative suggestions would have existed. The inability of the labor movement to clean its own house completely and thoroughly provides an atmosphere for the kind of debate that will ensue when Congress reconvenes.

The actions of this convention give the union movement greater moral authority to speak out and defend itself, and they will make more difficult the plan of reactionaries to smear successfully the entire labor movement. Nevertheless, the smell of the recent rigged Teamsters convention—the stifling bureaucratic

situation in many other unions—still provides grounds for an excursion into the heretofore sacred area of internal union operation.

There is necessarily much discussion and difference of opinion around this convention as reflected in many discussions of how to meet the new challenge, and what attitude the union movement should have towards these new issues.

Obviously, everyone fears further intervention of the federal government, arguing that labor as a voluntary organization has the right to rule its own house. The trouble is that this is not an effective or persuasive argument in public since the scandals of corruption and racketeering have left the union movement wide open to criticism.

The cynical manipulation of Jimmy Hoffa to gain control of the Teamsters Union has added much fuel to the fire of suspicions which the union movement faces.

And not the least of all, there is an understandable difficulty in proving that the new proposal of secret elections, etc. is wrong, for by itself, this kind of proposal has often been advanced in the union movement by progressive forces.

(Turn to last page)

Teamster Expulsion Leads Way

By GORDON HASKELL

Atlantic City Dec. 7

The expulsion of the Teamsters Union stands as a symbol and proof of the upward road taken by the united labor movement. Only the months ahead will make clear what the long-range organizational consequences of this action will be. But by ousting the Teamsters, the top leadership of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations has demonstrated the kind of labor movement it is intent on building, and has further demonstrated that it has the backing and the power in the united labor movement to proceed toward building it.

Does the expulsion of the Teamsters Union solve the problem of corruption in the American labor movement; or the even deeper problem of the revitalization of its inner democracy; or the many difficult political, economic and social problems which confront it? Of course not. There is no one in or near the labor movement who thinks that any or all of these problems can even begin to be solved by ousting the Teamsters and a few other unions from the AFL-CIO.

But, paradoxically enough, it is also true that at this particular stage in the life of the American labor movement,

failure to act against the Teamsters would have paralyzed the labor movement's action with regard to the rest of its pressing problems for a long time to come.

It is the inability to understand this paradox which has led a number of trade unionists who themselves are untainted by corruption to oppose the expulsion of the Teamsters. And it is likewise a failure to understand the critical nature of this problem which has produced attitudes among American socialists ranging from outright hostility to the expulsion of the Teamsters through all shades of doubt, uneasiness and reluctant acceptance.

The critical character of this particular action by the AFL-CIO was due not so much to the specific benefits which can be expected to follow from the expulsion, as it was to the forces which lined up on each side of the issue.

TWO POINTS OF VIEW

On one side was pretty much everything corrupt, conservative, narrow and parochial in the labor movement. The other side was led by the most progressive and healthy sections of the movement.

On one side was the feeling of unconcern and apathy, of "don't rock the boat" which has been responsible for a good deal of the moral atmosphere which has made the growth of corruption in the labor movement possible. On the other was the determination to act openly and vigorously, to insist that the labor movement begin to face its responsibilities in this field, even if no one could clearly foresee just when and how the battle started by the expulsion of the Teamsters would finally end.

The way in which the point can, perhaps, best be illustrated is to follow the development of the fight just before and during this convention.

As usual, the lineups were not absolutely pure. On the final vote many a union in which the worms of corruption have pretty well honeycombed the organization voted on the side of the angels, while a few unions which are as honest as they come voted for the crooks. But the basic forces, their strategy and intent, were clear enough. And even in the case of the exceptional clean union, the arguments used against the expulsion of the teamsters illustrates the weakness of their position.

In the days preceding the opening of the convention, there were mutterings and rumblings from the building trades unions and others to the effect that if

(Turn to last page)

BAKERY WORKERS

DEMOCRATIC UNIONISM ONLY REAL ANSWER TO CORRUPTION

By GORDON HASKELL

Atlantic City Dec. 9

The fight against racketeering and corrupt practices is moving with a logic of its own to change the American labor movement. It is difficult to believe that the top officers of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations fully realized at the beginning of the process just where it would lead them.

Today, George Meany stood up before the convention and read approvingly the indictment drawn up by a rebel group in the Bakery Workers of the present administration of their union. Although he disavowed any direct connection, backing or encouragement to this group which claims to represent some 50,000 members in the Bakery Workers, in fact he put the moral authority of the AFL-CIO behind them in their fight.

And to the outraged protests of some of the troglodytes who still lead large sections of the movement, that by telling the Bakery Workers that they could not re-elect a crook to be their president and still stay in the AFL-CIO their sacred autonomy was being invaded, Meany replied:

"We are determined to try to keep this organization what it is intended to

be, an instrumentality to serve workers, not an instrumentality to build up the personal affluence of an individual, to make him a big-shot in the community, or to make him an expert on finance, as one of our former members of the Executive Council turned out to be.

"This is a workers' organization, and I don't know anything else about this business. Let's keep it that way."

It would not be true to say that the convention rose to cheer Meany after his speech. The rebel Bakers, sitting in the gallery cheered him to the rafters, and about a third of the convention rose to their feet to applaud him. But when the roll-call vote was taken, only a handful of unions, led by the Typographers, Carpenters and the "radical" Mechanics Educational Society of America voted "no."

The Bakery Workers case was drawn narrowly, like that of the Teamsters, on the issue of the eligibility of the president of the union to remain in his post. In the case of the Bakery Workers, the union agreed to hold a special convention in March, 1958, but it would not agree to eliminate James Cross, their corrupt president, as a candidate.

Cross made his plea to the convention primarily on the grounds that the union

(Turn to last page)

OPPENHEIMER RE-INSTATEMENT DUE IN POST-SPUTNIK ARMS BUILD UP

By MAX MARTIN

The infamous security case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer has arisen from the ashes of the past to haunt the contemporary Age of the Sputnik.

The successful launching of two earth satellites by Russia, and its reputed possession of an inter-continental ballistics missile has triggered off a storm of discussion on the weaknesses and failings of science in this country. Inevitably, this examination has touched upon the role of the witchhunt in the failure of the U.S. to beat the Russians to the punch in developing the missile and the satellite.

The attention of many scientists, journalists and public figures has been refocused upon the witchhunt of scientists, among others, which occurred during the McCarthyite era. Since the Oppenheimer case is a public symbol of that era, it has been disinterred for a troubled re-examination by many people. And increasingly there has been a demand for the reversal of the government decision to deny Oppenheimer security clearance, and to urge his recall to government service.

Nearly four years ago the country was startled by the announcement that Oppenheimer, the outstanding scientist responsible for U. S. leadership in atomic development and the organizer and director of the Los Alamos project, had been tagged a poor security risk and denied all contact with government atomic research.

RAISING OLD CHARGES

The government pointed to Oppenheimer's association with Communists and "Communist causes" some fifteen years earlier as the basis for its action, despite the fact that Oppenheimer's political past had been well-known for years, and despite his having previously been cleared repeatedly after investigation of these associations and connections.

The denial of clearance to Oppenheimer resulted in a public outcry, especially from scientists. The Oppenheimer case was turned over to the Atomic Energy Commission Personnel Security Board headed by Gordon Gray, president of the University of North Caro-

lina. The Gray Board, while finding that Oppenheimer was neither disloyal nor indiscreet, tagged him as a security risk on the basis of his opposition to the H-Bomb crash program prior to its initiation and his lack of enthusiasm for it afterwards.

This decision called forth an avalanche of criticism, not merely from scientists and militant civil-libertarians, but from nearly all liberals and many conservatives. That a man should be dubbed a security risk for his opinions and his lack of enthusiasm struck even luke-warm opponents of McCarthyism as outrageous.

The furor over the majority report of the Gray Board resulted in a review by the AEC itself. The Commission, having learned a lesson from the reaction to the Personnel Security Board decision, declared that "enthusiasm" was not a criteria for security.

A LITTLE FOR EVERYONE

With the exception of one commissioner who branded Oppenheimer as "disloyal," the AEC steered clear of the whole question of loyalty. By a four to one decision, it simply reaffirmed the denial of clearance to Oppenheimer, but on other fudged-up grounds, namely, an alleged lack of forthrightness in Oppenheimer's testimony.

The AEC thereby satisfied everybody. The witchhunters received Oppenheimer's head and the liberals got an implied repudiation of the totalitarian principle which underlay the decision of the Gray Board. Most of the opposition to the witchhunting of Oppenheimer melted away and the whole case pretty much disappeared from public view during the following years, except for an occasional article regretting the Oppenheimer case and sighing over Oppenheimer as a casualty of McCarthy.

Actually, this last conception is not really true. For while the case was in the broad sense a product of McCarthyism, more specifically it represented an instance of the reaction to McCarthyism by the non-McCarthyites. The Truman and Eisenhower administration both were distinguished for their struggle against McCarthyism by meeting it more than half way. They adopted and institutionalized many of McCarthy's anti-democratic proposals, minus the rough edges and "excesses."

What happened in this case was the following: McCarthy had been hinting that he was going to unleash a sensational revelation about a top atomic scientist being a "Red." So, to undercut him, the administration let go at Oppenheimer first.

RE-AWAKENED INTEREST

The re-awakening of interest in the Oppenheimer case has come close to constituting a small-scale campaign for Oppenheimer's vindication and his return to government scientific work.

A number of scientists who are members of the President's Science Advisory Committee, including its chairman, Nobel Prize winner Dr. I. L. Rabi, and Dr. Hans Bethe, have come out for this position. They have been joined by former Air Secretary Thomas K. Finletter, former Under Secretary of the Army Tracy S. Voorhees, and Senator Henry M. Jackson, a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

Most surprising of all, former Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, who was the only member of the AEC to brand Oppenheimer as "disloyal," now favors a review of the case, and stated that he would not be displeased by Oppenheimer's reinstatement. In addition, there have been rumors that the administration is actually considering reopening the question.

This occurs in the context of the more liberal atmosphere which prevails with respect to civil liberties in the country today. Had not McCarthy been personally handed a defeat, had not McCarthyism been sent into decline, and had not the witchhunt in general been considerably weakened, it would be impossible.

Nevertheless, the specific catalyst for this development is not a strengthened

civil-libertarianism. Rather, it is located in the realization by responsible politicians, including responsible witchhunters, that a hysteria over "loyalty and security" hurts America's military program. In fact, the realization that the witchhunt has been self-defeating in so far as the government's cold war needs are concerned has, in general, played a significant role in the decline of the worst features of the witchhunt.

For a long time the United States government based its cold war strategy on the notion that it would obtain and keep a military advantage over Russia through a monopoly on nuclear weapons and missiles. It was believed that Russia would not be able to develop such weapons for a long time, if ever, by itself. Rather Russia would only be able to produce A and H-Bombs, and missiles, by having its spies steal American plans. Hence the emphasis was on secrecy and "security."

SHIFT IN THINKING

When Russia developed the H-Bomb not too long after the U.S. did a reappraisal of this concept began. And when it sent Sputnik aloft and gave indication of possessing an ICBM before the U.S., a complete shift in thinking on these questions got under way.

Significantly, only a few crackpots explained the Russian successes by screaming about spies. On the whole, the prevalent view was that the U.S. had underestimated Russian scientific and technical development. Increasingly the view has been pronounced that the United States has little, if anything, to hide from the Russians in the way of scientific and technical knowledge.

Former AEC Commissioner Murray reflected the new, post-Sputnik attitude by proposing that the U.S. end its atomic secrecy and share atomic information and weapons with its allies. In the past, the view that they would then leak out to Russia was the major argument offered against such proposals.

Along with the feeling that there is less need to worry about "security," there has developed a feeling that witchhunting among scientists hampered their work and produced a general distrust of scientists and science in the country, one of the factors being held responsible for Russia's triumph over the U.S. in the missiles field.

If a vindication of Oppenheimer results from the current trends it will, of course, constitute a victory for civil liberties and will deserve hailing by all democrats. What will be regrettable, however, is the fact that it will result not so much from a concern with democracy, as from a desire to further the armaments race.

New Perspectives for American Socialism

The Case for Unity

Introduction by
Max Shachtman

ten cents

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

114 West 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

LABOR ACTION • 18th YEAR

December 16, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 39

Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: GORDON HASKELL
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON
Business Manager: Mel Stack

Editorial Board:

GORDON HASKELL
HERMAN BENSON

MAX MARTIN
SAM BOTTONO

CROSS CURRENTS

American Forum Debates Socialism and Democracy

The long-heralded "Conference on America's Future in the Age of Automation and Atomic Energy" organized by the American Forum-for Socialist Education was held in New York on December 7.

Under the announced purpose, the conference was divided up into three panels: trade union problems, youth problems, cultural problems. Aside from these, 2 separate panels were set up: one on "Socialism and democracy," the other on "political action."

The greatest interest in the entire conference was, quite naturally, in the socialism and democracy discussion. Participants in this panel were John L. Lewine, Farrel Dobbs of the SWP, Steve Nelson of the CP, Dave Dellinger of Liberation and Prof. Frederick Shuman of Williams College. The moderator was Russell Johnson of the Quakers.

Rather than giving the speakers an opportunity to make an opening presentation of their point of view, questions were asked. On the whole the questions were pointed and would have provided a format for an interesting and provocative discussion on this vital question.

But the panel as a whole fell far short of the challenge. There is little doubt that everyone would come out for "democracy." Who but extreme right-wing reactionaries would speak out against it? The problem, then, is how to relate it to politics as it actually exists today, and to the questions facing socialists, that is to make it the content of socialist politics.

A DEMOCRATIC STANDARD

Measured against this standard, only Lewine, an SPER although not representing the SP-SDF, approached the problem from the point of view of a democratic socialist. Not only did he state that socialism and democracy are intertwined but he spoke out forthrightly for the democratic rights of free speech and right to form parties in a socialist society.

Leaving aside Dellinger who is an anarchist and Schuman who spoke from a pro-capitalist point of view, the other two speakers, Dobbs and Nelson, left large areas of ambiguity in their positions.

Nelson's main emphasis was that "socialism" in Russia and in the U.S. will be different; each will travel its own road; therefore let's leave the other countries to find its own road.

In the U.S., he said, "socialism" will be more democratic, there may be many parties in power. At any rate it will not be the "classical form of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

However, when we remember that none of the Stalinist regimes in East Europe or China are considered by the Stalinists themselves to be the "classical form," Nelson's answer leaves great gapping holes of doubt.

Dobbs seemed mainly concerned to prove that socialism is better than capitalism, that capitalist democracy is limited, that Russia is not socialist because there is no social equality but it is a worker's state and a progressive society, because of nationalized property. This latter distinction confused Nelson who accused Dobbs of believing that a new class society exists in Russia.

However, when Johnson raised the question to "Marxists" as to their attitude toward the dictatorship of the proletariat and the existence of more than one party, Dobbs directed his attention toward other and less important aspects of the discussion.

Schuman at one point raised an important question: what historical evidence can be offered to support the position that nationalized property makes for democracy? But all of the other speakers managed to miss the point or to ramble on in a tangential fashion. Dobbs was the only one to attempt to offer historical evidence. He said, "Sputnik."

Although this is a bare outline of the discussion, it is no more barer than the content of most of the discussion. If the purpose of the AFSE is, as A. J. Muste stated, to introduce "civil liberties" among radical tendencies, it did little more. This conference proved that they will speak at each other, but not with each other. S. B.

JULIUS SCHAEFFER

Sad news reached us from Streator, Illinois, that Julius Schaefer, one of America's veteran socialists and long-time member of our movement, has died. At the age of eighty-three "Jake" was the oldest member of the organization and until his very recent illness remained an active socialist, just as he had devoted his entire life to the ideal of his youth.

Although born in Germany, comrade Schaefer had lived in the United States for seventy years. He experienced in a personal way the evolution of the labor and socialist movement from its beginnings, knew the hope of the movement in its periods of progress and growth, and the sadness of its decline and stagnation. Throughout these different periods, particular today when the movement for socialism seeks new beginnings, Jake never once lost his faith or hope in the free world of the socialist commonwealth.

He was a retired glass blower, but before then, and for many decades he was a well-known socialist worker in Streator and the surrounding that town. Everybody knew warm-hearted and congenial Schaefer who spent so much time trying to make socialists of his fellow workers, and especially the youth. He was never without LABOR ACTION or other socialist literature; he never ceased trying.

With his friends in Streator and throughout the country we are going to miss Julius Schaefer—socialist worker and comrade.

Portrait of the Department of "Justice" at Work

Attorney-General's Puppet Upholds Listing of ISL

By ALBERT GATES

More than a year since the close of the hearing granted to the ISL by the Attorney General's office, Hearing Officer Morrissey presented his Recommendation that the Organizations (Workers Party, Socialist Youth League and Independent Socialist League) be retained on the Attorney-General's List. This was not unexpected, as readers of LABOR ACTION know.

The hearings were held after endless efforts to force them from a reluctant Department of Justice. They came only after the nation-wide revulsion to McCarthyism, and as a test of an administrative act committed in secret and then announced publicly without notice to the Organizations. Together with the Workers Defense League and our attorneys Joseph L. Rauh and Isaac N. Groner, a legal challenge was made to the Attorney General's "List of Subversive Organizations" itself.

Such a legal test could not be made prior to utilizing all Administrative procedures and exhausting them to the end. That point is fast approaching; it will be concluded with the filing of a brief in reply to Morrissey's recommendation and the final decision of the Attorney General. In these hearings a government department appoints its own hearing officer to review its own decision and recommend how its chief officer should account for his own acts.

A PREJUDGED RECOMMENDATION

The Hearing Officer acted exactly as was foretold at the time the hearings began in 1955 when, after the futile attempts to obtain some standards of judgment and rulings on elementary procedures, Rauh unsuccessfully moved that the Attorney General remove Mr. Morrissey on the grounds of bias and prejudice. The subsequent record of over 3000 pages emphasized the justification for that demand and the Recommendation is the final proof of it.

In theory, the Hearing Officer has the task of taking into account the basic positions of the Attorney General and the Organizations as to what they intend to prove in the hearing. He has to take into account the witnesses for both sides, their number, their demeanor and the material presented. Finally, he has to consider the weight of the objective evidence, in addition to witnesses, before making his judgment.

Morrissey was cognizant of this, for he had to take into account, for example, the witnesses in the case and point out that the Government had only two witnesses, Prof. Robinson and James Burnham, while the Organizations produced seven. And it was not for lack of trying that the Government only had two witnesses.

However, Morrissey overcame the disproportion in witnesses by asserting the superior public positions and the evidence of the two government witnesses against the seven Organization witnesses on the ground that the former were objective, knowledgeable and unbiased, whereas Norman Thomas and Harry Fleischman, former Secretary of the Socialist Party, were not members of the ISL (!) and did not know much about it. Dwight Macdonald was dismissed because he was once a member of the Workers Party; the other witnesses, principally Shachtman and Widick, were self-interested witnesses.

IGNORES SOCIALIST WITNESSES

What about Daniel Bell? He was one of the important witnesses in the case, a man of high professional standing in the field of study of labor and socialist movements. Aside from a passing nod to a single reference by him on the historical antecedents of some of the leaders of the ISL, there is not another reference to his testimony on the theory, politics and history of the Organization.

The Government set itself up as the arbiter of socialist theory and practice; it determined the historical role of Marx and Engels as the founders of scientific socialism, as well as the meaning of socialist history. Such a series of pre-judgments, accepted in advance by the Hearing Officer, served as his theoretical guide in the writing of his "decision." Whatever the Organizations had to say about theoretical, historical and political questions was ignored or not even listened to. Only the views of the Attorney General, Professor Robinson and the turncoat James Burnham served him as "evidence." (See box below.)

Morrissey devoted considerable space to the question of "Antecedents and Formation of the Organizations." The point of all this was to establish "the nature and character of the Organizations, their sources, background and genesis. To trace these roots the political orientation and activities of certain individuals were examined, particularly those of Max Shachtman, one of the organizers and a principal officer of the Workers Party and of the Independent Socialist League."

The record established that Shachtman belonged to the Workers Council in 1920, thereafter was successively a member of the Communist Party, Communist League of America, Workers Party of 1934, Socialist Party, Socialist Workers Party, Workers Party and ISL. But what does this prove? That the Communist roots of the Workers Party and ISL were established in 1920? Historical events, political changes and evolution of organizations during the past thirty-seven years completely escaped the Hearing Officer, as it did the Justice Department and its notorious expert on radicalism, J. Edgar Hoover.

ONLY ANTECEDENTS CONSIDERED

Despite the enormous amount of informative material in the record, the Recommendation ignores what is new and different about the WP and the ISL. Only antecedents are considered although the charges against the antecedents of the Organizations have yet to be proved.

However, it does not follow, in fact or legally, that whatever may be said about an antecedent organiza-

NEW DEFINITIONS

An example of how the government presumes to act as the official authority on the theory of socialism appears in the Recommendation in a footnote on the meaning of socialism. It says:

"Socialism is a political and economic theory of socialist organizations based on collective or government ownership of the essential means for the production and distribution of goods. To attain this end there have been and are parties which advocated and advocate the arrival of this end by education, the use of the ballot and other parliamentary means, and the conduct of government by such parliamentary means in the management of the means of production and distribution. Socialism in this sense contemplates a reform of the capitalism system and a continuation of that system." This is, at best, a hodge-podge of ideas. We know of no socialist who believes that socialism means a "reform of the capitalist system and a continuation of that system."

The government has a subtle and diabolic aim here: It is perfectly all right to be a socialist if by socialism you merely want to reform it, but continue the system nevertheless. That's all right; that is legal. But if you want to change the capitalist system, abolish it and substitute for it the new socialist system, no matter by what means you are subversive by definition.

tion applies to a subsequent one. The fact that of the major WP and ISL leadership only two were members of the CP (expelled from it in 1928!), that a large part of the leadership came from the Socialist Party and Young People's Socialist League and made up a part of the heritage of the new movement, is entirely ignored. Mr. Morrissey imposes the lineage of part of the leadership of the movement upon all!

A large part of the Recommendation consists of reference to the testimony of "experts" Professor Robinson and James Burnham. For two and a half days Professor Robinson read quotations from numerous volumes of Lenin's selected works. The quotations had, of course, nothing whatever to do with the ISL, the WP or SYL. They dealt with Russian questions largely, or inner-party matters, the struggles of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in Russia, the Russian Revolution, and so on. Much of the material had only a historical interest and value. Little or none of it had a reference to our times or the United States.

Robinson admitted on the stand that he had never heard of the ISL, WP or SYL; that he knew nothing of their positions or program and was unfamiliar with their activities. When asked if he knew any Leninist organizations in the United States, he replied that he

did not. Asked what the attitude of a Leninist organization would have been toward the Stalinist coup in Czechoslovakia, he replied that it would have supported it. Asked again, if an organization would be Leninist if it had opposed the coup, he answered no.

LUNATIC FRINGE McCARTHYITE

The second and final Government witness was the reprehensible Burnham. A member of the "lunatic fringe" of the McCarthyites assembled around the magazine, National Review, Burnham was excoriated on the stand under cross-examination as a downright liar, a person who was ready to employ any and all means against an "enemy" in political struggles. Moreover, it was established that Burnham knew little or nothing about the Organizations which he helped to found in 1940. In the decade and a half since he departed he admitted he was unacquainted with their policies and activities and that he seldom if ever saw, let alone read, their literature.

Although Morrissey acknowledged that Burnham's testimony "while tinged with some bitterness against the Organizations, he, nevertheless, impressed the Hearing Officer as straightforward and honest."

One of the important disputes in the Hearings was over the "standard" of communism with a big "C" or little "c." The government contended that it did not charge the Organizations with being big "C" Communists. Yet Mr. Morrissey writes in his Recommendation that:

"The definition of communism established by Robinson included all parties which accept as part of their major doctrine the doctrine of Lenin."

REFUSES TO DEFINE COMMUNIST

It goes without saying that Robinson "established" nothing of the kind. He merely asserted or implied. In accepting Robinson's testimony, Leninist doctrine is made the central feature of the Government's case and it should have charged and sought to prove that the Organizations were big "C" Communist. Actually, in Robinson's definition of the Leninist organization, he meant, clearly and unambiguously, the Communist Party and its world affiliates. But it just didn't have the courage to do so on the basis of its own definitions.

A large part of the Recommendation refers to the activities of the Organizations confined for the most part to the activities of the 1940's. Imagine, the Organizations were active in the labor movement; they advocated that labor rescind the no-strike pledge and to get off the War Labor Board. They were active in youth work and were interested in the Negro question. They were against the Korean War.

All of these things, in the mind of the Government and its Hearing Officer constituted subversion and cause for alarm. As if this is not enough for its purposes, the Recommendation contains a downright misrepresentation of the position of the WP on the war draft in the 1940's.

Although opposed to the draft, once it became law, the WP and SYL took the position that their members must obey the law if drafted, must serve along with and side by side with their generation of fellow soldiers. From this the Recommendation concluded:

"The reason for this was not to help the United States at war but that it was of no practical use to the Organizations to have their members imprisoned or held up to scorn as draft evaders; on the other hand, these members while performing a distasteful duty, would be learning the military sciences which might be useful to the working class if ever it acquired an army of its own."

FAIR HEARING REFUSED

Little wonder, then, that the Recommendation, on the basis of such evidence, concluded: "It is found that the Organizations were, and are, communistic, in the sense intended by the Executive Order, and that they have adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence and seek to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means."

Where, when and how? That is precisely what the hearing did not and could not establish. But, as we have already pointed out, the Recommendation has little or no reference to the hearing. When it was presented, Rauh and Groner requested the opportunity to present oral argument to the Attorney General before he acts upon the Recommendation of his appointed Hearing Officer.

This request was denied by the Attorney General. In its place, he has given permission to our attorneys to file a written brief in reply to the Recommendation of Mr. Morrissey. The reply to the letter of permission states the position of the Organizations as succinctly as possible and presents the fitting commentary on the hearings in general. On the date of December 2, Rauh and Groner replied to the Attorney General:

"The arbitrary refusal to grant us oral argument means that this matter has been predetermined and prejudged. There is no real point to the submission of exceptions and a supporting brief. They will be given no more attention or consideration than our request for oral argument.

"Nevertheless, the theoretical possibility that justice will be done, and the willingness of the organizations to take advantage of any and all of the very few and always begrudging opportunities which they have had to present their case, induce us to accept the permission granted in the letter (of the Attorney General's office)."

NEW YORK LABOR ACTION FORUM

Thursday, December 19

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES:

His Work and Influence

Speaker: STAN GREY

Thursday, December 26

THE FUTURE OF LABOR UNITY:

A Report on the AFL-CIO Convention

Speaker: GORDON HASKELL,

Editor, LABOR ACTION

Tuesday, December 31

NEW YEAR'S PARTY

Thursday, January 2, 1958

SPUTNICK AND THE ROLE OF AMERICAN SCIENCE

Speaker: OSCAR FINE

8:30 P.M.

L. A. HALL

114 W. 14 ST.

Teamster Expulsion Leads —

(Continued from page 1)

the Teamsters were expelled, they would walk out of the AFL-CIO too. In part, they tried to cover their hostility to the idea of the head-on attack on the strongest bastion of corruption in the labor movement planned by its Meany-Reuther wing under a cloak of jurisdictional pettyfogging. In part, they took their stand on the traditional grounds of union autonomy.

But the real basis of their opposition was different. They had never really been for the unity. They regard the big industrial unions with undisguised hostility and suspicion. They feel far more comfortable and at home with crooks like Hoffa, whose methods of union operation are very close to theirs, than they do with men like Reuther and the kind of unionism he represents.

The rumblings of revolt at the convention of the Building and Construction Trades Department were squashed by Meany with ease. To be sure, he was given an unanticipated assist by the idiotic proposal of a one-year wage-freeze put forth by the Department's president at the beginning of its convention. But the fact is that even without this exhibition of benightedness which Meany was able to exploit, there was no really solid foundation to the revolt.

On the floor of the convention itself, opposition to the expulsion was voiced chiefly by union leaders who represent organizations which are as free from racketeering as any. Aside from Teamster leaders Mohn and English, the chief burden of the debate was carried by Randolph of the International Typographical Union. As a matter of fact, the presentation of the anti-expulsion case by men like Randolph and Gorman of the Meatcutters was calculated to create a decent union - can-get-on-the-bandwagon psychology. This strategy failed.

Randolph's speech had three main themes. The AFL-CIO Executive Council was arrogating dictatorial powers to itself by promulgating its various ethical and democratic practices codes; and seeking to "impose" them on the whole movement.

Secondly, it was violating the autonomy of the internationals by this action, and the AFL-CIO constitution to boot. They were exposing the whole union movement to government control and intervention by "keeping in the public eye" the issue of corruption.

And finally, the job of democratization of the unions would have to be done by the rank and file from below.

On the various ethical codes, Randolph said:

SPECIOUS ARGUMENTS

"Now I call to your attention that the scope of these codes is not only wide; I say it is complete in its attempt to control the internal affairs of the International Unions and National Unions. It is a complete reversal of the basic and fundamental right of International Unions to control their own internal affairs as is indicated in the law which they sought to implement, and instead of implementing it they reversed it entirely and undertook to set up a dictatorship of 30 men over the American labor movement that you will never get out of if you adopt it here."

At the end of his speech, Randolph gave voice to the kind of reasoning which is the strongest bait for many sincere liberals, militants and socialists on this question. That is the "from below" argument. He said:

"The point is this, that any reformation that can last at all in any circumstances where reformation is needed, that reformation will have to come from the bottom and not from a mandate at the top that will skim off a few crooks, allowing opportunity for more crooks to grow up underneath it. Unless you do that, unless you go from the bottom then you have to divide up the thirty men, and they can't possibly take care of it, where each one will be supervising a lot of unions to try to get them to live up to an ethical practices code that you never adopted."

NO REAL ALTERNATIVE

This argument went hand-in-hand with the "why punish a million and a half Teamsters for the crimes of a few men" one. It also was unaccompanied, either in

the speech of Randolph, or in any other, buy a suggestion, let alone a program, of what the labor movement as such could or should do about corruption.

The whole flavor, the whole logic of their position was to imply, or to state openly, that neither corruption nor dictatorship in the internationals was any business of the convention or the AFL-CIO as such, and that they should let it alone just as they have always done until that bright and shining day when the ranks rise up and wipe it out.

At the convention itself, Meany devoted most of his time answering the argument made by Gorman of the Meatcutters, and others that the action of the leadership had been too hasty, and that they should give the Teamsters more time to put their house in order. A number of union leaders had indicated they would vote against the expulsion solely on these grounds.

But he had answered the argument about penalizing the many for the sins of the few in his speech before the Building and Construction Trades conference this way:

SUPPORT TO RANK AND FILE

"A lot of well meaning people say from time to time: 'why punish the members of a union by putting them out because of the sins of a few individuals?' Well, that is a reasonable sort of question. But I ask people who take that position, 'What is the alternative?' And they cannot come up with any reasonable, logical answer because there is no reasonable, logical answer. The alternative is unthinkable, and that is to compromise; place the seal of approval, give a victory to these people who are corrupt, who have misused the union's money, used it for their own purpose, diverted it for all sorts of activities, who have given no indication at all of any concern for the welfare of the membership except to get their dues in the till and then do as they like with it."

And he is right. That is the only realistic alternative which has been "presented" by the opposition of all stripes to the expulsion even in those instances where it is connected with talk about

"democracy from the bottom up."

It is not that the only alternatives are expulsion or compromise, generally and abstractly speaking. The AFL-CIO could help to organize a fight for democracy and against racketeering throughout the movement, or could give aid and comfort to struggles put up by rank and file groupings in the unions. As a matter of fact, one of the implications of the adoption of ethical and democratic practices codes is that the union movement stands, morally at least, behind such struggles.

But the arguments advanced by Randolph, and in a more sophisticated way by some socialists, against the "centralization" of power in the labor movement involved in the promulgation of these codes is an argument, as well, against that kind of "intervention" too.

As a matter of fact, the weakness in the Meany-Reuther position is that they have not been able to offer the labor movement a very clear idea of how the fight against corruption is going to proceed from here on.

NEEDED: PLAN OF ACTION

In order to mobilize the maximum forces for the crucial symbolic act against the Teamsters, and in their effort to shut off the various phony loopholes and cracks through which Hoffa had his boys were trying to squirm out of their quagmire, they had narrowed the issue virtually down to the single demand that Hoffa resign. While this was adequate for their immediate purpose of taking a clear-cut stand, it did not mobilize the movement behind any particular idea or plan of action on the corruption problem in general.

That will have to evolve in time, and it is the business of all the progressive and militant forces in the labor movement to help develop it. They should not be frightened off or deterred by fears of the possible long-range effects of centralization in the labor movement; or seduced by arguments, about letting the rank and file do it, which are divorced from any actual movement or program for rank and file action.

The labor movement has taken the first big step against its greatest internal enemy. Not all its steps in the future will be as firm as this one, and they will not all be in the right direction. The worst mistake that socialists and progressives in the labor movement could make at this moment, however, would be to become confused and disoriented about the meaning of the first steps the labor movement is taking.

New Danger —

(Continued from page 1)

What unions, for example, would be affected by a law saying that secret, democratic elections at least once in four years had to be held. Not the UAW? Not many other unions where democracy in one degree or another exists. It would make for a revolution in the Teamsters union, however, and some other unions whose activities are under the scrutiny of the McClellan committee.

These considerations, among others, have served to slant the approach of the Meany-Reuther forces on this difficult question, and to take the tack of trying to put through their kind of laws, rather than those proposed by the Eisenhower administration.

There is a very understandable division of opinion in all circles at the convention on this question, with the exception of the outright apologists of the Hoffa machine. For them, the slogan "let the labor movement alone," means in practice let the Hoffas alone.

In the context of the present political climate this will hardly suffice as an effective answer. Here is a question which merits attention and discussion in the ranks of the socialist movement.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

The Marxist review for serious students of social issues

50 cents

\$2 a year

Only Answer to Corruption —

(Continued from page 1)

was willing to hold a fair and square election to a convention, but that it would not stand for "dictation" from the AFL-CIO on who could run in such an election. The only part of his socialist education which showed through was the cleverness with which he was able to give his case the appearance of a democratic issue.

DEMAGOGERY EXPOSED

The only trouble was with an active opposition in his ranks, and with Meany determined to push the clean-up of the labor movement to a decisive issue, he could not hide the reality behind his demagoguery.

"He gives the picture of one who wants a fair deal," Meany told the convention, "and he wants the thing determined by democratic process. Well, let's see what is going on."

"In recent days nine of the organizers have been fired in that International Union. Four more have been threatened. Local unions have been subjected to retaliatory action by Cross because they voted to support the Integrity Committee [the name of the opposition caucus]. Of course, this may be democratic, this may make for a nice open convention, but I can't see it. I imagine if we let this fellow go until the 15th of March he will be elected unanimously by the convention."

RANK AND FILE TERRORIZED

For ten or fifteen minutes Meany spread on the record, in detail, the story of the brutal and dictatorial measures the Cross administration was using to crush the rebellion, citing names, places and dates. And he summarized:

"These are the things that are going on, and it is quite obvious that one of

two things is going to happen. Either these people are going to be beaten into submission by the power of this International office, by using all the methods that this man's mind can devise, or we are going to have a split organization. . . .

"Then we are requested to let our members make their decisions without the club of expulsion hanging over their heads. What about the club of reprisal? What about the club of discharge of people who have worked for the Union for many years? What about the clubs over the heads of the members who are going to be merged into other organizations, their unions broken up? What about the club over their heads indicating the possible loss of their benefit rights under welfare and pension plans."

This is not the first time, of course, that an opposition in a union has been suppressed by arbitrary bureaucratic measures. Many of the delegates sitting in the convention, and many of the men comprising the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO have used the power of their office to penalize or crush opponents in the labor movement in the past, and there is no reason to believe that it will not happen again.

But in this situation, the whole labor movement is being given a lesson in the indissoluble link between corruption and the crushing of democratic processes in the unions. And the forthright support given by Meany to the rebels in the Bakery Workers points clearly to the real long-range solution to the problem of corruption.

The convention voted overwhelmingly to authorize the Executive Council to expel the Bakery Workers unless they take "immediate steps . . . to eliminate corrupt influences . . . and to bar from international union office those responsible for the abuses, and, to the satisfaction of the Executive Council, complete

such steps, not later than March 15, 1958."

The question will no doubt be raised: if the relatively small Bakery Workers can be granted a grace period in which to clean up, why were all attempts by Hoffa to get a deal by which he would be given "time to eliminate the worst abuses" rebuffed, when such a large union was involved.

The answer is obvious. The Bakery workers are willing to hold a special convention for the purpose of complying with AFL-CIO clean-up directives. Under the circumstances, the election is bound to be held under the closest union and public scrutiny. If the Bakers can ever hope to hold a democratic convention, this should be it.

In the case of the Teamsters, they had just held a convention which was brazenly rigged and which contemptuously rejected the urging AFL-CIO's Ethical Practices Committee's report on the crimes and skulduggery of its officers. They had taken absolutely no first or minimal steps to begin any action against even such convicted criminals as Vice-President Brennan.

ONLY THE FIRST STEP

George Meany made it perfectly clear that he did not believe, from his experience with Cross, that the latter has any intention of complying with the convention's decision. "If it is indicated that this group is not going to comply, then the Executive Council, for my part, isn't going to take 90 days to act—they are going to act in about 90 minutes," he concluded his speech. But that will be just the beginning of the fight to give the Bakery Workers a decent and democratic union, and by doing so to raise one step higher the consciousness and self-confidence of the American working class.

1 Sputnik and ICBM Demand a Political Answer But

Only One Weapon Is Banned: A Real Offensive For Peace

This special issue of *Challenge* documents a fact which should be beyond argument: that we desperately need a world-wide offensive for peace.

The potential destruction of civilization is no longer the fantasy of a science fiction writer. It is a conceivable future for the world. And in this situation, the two major power centers, the United States and Russia, both act in an incredible fashion.

In Moscow, Khrushchev announces the literally insane thesis that World War III will result in a Communist victory—as if the pretended superiority of a social system is a defense against ultimate weapons.

In Washington, a government which has been shaken to the very core by the appearance of Sputnik responds by a new crash program—its answer to the problem of peace is to build a stockpile for war.

Sputnik and the Intercontinental Ballistics Missile have only focused a problem which has been with us for a decade: the fact that we need a program, here and now, which can actually wage the fight for peace; the fact that we need a long range vision and actions to go with it, a method, not simply of avoiding im-

mediate holocaust, but of achieving a peaceful world as well.

As an immediate program we propose:

- that the United States, immediately and unilaterally, cease the testing of atomic weapons;

- that the United States give up on the house of cards called NATO, that it withdraw all troops from Europe and demand that the Russians go through with their promise (one should say, bluff) to do the same;

- that the United States embark on a political offensive aimed at aiding the democratic revolutions which are taking place throughout the world; and in particular, a program of massive aid to the nations of the colonial revolution.

These are only the first steps of a much longer process. None of them are "socialist" demands, in the sense that they re-

quire a basic transformation of American society before they can take place. Yet if America would adopt them, that very fact would signify an event of incalculable importance: a political response to the threat of war, a democratic response to the threat of totalitarian Communism.

If, for example, the United States were to cease testing atomic weapons unilaterally, could the Russians continue testing them? We think not.

If, for example, in late October of last year, America had announced the withdrawal of troops from Europe would this have made the Russian slaughter of the Hungarian Revolution infinitely more difficult, perhaps even impossible? We think so.

POLITICAL PROGRAM

If, for example, the United States aided massively in the revolutionary transformation of India into a thriving democracy, would this deal a more telling blow to Communism in Asia than all the paper forces of the Southeastern Asian Treaty Organization put together? Again, we feel that the answer is obvious.

These moves have this in common: that they constitute a political response to

the threat of war, a democratic political response. For us, that must be the core of our policy.

We live in a world of revolutionary transformations, a world in which over a billion people have won their political independence in a breathtakingly short time. Thus far, the American answer has been increasing reliance of military strength and alliances with every reactionary and defender of the status quo on the planet.

This has not only resulted in gains for Communism (the decade of American support to French imperialism in Indochina not only ended in disaster; it had the impact of a recruiting campaign for Asian Communism), but it has threatened the world with a war of unthinkable destructive potentiality.

But, we are told by various defenders of American policy, we are achieving a "balance of terror," a situation in which the very monstrosity of war will act as a factor for peace. Supporters of this view must face two crucial questions.

First, will terror "balance?" We already know, as is documented elsewhere in this issue, that America almost used atomic weapons in Indochina; that it was probably prepared to do so in Jordan; that the official NATO policy is to respond to any kind of an attack with nuclear weapons. In short, we know that the "balance" of terror is a precarious thing, an unstable thing, and that just one slip means a plunge into an abyss of destruction. But even if this argument is assumed to be unconvincing, a second question remains.

FUTURE ON THE BRINK

Once this "balance" of terror is attained (if it can be, which is dubious), what then? Is the world condemned to an indefinite future on the brink of extinction? Or isn't it true that even the theorists of a balancing terror must think in terms of non-military alternatives?

These ideas are, obviously enough, radical. But so is the situation. And the response of American society today is tragically inadequate. Official liberalism has adopted the line of the crash program. It has abandoned its old emphasis upon aid programs. It now lines up with the redoubtable Dean Acheson who calls for a belt-tightening for defense, i.e., a huge military effort whose cost is to be borne by the great mass of the people even while the corporations grow richer in the doing.

On the other hand, one section of American liberalism is groping toward a political response. But it has yet to formulate a clear program, even though its instinctive reaction is all to the good. It is to these people in particular that we must now address a more basic analysis.

The threat of war in the world today is not the function of evil conspirators in the two major camps—an invention of Wall Street plotters or of Kremlin subverters. Rather, it comes from far-reaching social and political causes.

American capitalism seeks to organize the world its way, i.e., the capitalist way. Because of this, its allies are, to say the least, limited. What can such a policy say to the masses of the colonial revolution, that restless surge of the millions which everywhere is battering

2 "Know Your Enemy"—Some Facts and Figures About Horror

The H-Bombs are Over America Now

As this article is being written—and at the moment when it is read—there are bombers of the Strategic Air Command in the United States and throughout the world, armed with hydrogen bombs, ready to take off in fifteen minutes. That is the official Government policy as announced by the Defense Department and reported in the New York Times on November 19, 1957.

For some time now, it has been the stated policy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) that any Russian attack upon Europe, even if with conventional weapons, will be met by American nuclear counterattack.

At the time of the crisis over possible American participation in the Indochinese war, there was a faction in the Pentagon, headed by Admiral Radford, which was for nuclear intervention.

And in 1957, when the American fleet in the Mediterranean maneuvered in support of the monarchy in Jordan, planes were at the ready with nuclear weapons.

These arms, some say, are like poison gas: their very effectiveness guarantees that they will not be used. Yet we already know that we are on the brink of using them, that the SAC bombers are, at this instant, prepared to launch H Bomb raids, that NATO will respond to any attack with such a strategy, that high officials in the American Government have demonstrated their readiness to use atomic weapons in localized "brush-fire" wars. World War III, if it comes, will be a total war. We now know that beyond any doubt. And we can assemble a picture of what this means, both today in terms of the effect of radia-

tion through fallout, and tomorrow in an actual war.

This article is a brief, sketchy presentation of the known facts. It is dedicated to the proposition that we must know the Enemy—the enemy of all mankind, American, Russian, the enemy of all of us.

We know that "Any radiation is genetically undesirable since any radiation induces harmful mutations." That is from the Summary Reports of the National Academy of Sciences. Any radiation is harmful. But then, consider this statement by Albert Schweitzer on April 23, 1957: "What this storing of radioactive material implies is clearly demonstrated by the observations made when, at one occasion, the radioactivity of the Columbia River in North America was analyzed. The radioactivity was caused by the atomic plants at Hanford which produce energy for industrial purposes, and which empty their waste water into the river.

"ANY RADIATION"

"The radioactivity of the river water was insignificant. But the radioactivity of the river plankton was 2,000 times higher, that of the ducks eating the plankton, 40,000 times higher, that of the fish 150,000 times higher. In young swallows fed on insects caught by their parents in the river, the radioactivity was 500,000 times higher and in the egg yolks of water birds more than 1,000,000 times higher."

Or, there are the figures of the Federation of Atomic Scientists. Today, the level of Strontium 90 in the human sys-

tem is 0.12 micro-microcuries per gram of calcium. That is fairly well below the level that is now thought to be harmful (keeping in mind the National Academy of Sciences statement that any increase is bad). But if we look at children today, we discover that the level of Strontium 90 is three or four times the average. And if bomb tests continue at their present rate, in twelve years, the Strontium 90 ratio will rise from its 0.12 to a figure somewhere between 4 and 8, that is a percentage increase of around 5000 per cent.

But there is still more evidence. Writing in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, A. Lacassagne, Chef de Service of the Institute Pasteur in Paris, had this to say: "... geneticists are justified in raising an alarm over the danger that a notable increase in general radioactivity might bring about for all living species, including the human race. . . . If this is true (as many radiobiologists admit), then the increase in the frequency of cancer will be accentuated in the future as the result of an ever growing number of cancers caused by radiations."

Yet, the facts are not all in the realm of the future. In a brilliant article by Paul Jacobs in the May 16, 1957 Reporter, it was indicated that one child, Martin Bardoli, may have died from leukemia as a result of radiation. This child had the misfortune to live in Warm Springs, Nevada, near the test site. The Atomic Energy Commission denies that the tests had anything to do with his death, but as Jacobs points out, the AEC does not

(Continued on page 4-C)

(Continued on page 4-C)

They're Only Kidding with Our Lives

"Civil Defense" Is America's Grisly and Impractical Joke

Civil Defense in the United States is a terrible, grisly, costly joke. This statement can be documented, point by point, from official Government sources.

Before Sputnik and before the Intercontinental Ballistics Missile (ICBM), the Civil Defense set up was already almost totally ineffective. In the mock attack of July 12, 1957, the official estimates were that 50 million people would have been killed and 50 million seriously wounded. This was based upon the assumption that everybody, in the midst of panic of a nuclear attack, followed the Civil Defense instructions to the letter.

The scientist member of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Willard Libby, testified before the Holifield Committee of Congress that the explosion of a Hiroshima-type bomb at 3,000 feet would kill 30 per cent of all humans within its radius even if all of them were protected by a foot of concrete. It should be remembered that in current military parlance, the Hiroshima-type bomb is now a "nominal" weapon, and is considered as effective in tactical (air support to land military operations) strategy.

But—all this was before sputnik and before the ICBM. Now all these amaz-

ing estimates of the total ineffectiveness of Civil Defense must be multiplied a hundred thousand times.

For instance, the United States has poured millions and millions of dollars into two security networks: the Distant Early Warning line (DEW), a radar grid to warn of the approach of enemy planes, and SAGE (the military communications network). Today, these projects can more or less be written off. They are worthless, because they have been made obsolete. Before the announcement of the Russian possession of sputnik and the ICBM, the Holifield Committee was told that both of these defense systems will be obsolete in the case of the ICBM.

The Distant Early Warning system was predicated on the assumption that

it would enable the United States to have a three to four hour warning in the case of enemy air attack. Under present conditions, a foreseeable ICBM attack reduces that margin to three or four minutes, and this only if the missiles are picked up. Under the old conception of the three to four hour warning, it was conceded by the government that the overwhelming majority of the urban inhabitants of the United States could be evacuated. The Holifield Committee—and this, in the good old days before the ICBM—branded the evacuation programs then in operation as weak and ineffective. The committee stated that, under the old conditions, there was no provision for sufficient advance warning. It finally judged the evacuation policy to be "dangerously shortsighted." Note, that these estimations are not from radicals or socialists. They are the work of the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the House on Government Operations of the United States Congress.

CIVIL DEFENSE IS A FARCE

But now, the scandalous inadequacy of Civil Defense of the pre-ICBM era looks like a time of comparative safety. Before the Russians unveiled sputnik (that is, in a period when the official sources continually under-estimated the advance of rocket technology), it was thought that an ICBM could travel from Moscow to Chicago in half an hour.

Today, we are in possession of the fuller truth. Sputnik crosses the United States 7 times a day at a speed of 18,000 miles per hour. It makes the distance between Detroit and Washington in one minute. And, reported the New York Times, "It is said of the forthcoming satellite (the next one) that it can be made not only to vary its proximity to earth but also to open at a given time, release its load, close again and continue on its set course. . . ."

Civil Defense was thus a farce before the advent of ICBM and sputnik. Representative Martin Griffiths of the Government Operations Committee called it "worthless" even in those days and anticipated one hundred million dead in a one night attack.

NO DEFENSE

Today, Griffiths, fears appear to be conceived in optimism. All of the advantages of the Distant Early Warning System and the SAGE network, which were a part of calculations in the "old" days, have been wiped out. These systems, or at least the DEW apparatus, will have a social usefulness equal to that of the pyramids in the near future. They are set up to deal with the old fashioned type of war which was only fought with fire-bombs, "nominal" nuclear weapons (87,000 dead in Hiroshima) and jet aircraft.

In short, Civil Defense as it is presently constituted—all of those exercises, all of that money, the yearly sport of jailing a dozen pacifists or so for non-compliance—is unreal, it is a trick played upon the American people, a boondoggle.

What are the alternatives?

Professor Teller, the atomic scientist who achieved a certain notoriety by attacking Oppenheimer and who has followed this early reputation up by winning renown as one of the most bellicose of American scientists, has long been an advocate of underground shelters. In May of 1957, he discussed the feasibility of building shelters for 1,000 people each. But these were predicated on an assumption as to warning time which is now thoroughly obsolete: Teller's plan would require a fifteen minute warning before attack. That, as we have pointed out, is no longer in the cards. A satellite with directional machinery to dump a hydrogen warhead, or an ICBM, is somewhat more punctual.

But there is still another problem when one speaks of the underground city as the defense to nuclear attack:

cost. The Holifield Committee estimated that it would cost 13 billion dollars to shelter 87 million urban Americans. Paul Steinbecker, Civil Defense Executive in St. Louis, Missouri, pushed that ante up a bit. His figure was \$47,710,000,000 to shelter an urban population. According to Steinbecker, the lower estimates cover Monday to Friday during working hours when city populations are concentrated down town. His calculation was based on actual "protection" twenty four hours a day.

WARNING VANISHES

For these reasons, we can now say that it is empirically, factually demonstrated that there is no Civil Defense. There is a great investment in equipment and plans which are rapidly becoming obsolescent (if they are not already obsolete); there is a great deal of public relations hokum; there are those annual jokes, the Civil Defense Tests—but there is no safety from enemy attack.

So far we have been talking of America. A word is in order about Russia. Nikita Khrushchev, the leader of the Russian Communists, recognizes all these facts with regard to America. But he continues to assert that a third nuclear war will destroy capitalism and leave Communism victorious. And yet, all of the facts and figures which we have cited make it plain that what is involved is the annihilation of the world, or at least of the centers of industry and civilization, Russia included. American military technology may be lagging behind the Russians, but there is no reason to assume that the United States cannot deliver hydrogen warheads to Moscow and Leningrad. Khrushchev's intimation that the "superiority" of his social system will be a defense against American missiles is, in this context, ludicrous.

There is no Civil Defense in America—and there is no Civil Defense in Russia. There is no Civil Defense anywhere in the world.

NO PLACE TO HIDE

In this article, we will not attempt to discuss the kind of response which this situation demands. That is covered elsewhere in this special issue of *Challenge*. Suffice it to be said here, that the facts on military technology and Civil Defense now demonstrate that there is

On March 12, before the era of sputnik and ICBM began, Yal Peterson, Civil Defense Administrator, told a Congressional Committee that 98 per cent of the urban population may be killed in surprise nuclear attack unless there is an enormous shelter program. With the shelter program—his cost estimate was 32 billion dollars—perhaps 60 per cent of the urban population could be saved. But then, the Admiral noted that there would be millions of casualties despite all Civil Defense efforts.

This was in the "old days" before technological developments made all this hopeful talk of saving 60 per cent of the urban population as obsolescent as the entire Civil Defense Program.

no place to hide anywhere on the planet, that the only real defense against a nuclear World War III is . . . peace. In summary:

Government sources, at their optimistic best and before the announcement about sputnik and ICBM, made it plain that the optimism effectiveness of Civil Defense included a figure of one hundred million dead in a single attack—that is, over half of the people of America wiped out.

This had caused an official agency of the government, the Holifield Committee, to brand the whole Civil Defense scheme as "ineffective" the notion of evacuation as "dangerously shortsighted."

Now these are old estimations. The three to four hour warning has disappeared. The three to four minute warning is the reality. The one minute "warning" is a possibility. The non-existent shelters, which will never be built, wouldn't work anyway.

Civil Defense is a grisly joke. There is no place to hide. Not here. Not in Russia. Nowhere.

The Shortage of Scientists

The Crisis In Education Rooted Deep In Our Life

OSCAR FINE

As Sputnik I makes ready to plunge to its fiery death on reentering the atmosphere back here on terra (American Sector), the eggheads and their fellow travellers are emerging from their cellars and filling the air with vigorous and self-righteous cries. If five years ago McCarthy had the public casting wary and hostile glances at the "communist ridden" universities, today that same public is looking to the scientific eggheads to protect them from the evil eye in the sky. It is clear that with the new atmosphere of crash programs many billions will come pouring from Washington in the next period. The various journals are filled with articles by and about scientists, educators etc, in which the overwhelming emphasis is on the need to change the public's attitude toward scientists and basic research; the need to revamp our educational system to turn out massive numbers of scientists; the need to put lots more money into basic research, and catch up with the Russians.

SOCIAL BASIS

Let us put aside for a moment the military flavor of the current panic, and take up the broader social question of the role and status of science in these United States. A strong undercurrent in the flood of articles has been a grudging admiration for the Russians dictatorial freedom from democratic pressures, elections, etc.; and its ability to "get things done." The incomparably greater relative investment of the Russian rulers into education and scientific research of all kinds is undoubtedly done without giving the Russian people any say so. However, if there is one area in which the government there has wide support, it is in just this investment,—though this is not extended to the corresponding huge investment in heavy and war industry as against consumer goods which is responsible for their abominable living standards.

When "Clean H-Bomb" Dr. Teller speaks of the Russian youngsters aspiring to become scientists in the same way that American bobbysoxers dream of becoming movie stars, his comments on the lack inherent in a democracy become ludicrous. The American public's attitude toward scientists and basic research flow not from our democracy, but

from a money and gadget oriented value system that has taken a hundred years to flower.

It is not too qualitatively different from that toward their counterparts in literature, social science and the arts. "Those who can, do. Those who can't teach." Or paint. Or write poetry. Or make theories.

The image of the ineffectual, beglazed and myopic bookworm flows from the deep-rooted adulation of the "successful" man,—the one with the big bank account. The proud mother's boast, "My son is a doctor!", or an engineer, is about his financial standing; certainly not about his great and idealistic contribution to humanity, though this may be tossed out as a conversational gambit. Thus the alienated reaction to the strange individual who isn't particularly interested in money. Thus Einstein's advice to the young man seeking a career in America, "Be a plumber." It is this attitude that discourages young people from a scientific career. Take the easy way to money. Study of science certainly isn't easy. Given a money oriented value system (Marx called it the "cash nexus"), how can government policy modify these attitudes?

What is it that is at the root of the popular distrust of the scientist, the "ineffectual" academician, the "subversive" intellectual? This attitude does not necessarily flow from the capitalist system or from democracy. One need only look at Europe, where the status of the egghead is incomparably superior to that here. But it is historically related to the unbridled development of capitalism in this country, where it was free to create its own traditions and attitudes. In Europe, the mundane bourgeois was only able to wrap and twist a cultural structure that was built on the foundation of centuries. The respect and admiration in wide sectors of the European people for "nobility of mind," the worth of knowl-

(Continued on page 4-C)

5 When Some of Our Liberals Go to War

"Vital Center" Falls Apart As Sputnik Splits the Liberals

By GEORGE POST

The fact that the Russians have successfully launched two earth satellites has succeeded at least in touching off the beginnings of a split in the liberal-Democratic Party ranks, between the orthodox cold-war liberals and party loyalists, and the more advanced Left Liberals. While this split has by no means been consciously understood nor has it, of course, been consummated, the fact that it is beginning is encouraging.

And what is of major interest is to observe the complete vacuousness, cheap opportunism, and inability to pose a real alternative of the orthodox cold-war liberals.

It must first be stated bluntly and baldly that the leading circles of American capitalism, both the right-wing of Wilson and Dulles, and the "left-wing" of the orthodox cold-war liberals and Democratic Party leaders, have displayed their own inability to meet the challenge of Russian totalitarianism. They are the directors of a capitalist system whose ability for imaginative thinking and action is becoming for the most part, only a thing of the historical past. The orthodox liberal press displays this same intellectual and political *malaise* in its "response" to the launching of sputnik and muttnik. While Dulles fulminates about "to the brink of war," "liberation," and "massive retaliation," what imaginative and adequate solutions and policies do the orthodox liberals offer?

LIBERALS MOVE RIGHT

The *New Republic* has followed the policy of, on the one hand, opposing a military-foreign policy based "exclusively" on the hydrogen and atomic bombs because such a policy would mean that "small wars" and Korean-like "police measures" would no longer be possible, that the United States would be unable to wage anything but global atomic war. On the other hand they are for a wide array of "tactical" arms, from the development of the various missiles, operational, of course, to "small" "tactical" nuclear weapons. The program that they have supported has been essentially that proposed last spring by a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee headed by Senator Stuart Symington. This program has two major differences, only one real, from that of a reliance upon the hydrogen bomb—it is the more expensive program, the Democrats being distinguished from the Republicans by their willingness to spend more money, and it is supposedly "less dangerous."

In this spirit, in September of this year, the *New Republic* belittled the achievements of the Russian's successful test of the first Inter Continental Ballistic Missile. They were worried about the possible propaganda victory for the Russians and they were worried that "the announcement (by the Russians) may stir Congress to insist upon further distortion of our defense programs in the direction of exclusive dependence upon the "deterrence of threatened total war." On October 7, they again returned to the theme and opposed "deterrence," "brinkmanship," and "nuclear war." They favored "... a national strategy that is more moderate and modest than deterrence," although they did not specify of what such a strategy would consist.

RUNNING VERY SCARED

And then sputnik hit and without missing a step and without realizing that they had turned in another direction, the *New Republicans* (differing from the Eisenhower Republicans only by the fact that they voted for Democrats with the same program as Eisenhower) demanded the "kind of defense we need, regardless of cost," and attacked the Republican administration and Eisenhower and the Bureau of the Budget for their unwillingness to spend the kind of money needed in the cold war. The next week they mused about the need for a reaction to sputnik but did not really specify what kind of reaction. Then Laika-the-Space-Dog was sent off on his fatal journey into outer space

and the floodgates of hysteria on the *New Republic* were let down. No more discussions of "a national strategy that is more moderate and modest than deterrence" but rather the excited cry, in the November 4th issue, "We must run scared because it is the only way we can put up a respectable race." And then they went on to extoll the virtues of spending and more spending, appealing to the Holy Spirit of the first Atomic Bomb.

From the *New Republic* we move to its slicker and more widely read rival, *The Reporter*. Here the array of profundities dished out by publisher Max Ascoli is staggering. On September 19, 1957, Ascoli comments upon the first announcement of the Russian ICBM. His comment falls in the category of "If You Have Nothing Else to Say, Blame it on the Tribal Scapegoat, Eisenhower." He wrote:

"But it is not reassuring to think that, at best, the game will go on indefinitely, with bigger and bigger chips thrown on the table—a game that we started and from which we cannot conceivably drop out. Moreover, it is exactly at this time that the institution designed for the supreme guidance of our country—the Presidency—is being put in mothballs." Thus the article ends, having pointed to the Cause of Evil and thereby avoiding all analysis or thought.

And then Ascoli heard the Voice of Sputnik beep-beeping throughout the land. And the *Reporter* responded with the same hysteria, the same demand for more spending on arms development, and the same kind of meaningless, exhortatory prose as the *New Republic*. On October 31, Ascoli in an essay of muddled hysteria titled "Thank You Sputnik" declared, "It is good to know that the effort required of our nation is a definite one, and that every day, every hour, counts." He too was running scared and he too was calling for a national tightening of the belts in order to spend more on the development of ballistics missiles and the whole range of arms. He ended the essay with the following bit of jargon "... leaders of tomorrow, irrespective of party, must be sought out and given the chance to become known and experienced so that we may emerge from the present peril and the present rut. We have been jolted hard, and that is very good indeed, for nobody can defeat us but ourselves." Sounds pretty, but what does it ever mean?

"THANK YOU SPUTNIK"

And then Ascoli heard the Voice of Sputnik beep-beeping throughout the land. And the *Reporter* responded with the same hysteria, the same demand for more spending on arms development, and the same kind of meaningless, exhortatory prose as the *New Republic*. On October 31, Ascoli in an essay of muddled hysteria titled "Thank You Sputnik" declared, "It is good to know that the effort required of our nation is a definite one, and that every day, every hour, counts." He too was running scared and he too was calling for a national tightening of the belts in order to spend more on the development of ballistics missiles and the whole range of arms. He ended the essay with the following bit of jargon "... leaders of tomorrow, irrespective of party, must be sought out and given the chance to become known and experienced so that we may emerge from the present peril and the present rut. We have been jolted hard, and that is very good indeed, for nobody can defeat us but ourselves." Sounds pretty, but what does it ever mean?

TROUBLESOME DISTINCTIONS

Commonweal magazine, often more honest than the other liberal journals, displays much of the problem of the better left-liberals on the whole issue of armaments. Thus, in the spring and summer of this year they vacillated between opposing nuclear tests because of the dangers of radioactive fallout and supporting such tests because without them "small factual atomic weapons" could not be developed, which would leave us in the situation "in which the only weapon available to us is the total weapon, to be used in total war." Atomic Energy Commission member Thomas Murray convinced them of the necessity of continued nuclear tests. At one point in the editorial opposing the suspension of atomic tests, *Commonweal* admitted parenthetically "A couple of troublesome points are the distinction between a 'small' nuclear weapon, and a larger one, and the classification of warfare as 'conventional' when nuclear weapons are used at all." Of course, this is more than a "troublesome" point, because if there is no real distinction, then their entire position is support

of continued tests collapses. But this major problem is reduced to a "troublesome point" which does not in any way influence their major argument.

Commonweal in the matter of defense and armaments has always resorted to viewing the situation as being in reality a Gordian knot—and always deciding to cut it in favor of spending more money on defense and armaments. Thus in an essay on such governments as Jordan and Laos, which they acknowledge to be totalitarian, feudal, and about whose ability under any circumstances to contribute to the "defense of the free world" they have considerable doubts, *Commonweal* declares that the situation is "complicated" and chooses to send them arms and aid because "the American defense horizon has widened."

AMBIGUITY RESOLVED

And so when Sputniks I and II began to accompany the moon around the earth, *Commonweal* was ready with *The Politics of I Told You So*: "... for years magazines like this one have said that budget-cutting imperiled our national security and that of the free world..." On November 8 and November 15, they returned to this theme and called for tightening of belts, facing facts, and spending more money on the development of satellites, the ICBM, and other weapons. "Americans," they declared, "must gird themselves for a much more intense stage in a worldwide struggle." They did add that the United States should spend more on economic aid, particularly in a period in which the Russians have the tactical and propagandistic advantage.

What is significant to note is that with the exception of some casual comments about the need for more economic aid to under-developed countries, without specifying anything about the nature of such aid, all three of these leading liberal journals reacted to sputnik only by calling for more money on the development of satellites, the ICBM, other weapons, and technical education. None of them thought it a time to sit down and try to think through the entire problem of meeting Russian totalitarianism, none of them allowed themselves to question the basic lines of American foreign policy.

But the left-liberals, most of them Old Time Liberals, have begun to question, have begun to look in another direction than military weapons. Thus the *Progressive* magazine, in its October issue (put out before the launching of sputnik, under the impetus of an evaluation of the Middle-East Crisis and their belief that the Baghdad Pact had strengthened the Russian position in the area, deplored the fact that "dependence on military alliances and hand outs of military aid, and an arrogant insistence that other nations join our anti-Communist front or suffer the consequences, remain the heart of American foreign policy despite the mounting evidence that this emphasis defeats our own purpose and plays squarely into Communist hands." They welcomed sputnik in the following issue because they hoped it would jar the United States from its smugness and anti-intellectualism, might further the notion that public welfare is "at least as important as private welfare," may help end the witch-hunt, might get federal aid to education and scholarships for those who cannot afford

to pay for a college education, and might make the United States more humble in the world.

On November 15 a group of leading pacifist, socialist, and left liberal leaders placed an advertisement in the *New York Times* in behalf of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. This group was led by such figures as Norman Cousins, editor of the *Saturday Review*, and a leading World Federalist, the Reverend Henry Hitt Crane, Robert Gilmore of the AFSC, the Reverend Donald Harrington and the Reverend Homer Jack, Clarence Pickett of the AFSC, and Norman Thomas. There is nothing surprising in this, for these are those who have been the bulwark of the pacifist and anti-war movements in the United States.

THE LEFT LIBERALS

What is startling and encouraging is the inclusion on the list of signers of such leading liberals as John Hersey, Robert Nathan, National Chairman, Americans for Academic Action, James G. Patton, President of the National Farmers Union, and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. While socialists may have criticisms of the details of the proposals, it is encouraging that one group of liberals did not blindly react to sputnik by calling for an intensification of the arms race. This may well be their major step away from cold-war militarism and toward a progressive democratic foreign policy.

At least one segment of the liberal world has gone even further. The *New York Post* has been running a series of splendid editorials which call for a basic reevaluation of American foreign policy and engages in basic criticism of the Democratic Party National Committee and of the Democratic Advisory Council, the voice of the Stevensonian liberals within the party. For example, the editorial of November 18, states that the statements of the Democratic Advisory Council "continue to be disappointing," that they are "uninspired and unoriginal." It deplores the fact that the Democrats beat the war drums. Wechsler wrote:

"... the real weakness of the President's response to recent events has been his overwhelming emphasis on accelerated military programs. The Democratic indictment duplicated that failure. 'Democrats Seek Greater Urgency in U.S. Arms Plans,' said *The Times* headline in an accurate characterization of the main thrust of the manifesto [of the Democratic Advisory Council]. The truth is that it is politically safe, easy and inexpensive to beat the preparedness drum.

The great danger now is that our new national obsession with military matters will divert us from the infinitely more complicated political and economic challenges we face in Europe and Asia. The parallel danger is that military panic will give the diehard enemies of domestic reform an excuse for slashing all budgets not directly related to the rocket exercises.

Wechsler concludes that we should take a "fresh look" not only at our military establishment, but at American foreign policies. He questions our entire Far Eastern policy and its "ritualistic fidelity to Chiang," "our preoccupation with the military revival of West German," the adequacy of our economic program in Asia, and the refusal to suspend atomic tests.

This, we hope, is only a beginning. It is hoped that Wechsler will push his analysis further and that in so doing he will bring along with him the rest of the left-liberals and, as well, the labor movement, which so far has been either quiet on this issue, or has utilized it to gain more armaments contracts for industry to offset the general recession in the economy.

NEW YORK YOUNG SOCIALIST FORUM

Socialism and the Intellectuals

December 15—INTELLECTUALS AND THE WORKINGCLASS

December 22—MIDDLE CLASS ANXIETY AND THE MOVIES

December 29—THE INTELLECTUAL AS A REBEL

January 5—MASS CULTURE AND THE INTELLECTUALS

Sunday Evenings at 7:30

114 W. 14th Street,

Fight For Peace — —

(Continued from page 1-C)

against the old rule of imperialism, that is, against world capitalism? What can it say to the workers of the advanced countries, almost all of whom are dedicated to a socialist transformation of society?

In a most revealing editorial in the November 18, 1957, Life Magazine, Mr. Henry Luce candidly tells us, "The U.S. economy, cradled in a century of protectionism, has become so huge and strong that it must now look to an expanding world market for its own continued expansion."

This is a line remarkably deficient in appeal to the colonial masses. It explains to us why the camp of the "free world" has relied upon its Chiangs and Franco's, its Bao Dai's and Syngman Rhee's.

What does this mean in immediate terms? It means that the true utopianism of 1957 is to fiddle around with the major American parties, both of which are committed to this fundamental policy.

A POLITICAL REALIGNMENT

It means that a radical shift in foreign policy requires a radical shift on the domestic scene—which is to say, political realignment, the struggle for a party based on America's organized workers, its farmers, its white collar masses, and not, as is the case with the Republican and the Democrats, upon various sections of a ruling class whose self-interest commits it to a reactionary, military response to a far-reaching political problem.

But if this seems too extreme, then we say: go ahead with the old liberal line, fight within the Democratic Party for a political program for peace. We are firmly convinced that the experience will be a sober and a disillusioning one, that it will lead, in terms of realism, to the "unrealistic" approach which we have defined.

And then there is Russia. For many, the launching of Sputnik, the announcement of the ICBM, the statistics on education, prove that this society is "progressive," that it should be supported as a way to peace.

Yet, think for a moment. Sputnik is in a sense the very best example of the callous, anti-human policy of the Rus-

sian ruling class. Here is a nation which cannot house its people, whose agriculture is, by the admission of the Kremlin, at Czarist levels in various departments. And now it has a Sputnik and an ICBM to testify to the power of its rulers.

The Russian people's participation in the joys of Sputnik and the ICBM are vicarious: they paid for them by the sweat of their brow and no one asked them if that was their choice, if they wanted a huge missile program instead of living space, a moon instead of a house.

Every time the Russian rulers boast of their tremendous strides in industrialization, they boast of their skill at exploitation—of extracting more and more of the surplus product of society for their enormous projects, of denying the people a fair share in what they have produced.

But the argument need not be pitched at such an academic level. Russia did not simply march in Hungary and murder a socialist revolution in cold blood. It has constantly announced that it envisions World War II as a possible means of national policy, it has made the fantastic statement alluded to before: that World War III will lead to the victory of Communism.

THREAT TO PEACE

We say, nonsense. World War III will lead to the defeat of mankind, and any "statesman" who can base his policy on any other premise is a threat to peace.

American capitalism wants to organize the world its way, the capitalist way; Russian Communism wants to organize the world its way, the totalitarian Communist way.

This is the basic source of the threat to world peace. As long as these two exploitive power systems remain in existence, World War III is always a possibility. To win peace—as distinguished from the absence of war—means to remove the causes of war. And in terms of the long run vision, we see the only way out for mankind in the triumph of a new alternative, of democratic socialism.

Already, there is tremendous evidence that revolutionary, democratic and, as in Hungary, socialist movements are present inside of the Communist camp. America's reaction to this huge fact has

been one of . . . political impotence. We do not advocate sending troops or arms to a Hungarian Revolution; we do advocate a political response, such as beginning the withdrawal of American troops from Europe and making it difficult, if not impossible, for the Russians to carry out the murderous invasion.

We have heard of "liberation" from the right; and of a policy of waiting for Russia to change from liberals like George Kennan. We counterpose to these ideas the notion of a political offensive to aid the people in their revolt against Communist totalitarianism.

CRASH PROGRAM "SECURITY"

In the Western camp, the system of military alliances is now showing itself to be a house of cards. NATO, that capstone of a decade of policy, is rent by internal crisis. We can withdraw into the false, menacing "security" of crash-programism—or we can take the offensive for peace.

Peace, that is the radical problem before us. It will not be achieved in a giant step, and we do not think that we have a pat "answer." Yet this we do know: that peace will not be won in the way America is moving.

The challenge is radical—and the crash program is a retreat into the phony, lulling theory of a balancing terror. Such an attitude cannot be the basis of a struggle for peace. It can only continue to threaten us with war.

In such a situation, our radicalism, our immediate demands and our socialist vision of the fight for peace, may be utopian, but it continues in its unreal realism, attempting to build a stockpile which, like the great ship Titanic, will provide "safety" in a world of unparalleled turbulence.

Thus it is that we say that we must cease testing the Bomb, withdraw American troops from Europe, and turn positively toward a world in revolution—in short that we must respond politically, democratically to the challenge of war and peace. Thus it is that we say that the ultimate victory, the peace of the world, will be won, if it can be won, through a war on the causes of war, through democratic socialism.

active power systems remain in existence, really know how much radioactivity he was exposed to!

In short, today, here and now, the testing of nuclear weapons is a demonstrable danger to the world. The precise quality of the threat has not been charted, partially because much of the evidence is cloaked in secrecy by the AEC. As Albert Schweitzer put it in his April 23 statement, "None of the radioactivity of the air, brought into existence by the exploding of atom bombs is so unimportant that it may not, in the long run, become a danger to us through increasing the amount of radioactivity stored in our bodies. . . ."

That is the danger in the present: increase of cancer, leukemia, genetic mutation. But the future is even more monstrous in its nuclear bomb potentialities. The A and H Bombs are measured in "Kilotons" ("Kt," a unit equal in explosive power to 1000 tons of TNT) and "Megatons" ("Mt," a unit equal to 1,000,000 tons of TNT). The old-fashioned A Bomb dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki had a strength of only 20 kilotons, the range of total destruction was a half a mile, of moderate destruction to heavy damage, five miles. The bombs now in existence—and presumably resting at this moment in the bomb-bay of an SAC plane—have a power of 40 megatons, and the radius of complete destruction is now fifty miles. Last year when a group of pacifists staged a protest at the Nevada test site, they were told that the bombs under testing were "nominal." When asked what that meant, they were told that they were of the power of the Hiroshima bomb, now one of the smallest units in the range of nuclear armaments.

Of course, even these figures are somewhat mild, for they leave out the potentiality of the Cobalt Bomb—the C Bomb. A present type H Bomb which would be cased in cobalt could, given proper wind conditions, render a major portion of the entire United States uninhabitable. The fantastic progression goes something like this: the Hiroshima Bomb is a "trigger" for the H Bomb—it generates the temperature of 25 million degrees necessary to set off the thermonuclear weapon. The cobalt casing then increases the destructive swath of the H Bomb by another qualitative leap. The 87,000 dead of the Japanese City is thus an old type figure, the advance in technology in a period of twelve years is equivalent to the change over from the rickety air planes of World War I to the enormous bombers of the Strategic Air Command.

DANGER TODAY

But then, all of this leaves out the potentiality of such weapons as the war head of an Intercontinental Ballistics Missile. That is treated elsewhere in this issue of Challenge, and it means another tremendous leap forward in the means of destruction.

Thus, we now know for a fact the following three propositions: that American policy, according to official statements, is geared to the use of these weapons, indeed that their "tactical" employment has already been suggested in at least two cases; that the present rate of fall out, though not exhaustively analyzed, constitutes a significant danger to man even though there is no war; that the destructive potential of the weapons now in existence ranges from bombs which could destroy entire cities to bombs which could destroy entire nations.

This is the face of the enemy, the grimmest, most monstrous face of war that has ever been glimpsed by man. And what is at stake is not (as Khrushchev insanely asserts) "the destruction of capitalism by Russian Communism; it is not the victory of the "Free" world over the Communists; what is at stake is the future of the human race itself. With these weapons, there is literally no place to hide. And with the announced statements of both major power blocs, only a fool can take refuge in a comparison to poison gas.

It is not that we are approaching the brink—it is that we are already there, poised over an abyss of destruction and horror. The facts, the plain facts for everyone to see, are fantastically radical. Any sane approach to them must be as radical as they are.

The Crisis in Education — —

(Continued from page 2-C)

edge and artistic achievement for its own sake are rarely reflected in this country.

To the extent that science has captured the imagination and respect of the American people, it has been the technical gadgets that have sold them. But the technician, the engineer, the practical gadgeteer inventing new wonders in his cellar workshop are very different animals from the strange and alien Einstein whom "only nine men in the world can understand." (An absolutely mistaken popular notion.) The only thing that has made these mysterious and suspect men partially acceptable have been the weapons that admittedly could not have come without basic research, and the pictures of the enormous scientific machines they use. ("If it costs so much, it must be important.")

Any highly industrialized economy must utilize vast numbers of technicians. Our profit economy employs most of these people directly in production itself, or in the continual redesigning of standard products, as highly skilled workers. Since World War II it has added an enormous engineering staff which it has treated in a similar way. At one time the engineer was a part of management, and every junior could look forward to rising in a few years to a new status.

Today he has in fact become but a skilled worker, and the formation of engineering unions has followed. These technical skills are hard at work on consumer oriented gadgetry like the "air born" Buick and the "swept wing" Dodge, for that is where the biggest profits are to be found. The companies also have discovered that some research is worthwhile; it can produce new products and insure them against being made obsolete by new products turned

out by a competitor. But this kind of scientific work has no direct relationship to their market; they can only guess at how much to spend in an even wilder way than they do for advertising. And even when they employ the queer duck long-hairs, their attitude toward basic research is still shown in the remarks of Charles E. Wilson that basic research is "when you don't know what you are doing."

The bulk of the money going into science. When a Ph.D. leaves academia for industry, it is usually with the clear knowledge that he is prostituting himself for the buck; and those of ability who are so oriented soon find their way into administrative and sales posts where the really big money is to be found. The secrecy surrounding all direct government work, particularly the inability to talk about it or publish their work, acts as a very strong deterrent on scientists who take pride in their work, despite the lure of the big machines that would then be at their disposal. The greatest minds still cluster around the universities on moderate salaries with almost all research monies coming from the crumbs of relatively piddling government contracts—for the armed services.

Certainly the billions are on their way from Washington. There will be more science scholarships both from industry, which has been feeling the shortage of technical personnel for some years, and directly from the government, and a heavy propaganda campaign conducted among high school students—perhaps even in the grade schools. But unless careers in pure science become associated with the kind of financial-cum-social standing that only the businessman and manager today have, it is hard to see mothers urging their children towards a

teaching career, adopting a warm attitude to the Einsteins and Oppenheims. Why is this unlikely in America today?

The university is bound to get some of this money, but by all bets it will still be relatively piddling. For every dollar that will net them a new student for science and truly basic research, count a hundred or a thousand that holds that label and will wind up elsewhere. But don't worry unduly. Our military machine will manage to limp along, and even if the Russians can clobber us faster and more efficiently in that war our might is preventing, we can always manage to get back with at least a couple of cobalt bombs on the few percent of jet bombers that can penetrate the best defensive curtain imaginable; and they can wipe out life on the whole Eurasian land mass.

Be reassured, we're safe.

Unworried

by this special issue of Challenge?

Then don't

write to the Young Socialist League 114 W. 14th Street, N. Y., for information on how to put action behind the ideas on peace in these pages.

Don't join with us on the campuses throughout America in broad socialist clubs who speak with the voice of democratic socialism.

And don't complain to us if you're blown to bits.

P.S.

Worried? Write today to YSL.