

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 16, 1956

FIVE CENTS

FLASH — ISL HEARING HAS ENDED

Washington, July 11

The first hearing granted any organization on the attorney general's "subversive list" in the nine years since that list was first established has ended.

Cross examination of James Burnham ended dramatically on Wednesday morning, July 11, with an admission by Burnham, under questioning, that "it could be" all right to lie against Communists (unofficial Communists as well as official Communists) if this is necessary in the interests of the nation.

Burnham was being questioned about passages in his writings in which he had referred cynically to lying in this sense.

This damaging admission came as a climax of testimony under cross examination in which Burnham gave a disquisition on the utility of lying for political purposes.

For the next hour or two, Burnham and the panicky government attorneys tried to do something about this catastrophe, but Burnham only got in deeper. The hearing ended on this note.

Hearing Examiner Morrissey gave government attorneys until August 22 to hand in proposed findings for his consideration. Readers of Labor Action will be informed of all future developments in this case as they occur.

The Stalinist "Criticism" of Stalinism:

THE KREMLIN PUTS THE LID ON

"As for our country, the Communist party has been and will be the only master of the minds, and thoughts, the spokesman, leader and organizer of the people in their entire struggle for communism."

Editorial in Pravda, July 6

By GORDON HASKELL

The top leadership of the Russian Stalinist bureaucracy wants to put an end to the uncertainty, confusion and crisis which has developed inside the Russian empire, and throughout the world Stalinist movement since the beginning of the "downgrading" of Stalin. That is the reason for the long resolution passed by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on June 30.

But it is also clear that this resolution cannot possibly serve the purpose which its authors intend. This would be true even if it were far more able and effective than it actually is. The process which they hope to blunt, channel and if possible, stop altogether has already achieved too much momentum and it is fed by social-historic forces which cannot so easily be turned aside.

True, the first effects of the publication of this resolution have been to elicit expressions of satisfaction and praise from the leaderships of Stalinist parties in some of the capitalist countries. The servile bureaucrats in New

York, Paris and Rome thus demonstrate themselves once again to be—servile bureaucrats. But the pressures around and within their own parties which had induced them, in the weeks preceding the issuance of the June 30 resolution, to voice varying degrees of criticism of their masters in the Kremlin are still there. And if the Russian CP's resolution means, as it may very well, that the period allowed the local leaderships in which to make their adjustments to these pressures is now over, the developments in world Stalinism may take on even more explosive forms in the future than they have in the recent past.

The resolution itself is a clever and able Stalinist document. It combines and states in a more rounded and theoretical form all the "explanations" and rationalizations for the three decades of Stalin's brutal totalitarian rule which have been put forth by Stalinist leaders all over the world since the "revelations" of the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party. At the same time, it seeks to restrict any discussion of the implications of these

revelations to a repetition of the phrases about the "harmful effects" of the "cult of Stalin's personality," and "deviations from Soviet legality," and curtly rejects any attempt to extend it to a broader discussion of the nature of Russian society. The resolution ends by a pointed reminder to the leaders of the Stalinist movements in France, Italy and other countries that they owe the present position of their movements to Russia's victory in the war, and a warning that any division in the ranks of world Stalinism will play into the hands of the capitalist governments which still seek to undermine and destroy the world Stalinist movement and its Russian base.

Of course, all this is done in the usual Stalinist combination of truths with half-truths with outright lies; with the usual Stalinist terminology in which "democracy" and "socialism" are what exists in Russia; with the usual Stalinist attempt to exploit the aversion of millions of people to capitalist imperialism in the interest of their own.

SINGS PRAISES

The resolution starts out by singing the praises of the accomplishments of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, and the assertion that they have been "hailed" by millions of people throughout the world. It asserts that the vast advance for "peace" recorded by this Congress has led to embittered attacks on it by the reactionary forces in the world who still want war. Here, once again, is the old amalgam on which Stalinism has lived for so long: the capitalists and reactionaries are attacking us. Hence, anyone who attacks us is either a reactionary himself, or is a witting or unwitting tool of reaction.

But there have been criticisms from Communist Parties in other countries, and from those with whom the world Stalinist movement is now seeking a new Popular Front. The old amalgam is a warning to all to curb their criticism, but in the present circumstances it is obviously not enough. To answer the questions and criticisms from this quarter, something new has to be added, and it is.

This new element is a bowdlerized and distorted version of the Marxist analysis of the degeneration of the Russian Revolution into Stalinism. It points to the isolation of the Russian Revolution, the attempts at capitalist military intervention in the early years, the backwardness of the country, and the rise of Nazism with its avowed aim of attacking Russia. All this, say the Stalinist leaders, led to the necessity of "iron discipline, evergrowing vigilance and a most strict centralization of leadership which inevitably had a negative effect on the development of certain democratic features."

The utter and total destruction of all forms of democracy in Russia for thirty years is thus described as a "negative effect on the development of certain democratic features." This is later spell-

(Turn to last page)

STEEL STRIKE BLASTS "CLASS PEACE"

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, July 7

The shutdown of the steel industry gives every indication of becoming the most important strike since the General Motors 113-day walkout in 1945-46. To be sure there have been more violent strikes, like the Westinghouse strike of last fall. There have been cruel defeats like the two-year Kohler walkout. And there was even a two-month steel strike in 1952.

But none of these involved such a decisive sector of American capital and labor in a time as crucial as the current steel crisis. Its implications for the union movement and in terms of national politics are manifold and manifest. They are too big and important to be hidden or to be disregarded.

This is already understood by the shrewder observers of the labor scene like A. H. Raskin of the N. Y. Times. In a remarkable analysis of the steel strike in the July 4 issue, Raskin bewails the collapse of his own pet theory of the new epoch of industrial labor relations in America. As he puts it, "The most unfortunate result of the strike is the permanent heritage of ill will it threatens to leave in the path of steel labor-management relations."

"In his 3½ years as union president, Mr. McDonald has been trying to educate his members away from the 'hate-the-boss' spirit of the union's early conflicts" for which in return "the industry helped his amity campaign by giving steel workers bigger pay increases than any other union got." In a word, the myth of social peace in America has evaporated.

The policy of class collaboration between David McDonald and the big steel companies has failed in its first big test if a serious crisis and America's most basic industry is reverting to the policy of the naked struggle against unionism that marked the violent strikes of the early CIO days in 1936 and 1937.

Lest anyone have doubt about this Raskin adds, "The companies are determined to demonstrate to the rank and file that strikes do not pay. That means

a long tie-up with mounting bitterness."

Aside from the social implications of the steel strike, its very occurrence is a bitter personal blow to McDonald. The time for sneering at the "radicalism" of the United Auto Workers and its history of struggle surely is past, for today McDonald faces the same issue that confronted the General Motors workers in their 1946 strike.

PRICE TO GO UP

The steel companies have already announced their intentions of raising the price of steel to make up for any economic gains the union wins. Such a policy coming at a time of recession signifies the re-raising of the question of who is responsible for the recession and who is responsible for the resulting inflation.

For McDonald the choice is a painful one, either to adopt Walter Reuther's famous GM slogan of higher wages without price increases and placing the responsibility on the steel barons, or to allow the steel workers union to suffer a loss of national prestige from which it will be difficult to recover. The union movement as a whole has a stake in this debate since it will likewise be blamed for the recession as well as McDonald.

(Continued on page 2)

ROUND-UP ON THE NATIONAL STEEL STRIKE

Dave McDonald's Business Unionism Fails In Face of Companies' Arrogant Attitude

By EMIL MODIC

Pittsburgh, July 1

"Boulwarism" has come to the steel industry.

Boulwarism takes its name from Lemuel P. Boulware, vice-president in charge of industrial relations for General Electric. It was he who originated the strategy in union negotiations of making a company offer which included some modest concessions, and then using the offer as an ultimatum. Take this or strike—that is Boulwarism.

This strategy worked in the GE chain, torn as it has been by the strife between the UE and the IUE. Last fall, the same strategy was imported into Westinghouse, where it precipitated a five-month strike.

Now it has appeared in steel.

The steel industry this year has presented the union with an unprecedented united front. They came into negotiations, offered a five-year contract which would provide about ten cents an hour over-all increase in both wages and fringe benefits each year for five years, and said, "Take it or strike." The steel workers struck.

It would appear that David J. McDonald will now have the opportunity to learn the facts of life (at a late age) about getting along with the capitalist class. Ever since McDonald took over leadership of the union in 1953, he has been trading on the fact that he was less militant than Reuther. He has counted on his "reasonableness" and undisguised conservatism to win gains from the steel magnates, rather than counting on the mobilized might of the 700,000 workers in basic steel. He has made literally hundreds of joint company-union tours through steel plants in the interest of "better relations."

His reward now is a contemptuous ultimatum.

COMPANIES ARROGANT

When it became apparent in the last week of negotiations that an agreement was not going to be reached, McDonald even offered to extend the old contract for two weeks, if the companies would agree that any raises would be retroactive. The companies arrogantly refused. The only compromise that the companies would offer was really an insult—they offered to cut four months off the five-year contract! (Incidentally, this would mean that the contract would expire in February, when steel workers are usually broke from Christmas and in no position to strike.)

It is no secret in Pittsburgh that some of the steel companies welcome the strike. They welcome it for a very simple reason: they have no idea where they would sell their steel if there wasn't a strike. They certainly wouldn't sell it in Detroit, which ordinarily uses a quarter of the steel produced. They wouldn't sell it to wholesalers and brokers and many other industrial users, because most of them have a three- or four-months supply on hand—as much generally as they can possibly warehouse.

As a matter of fact, the only reason why steel sales and production have held up so well this year is that users have been buying in excess of their needs; because they anticipated a wage increase, and they know from bitter experience that a whopping price increase would follow. As a matter of fact, in some lines of steel, the price was raised several months ago in anticipation of a wage increase!

McDonald has never followed a policy of getting his people "up" for a threatened strike, because he has apparently never believed that one would take place. Last year, when a strike almost took place (one actually was on for a few hours) the strike machinery was creaky and the secondary leadership were uncertain and uninstructed—and therefore irritated.

This year, however, the very arrogance of the company has served to prepare the ranks in part. Productivity has been on the rise in steel as elsewhere; yet real wages of steel workers today are about where they were ten years ago—within one per cent, as a matter of fact.

One reason has been the waves of in-

flation which a greedy industry has touched off again and again. (In a sense, the steel workers and all workers and the entire people are still paying for the late Philip Murray's failure to back up the demand of the UAW in 1945-1946 for a wage increase without a price increase.) If the steel workers accepted this dime-a-year for five years, they probably wouldn't even hold their own economically, let alone make progress toward a better life.

The steel workers in areas where there are Westinghouse plants (and this would include Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Cleveland) must sense what they are in for from reading the papers and listening to the radio, for the steel companies have been making the same pitch to them to accept a five-year contract which Westinghouse made to its workers.

RE-OPEN THE PLANTS?

Westinghouse tried to reopen its plants during the strike. If steel tries to do that, the valleys of the Monongahela, the Allegheny, the Mahoning, the Cuyahoga, the Ohio and the other steel areas may see days reminiscent of the thirties.

There is still the possibility, of course, that before this article sees print the strike will be over. There is some pressure on the corporations during an election year to give in so as to avoid stirring up labor and hurting the chances of the Republicans to stay in the White House. The sight of pickets at plant gates may cause management to think again. But the odds seem to be against it at the moment.

The repercussions within the union will be interesting. Last year, McDonald was challenged in the union elections by an opposition slate. That opposition is still largely intact. McDonald will be under pressure to produce in a field which is strange to him—leading a mass strike in all of an entire basic industry.

Whatever happens to the personal fortunes of McDonald, the steel workers are now in the front lines of defense for American labor. Unless they stand their ground well, Boulwarism will spread into every nook and cranny of American life.

Blasts Class Peace — —

(Continued from page 1)

A good question naturally poses itself by the steel crisis. What happened to the theory of the sophisticated conservatives and the enlightened labor leaders who hoped jointly to work out the nation's economic problems? Just why couldn't the policy of business unionism, that was so successful up to now for McDonald, work at the present time? Or putting it even more simply, why is the class struggle sharpening in America to such a point that McDonald-type unionism does not work in a basic industry?

Both top union leaders and industrial leaders have failed to grasp the unseen but nevertheless growing social consciousness and class division in America. The small gains of yesterday are not enough for the union leaders to placate the rank and file. As for the industrial leaders, they have become blinded by the relative passivity of the union movement, the docility of its leaders and the total incapacity to understand the workers as human beings and not pawns controlled by labor-relations departments or by cooperative labor leaders.

It is interesting to note that the steel companies do not, at least as yet, have any plans to attempt to break the strike as Westinghouse did. It can be said in advance that they have little chance of accomplishing that, for the memory of the Memorial Day massacre in 1937 in Chicago, the bloodshed in the Canton-Massillon-Youngstown area and other steel strike struggles are still too fresh in the minds of the union cadres to keep the workers quiet in the face of union-busting tactics. The steel barons know they cannot beat the union on the picket line.

At the present time there is a deceptive calm about the strike. The implica-

Did Management Force a Strike To Help Jack Up Steel Prices?

By BEN HALL

There was nothing extraordinary when 650,000 workers in basic steel left their jobs at furnaces, rolling mills and foundries on July 1. Strikes, big and small, come every month, every year. Nor was there anything unusual in the demands of the United Steelworkers union: a substantial wage increase; week-end premium pay; supplementary unemployment benefits; higher insurance and pensions; full union shop; additional paid holidays and longer vacations; improved contract terms.

Yet the stoppage came as something of a shock; not because of the strategic position of steel in American economy but because the steel industry had become the testing ground in the mass production of "labor peace."

It was here that all sides were supposed to be straining to promote harmony of interests between labor and capital. Benjamin Fairless and David McDonald, not long ago, had embarked on their joint good-will tour of steel plants, symbol of mutual understanding and common goals. Then, last year, the union and the companies reached agreement after a short twelve-hour strike.

Presumably no one wanted a strike this year: not McDonald for the union; not the companies; surely not the "public," the consumers. Yet here it is.

We know now that both sides were ready for a strike, and more particularly that the steel corporations were willing to provoke one. Their inventories were substantial; their principal customers in auto were in a slump; they were looking for a price increase.

Even before the strike, steel owners announced that they would raise prices not simply to cover added wage costs but to increase profits—a necessity, they solemnly assured the public, in the interests of the health and expansion of the industry, not to mention their own pocketbooks.

The companies, united by agreement, decided to force the union to take a disadvantageous contract or strike.

They insisted upon a five-year con-

tract without the right to strike; but the experience of auto unionists with long-term contracts was an advance guarantee that the steel union would reject it. They offered meager wage increases. To the union's demand for double-time on Sundays, they replied by suggesting a 10 per cent bonus for Sunday workers. And finally, when the union offered to hold off the strike for fifteen days on condition that any agreement be retroactive to July 1, the companies turned it down, and the strike was on.

Where, then, is labor peace and harmony of interests? At the first favorable opportunity, the steel employers are ready to fight and to drain the union of some of its power.

This—after yards of speeches on class harmony, in a period of peace, at a time of soaring profits, when everything goes smoothly.

What are they capable of provoking if the climate changes, if instead of normal times we should enter a more critical period? The steel strike is almost a routine affair. Yet it is enough to prove that "labor peace" is only a thin crust over the molten lava of conflict.

When the steel workers were forced to walk out, another theory died. "Big Labor" and Big Industry, it was suggested, are in collusion to "exploit" the public; their conflicts, so the theory went, are largely play-acting to justify price rises at the expense of the consumer, a kind of conspiracy to mulct the people.

But the battle over prices started before the strike, with the union accusing the companies of trying to squeeze out higher prices without justification.

Last year, N. Y. Times labor editor A. H. Raskin was convinced that union-management harmony was founded on a whole new era of mutual cooperation against the public, and he pointed an accusing finger at prices. But his tone has changed. This is what he wrote after only three days of the present strike:

"The prospect of future discord is heightened by the union's suspicion that many industry leaders welcomed a shutdown as a means of drying up inventories and making it easier to put across a substantial price rise. This suggestion angers the industry."

Now he points out "that the strike will cause intense public scrutiny of the price adjustments that accompany its settlement." Instead of asking for a rise of \$10 to \$12 a ton, they will probably have to stick to \$8 to \$10 "to avoid excessive complaint from critics in Congress, labor and other industries."

He warns that the strike "may prove the bleakest in the industry's turbulent history." And only yesterday, a conflict-free industry seemed so certain, with both labor and employers eager for price

We learn, too, how "national emergencies" are concocted or not concocted at the whim of government officials. Eisenhower had decided in advance not to intervene; the companies were not averse to a stoppage. Thus, although one of the nation's key industries was completely shut, no one noticed any "national emergency," no injunctions, no court orders, no government back-to-work orders.

We can't avoid the nagging suspicion that if the companies were eager to avoid a strike and if the president had decided that it was wise to intervene, the press, ruling politicians, and judges might have unanimously discovered a crippling emergency where now none exists. And we can already read imaginary editorials castigating "irresponsible" labor "dictators" for putting the nation in peril.

But the steel strike takes no spectacular forms; it comes as a simple reminder of the continuing class struggle of workers, through their unions for a better life.

A CONVENTION STRATEGY FOR LABOR:

OUST THE SOUTH FROM DEMOCRATIC PARTY

By R. M. and B. S.

The strength of the bloc composed of the labor movement, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Americans for Democratic Action should be no less at the forthcoming convention of the Democratic Party than it was in 1952. But small or large it will be there. The labor delegates must participate in the conflicts of program and organization. Their behavior will be viewed by millions of American voters. Their activity will profoundly effect the political scene in the coming years.

What issues are likely to confront the convention? Four major areas of conflict come to mind: foreign policy, farm policy, civil liberties and civil rights. Unfortunately, there are no differences on foreign policy serious enough to cause a split; the labor-ADA left is slightly tinged with what might be called Point-Fourism, and that is about all. There are as many differences within the major blocs as between them on the question of farm policy. As for civil liberties the immediate future looks none too bright. A few liberal genuflections may be expected from the ADA and sections of labor but certainly not from the regular Democrats. But the one issue which cannot be buried, the one issue which will obviously dominate all others at the convention will be the issue of civil rights.

We are witnessing in the United States the most important social movement since the birth of the CIO. This movement is in its beginnings. The objective factors in American life tending to conservatize the labor movement—full employment, higher standard of living—have precisely the opposite effect on the Negroes. The higher the standard of living in the South, the more absolute poverty is abolished and small economic gains made here and there, the more determined, aggressive and united the Negro population becomes in their struggle for social equality. The aim of this movement is not anti-capitalist in character. It is a vast social struggle for democracy and participation in American life.

NEGRO ENFRANCHISEMENT

The Supreme Court decision set off this recent movement and for the moment the NAACP is pushing the main attack along the line of following up this decision by court action. The harbinger of the future, however, lies in the boycott of the busses in Alabama. The movement will not long stay within the confines of purely Court action—the White Councils will soon see to this. The Negroes have chosen for the moment an almost Gandhian method of attack, a kind of mass peaceable resistance. Given their minority status in the community and the legal channels left open to them by the Court decision, this is the wisest and quickest road to their liberation. The Southern racists have felt, for the first time, the power and threat of an organized, aroused community determined to defend its rights. The struggle for Negro enfranchisement—the key to the civil rights fight—is already implicit in the very first stages of the movement.

The Southern white politicians are fighting this movement with every weapon at their command. The deep South is alive with every kind of project to delay, hinder, mutilate or nullify the Supreme Court decision and the progress of integration in the schools. The use of force and violence by the Citizens Councils is covered up by the politicians; anti-Constitutional acts such as interposition and nullification are hastily passed. The Southern politicians are committed to fighting the Supreme Court decision and they cannot retreat. Here is precisely the point at which the labor-ADA-NAACP forces could play an important, even an historically crucial role.

The major political strategy of Adlai Stevenson for the last four years has been to re-cement the alliance between

the big-city Democrats in the North and the Southern racists. Unfortunately for his plans, the explosion in the South has torn asunder in a day, that which he has wrought with so much effort through the years. During the first few weeks of the campaign, he gave the impression of a man who had suddenly lost his hearing. He also lost, at one fell swoop, hundreds of thousands of potential negro votes, with his first few hands-off statements about the South. Eisenhower attempted to follow suit with a statement in favor of "moderation" which was politically out of date the moment it left his mouth. Events are moving quite rapidly and the politicians are dragging behind them. Both parties are jockeying for the Negro vote. The more far-thinking strategists in the Democratic party realize that the issue has finally been joined. They must choose between the Negro votes in the north and the electoral college votes in the South.

CRUCIAL VOTE

The Negro vote appears to be crucial for the Democrats in the big cities in the North. In the eleven Western States, for example, although only 32 per cent of eligible negroes actually voted in 1952, 81 per cent of these voted Democratic. Is it possible to imagine the number of votes that would be cast for a Democratic party which stood solidly for real Negro equality? The Party brass are beginning to realize this. The three bidding nominees—Kefauver, Stevenson, and Harriman, are finally fitting into a more definite stand on civil rights.

The white supremacists, on the other hand, openly talk of the possibility of split and have defied the Northern Democrats in advance by signing the Southern Manifesto. They desire an alliance with the North but on their own terms. Therefore their strategy at the Convention will be to prevent the adoption of a meaningful civil rights plank even if this means loss of the Northern negro vote and national defeat of the Democratic Party.

Here is an historic opportunity for the labor forces at the Democratic convention to seize upon this issue and fight it

to the end. Attempts will undoubtedly be made for a cease fire, a compromise. Labor must declare that such a shameful compromise would not only be a blow at democracy and at our non-white citizens, but would lead to the defeat of the Democratic party at the polls and thereby defeat labor's own present policy. Labor must point out that such a compromise would strengthen racism and would be a direct blow at the development of trade unionism in the South. Labor must make clear to the nation that it cannot and will not sit in the same party and at the same Convention with those who are legalizing the murder of peaceable citizens in the South. Labor must take the lead in ousting the South from the Democratic party.

A PROGRAM

In order to carry this policy into effect, the Labor-ADA-NAACP forces must have a program. The sending of federal troops to the South need not be part of this program. There are a whole series of perfectly legitimate powers and measures in the hands of the federal government which can be called into play, from court injunctions, to stopping Federal aid, to indictment of individual office-holders, to subpoena of State Attorneys General. All of these measures would be extremely effective and any one of them if used aggressively by a Government dedicated to upholding the Supreme Court decision and protecting the legitimate rights of the Negroes, would prove to be effective in settling accounts with the violent elements.

Labor should propose at the Democratic convention, a resolution supporting the legality and constitutionality of the Supreme Court decision and calling for its speedy implementation through legislative and executive action. This resolution alone, if voted by the Convention, would force the South to walk out. But labor must not be content with a mere resolution, a general vote of sympathy. It should indicate in what precise manner this resolution can be carried into effect by the government. This would include: (1) support to the anti-Jim Crow amendment to the Federal Education Bill; (2) legislation implementing the 14th and 15th Amendments, giving the Negroes the right to vote in fact, and following this up by Federal police and judicial action to protect their rights; (3) condemnation of interposition and nullification as anti-Constitutional; (4) action by the attorney general and the Justice Department to prosecute leaders of mob violence; (5) Justice Department indictment of office-holders who re-

fuse to carry out their Federal Constitutional duty; (6) cutting off Federal aid to any State refusing to carry through the lawful orders of a Federal judge.

Many more measures could be listed without adding much to the point. The labor movement must assume the burden of open aggressive struggle against the Southern racists and for all-out legal, moral, and political support to the Southern Negroes.

What would be the result of following the strategy outlined above? What progressive political benefits would flow from it?

IMMENSE EDUCATION

First of all this policy would be an immense education for the American people. It would indicate to all that labor is the foremost defender of democratic rights and the foremost opponent of the Southern racists. It would indicate clearly that at least one important social force in the nation is not going to stand helplessly by and allow the White Councils and their political friends to persecute innocent citizens. Thus, even if very few of these proposals were actually accepted by the majority of the Convention, they would have an important political effect.

Secondly, this strategy would put an end once and for all to the unprincipled political combination between labor and the Southern racists within the Democratic Party. The simple truth is this: the Southerners cannot stay in a political party devoted to upholding the Supreme Court decision. Labor must recognize this fact in all its ramifications and move to sharpen the conflict between the Southerners and the rest of the party. This can best be done by an independent, well-organized programmatic struggle at the Convention in which labor puts forward its own militant program for acceptance by the Convention.

Such an aggressive struggle would also have, as a by-product, pushing the middle sections of the Democratic party into a more militant attitude on the race question and would directly and immediately benefit the struggle for democracy in the South.

RALLY AROUND LABOR

Finally, such a bold struggle would help rally the progressive elements of the nation around the labor movement and would strengthen the alliance between labor and the NAACP and clear the road toward a final struggle with Labor's Democratic "friends" of the Truman-Stevenson-Kefauver variety.

To sharpen the struggle between the labor movement and the Southern racists even within the limits of Democratic politics is a progressive policy, a policy which, if successful, leads the labor movement toward more and more independence from its allies. In the long run labor must free itself of its alliance with the right-wing Fair Deal Democrats. Among the developments through which this will come to pass will no doubt be struggles within the ranks of the Democratic party. The indicated strategy for labor in the coming Democratic Convention is: oust the South from the Democratic party through an all-out struggle for civil rights.

Pickets Protest Poznan Repressions

By MAX MARTIN

New York, July 9

Approximately fifty socialists and radicals participated in a picket line demonstration for an hour and a half before the headquarters of the puppet Polish government's United Nations delegation this afternoon. The demonstration was held for the purpose of expressing solidarity with the Poznan workers who struck a blow for freedom ten days ago, and to protest their being killed and imprisoned by the Polish Stalinist regime. The action was sponsored by the Independent Socialist League, the Young Socialist League, the Liberation League, and the Industrial Workers of the World. It also attracted some unaffiliated socialists and radicals.

The pickets carried signs bearing such slogans as: "They Demanded Bread; They Got Bullets," "Stop Jailing Polish Workers," "Against Communist Party Dictatorship in Poland," "Hail the Fight For Polish Democracy," "Against Communist Party Dictators! Hip For Socialism," and "Against Dictatorship in Po-

land, Spain and Guatemala." The spirited demonstrators chanted these and other slogans and sang "Solidarity Forever." The demonstration received a short write up in the *N. Y. Times* the next morning, as well as brief television coverage in a newscast the same evening.

A leaflet distributed by the ISL and YSL announced that "we, who picket here today, take our stand unreservedly in support of the Polish fighters for freedom." "As representatives of democratic socialism," it stated, "we denounce the dictatorial rulers who shoot them down in the streets."

It pointed out that the Communist Parties throughout the world have been promising "reform" and "democracy" as a result of the recent revelations about Stalin, but that the events in Poznan expose the hollowness of Stalinist promises. The leaflet concluded as follows:

"The Polish people have given them a courageous and fitting reply: No trust, no confidence in the promises of anti-working class dictators. Democracy will

come to Poland, as everywhere under Communist Party rule, only when the people rise up against their dictatorial rulers and take power into their own hands."

In addition to this leaflet, the YSL and ISL distributed copies of the last issue of *Labor Action*, which had articles on the Poznan uprising. The Libertarian League also distributed a leaflet at the demonstration. The picket line was clearly a marked success, especially since it had been called on short notice. The ISL and YSL have called for continued campaigns in support of the Polish workers and are urging all socialist and labor groups to hold broad united front actions along these lines.

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

YOU *and* SCIENCE

New Attitude Toward Scientist?

By GENE LISTER

Accompanying the shift in the United States from immediate war needs to long-range preparation for intercontinental conflict has been the change in the government's attitude toward science and scientists. This is apparent in the current headlines and editorials in the professional, technical and general press.

The scientific intellectual climate today, on the surface at least, is much different from the time of the Oppenheimer case and the Fort Monmouth security witchhunt. The scientists then were often looked on as insidious plotters forcing the atomic way of life on us and just as likely to betray us to the enemy.

The goal then appeared to be a security officer in every laboratory, rather than the development of scientists. Little wonder that the public looked upon scientists and engineers with horrid awe and to many these became almost dishonored professions.

Partly because of this "bad press" but more because economic security could be more easily obtained elsewhere, promising students tended to avoid the scientific professions in the post-war years.

However, with Russia drawing abreast of the United States in atomic warpower it became apparent to the policy-makers in Washington that the next war would be won or lost not on the basis of "stolen" research formulas but through the efforts of scientific manpower right now being trained in the classroom. Politicians became aware that scientific productivity cannot be beaten out of scientists but is the result of the qualitative and quantitative availability of free creative minds.

A GRIM FACT

It is a grim fact that under capitalism "creativity" increasingly finds expression only in destructiveness. Now a shudder is running through the scientific policy makers as the realization grows that the United States is hard-pressed in the race with Russia for the development and utilization of scientific manpower.

The smug assumption of the Stalin era was that Russian science was sidetracked in Lysenkoism but the truth is that their academic facilities are being geared up faster than in the United States. Frantically now Washington is searching for a program that will attract youngsters to scientific and technical schools.

In balancing Russia's war potential, the figures on trained scientists or graduating engineers are being compared just as formerly was done with tanks, divisions and warships. The following figures were presented to the Research and Development Subcommittee of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee in Washington last month.

In Russia the number of trained engineers increased from 41,000 in 1920 to 541,000 in 1954. In the United States in the same period the gain was from 215,000 to 500,000. During the period 1950-55 in Russia the number of engineers graduating annually rose from 28,000 to 63,000. In the United States the same figure dropped from 52,000 to 23,000 annually.

Considering both engineers and scientists Russia graduates 120,000 yearly, compared to 70,000 here. This is estimated to be about half of the United States domestic needs alone. This leaves little for export when foreign aid in technical manpower is nearly as important as arms. Truly the cold war of the classroom has

become an established part of the academic way of life.

On the other hand many engineers feel that there is no real shortage in their profession but that the fault lies in insufficiently high salaries to attract manpower, and in industry's and government's failure to use them at their highest competence.

With today's scientific approach the way to get the facts on the shortage is often thought to be a poll à la Gallup. This past winter a survey of Oklahoma City students was made to determine why science and mathematics were not studied to a greater extent in high school. Typical answers: scientists are "squares"; or "little old men with beards working in musty laboratories"; or "evil geniuses on TV thinking up ways of torturing people." However, a similar survey in Indianapolis indicated that many teen-agers look more favorably on scientists and consider them "cool cats."

The lack of a program for scientific manpower has become so serious that President Eisenhower in April appointed a new National Committee for the Development of Scientists and Engineers to "foster the development of highly qualified technological manpower." Represented on the 19-man committee were college presidents, education and industry leaders as well as George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO.

Whether a program fully meeting the United States' war needs will result is uncertain. However, the shift in policy and propaganda as well as financial and industry's aid is likely to bring a greater influx of students into the sciences. How this affects the scientific balance with Russia will be shown by the output of destructive weapons in the next five or ten years.

One thing is certain: whether or not the policy-makers and the press succeed in changing the popular conception of scientists from "eggheads" to "cool cats," they will still be looked upon as purveyors of gadgets and hardware, trivial as well as gigantic and terrifying. In a culture where dread of total destruction is never far from our thoughts the true meaning of science as a way of life and a means to peaceful abundance will always be obscure.

The full application of science to peaceful ends is not for these times under present world leadership.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Cyprus

To the Editor:

You and most others support the Greek Cypriots in their struggle for Greek control of the island and its unity with the monarchy of Greece.

BUT Cyprus is the home of two peoples.

The Turkish Cypriots are now making themselves heard via riots and counter-terror to that of the Greeks.

Why wouldn't it be better for you to apply your slogan of a binational state—which you so logically use in Palestine and Israel—to Cyprus?

Cyprus like Israel is geographically near the homelands of its minority and belongs in the near East and not in Europe.

IRV SHENHABIM

It would seem that our correspondent is overlooking the basic democratic question involved in Cyprus: the right to self-determination. The people of Cyprus—naturally, by a majority vote—have a right to determine their national existence, including the right to join Greece if they so desire. No democrat can deny this to them.

This, which is the immediate question in Cyprus, is not today a question of Israel. The Israeli problem is a different one.

In Israel, which is now a national sovereign state, it is question of the in-

FORCE AND VIOLENCE!

By JACK WILSON

It's a deplorable fact but it's getting to the point where a few men can't plan to kill a few hundred million people by force and violence and keep it a secret.

At least that is what the New York Times informs us in a dispatch from Washington dated June 28.

Washington officials were shocked to learn that someone had released the information that hundreds of millions of people (including it said, a great many in friendly countries) would be killed in the event of an all-out air force nuclear attack on Russia.

Lieut. General James M. Gavin offered this figure as "the current planning estimate," and he happens to be director of Research and Development department of the army.

Mind you, there was no shock expressed at the horrible consequences to humanity of such an attack, no criticism of policies which make this awful nightmare a possible reality. Just shock that Lieut. General Gavin's testimony was released.

Although no newspaper in the Midwest which we scanned carried the story, it was published in the Times, and it did contain this significant exchange between Senator James Duff and General Gavin:

"I would like to ask you, sir, if we got

into nuclear war and our strategic air force made an assault in force against Russia with nuclear weapons so that those weapons were exploded in a way where the prevailing winds would carry them southeast over Russia, what would be the effect in the way of death over there under those circumstances?"

Answer:

"Current planning estimates run on the order of several hundred million deaths that would be either way depending upon which way the wind blew. If the wind blew in the southeast they would be mostly in the USSR, although they would extend into the Japanese and perhaps down in the Philippine area."

"If the wind blew the other way they would extend well back up into Western Europe. And I use the figure several hundred million which contrasts with the estimates that you have quoted in Fortune magazine."

Fortune estimated a mere 70,000,000 persons!

We sure would like to hear the general answer the question: "And what would Russia be doing to America at the same time?"

The political impact of the disclosures already has hit Washington. "Neutralist and free and uncommitted countries," as the Times puts it, will think again before lining up for self-destruction.

If You Don't Like Your Uncle Sammy . . .

ISTANBUL, Turkey, June 24—I do hope that you will please publish the enclosed letter. I do not agree with your newspaper on anything. But we are all Americans and we must tell the truth to our own people. My letter, which I ask you please to print, expresses my own view, my thoughts and what I wish to say to my own people about my own impressions and conclusions, as a result of the tour of the world I am making.

The American people must know this—we will take not one word of insult, not one expression of hatred, and we will no longer give one cent or one drop of blood of our boys, our sons, unless it is in a partnership of freedom. And if we cannot achieve that, then we should retire to our own shores, and if necessary fight it out to the death with communism. But the time has come, and more than come, when we honest Americans, myself who is anti-CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE, have taken enough, given enough, and have had enough of the blood of our boys spilled on foreign soil. From here on in, we should have a truly honest partnership in freedom, or else go it alone.

As I have indicated, I am anti-CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE. But with malice aforethought I am sending this communication to you. I ask humbly that you publish it because I feel it imperative for my own people, my own Chicago to know. Often I have criticized our Chicago and our America but we must stop taking as much as one insult from anybody in the world, we must apologize to no one for our country, and from here on in, we must not give one cent or one drop of the blood of our sons and nephews, unless it is for an honest and free partnership of free people.

Again and as (a) a fellow Chicagoan, and (b) a firm political opponent of your newspaper I ask you, please, to print what I have written you.

JAMES T. FARRELL

(Mr. Farrell, the Chicago born writer, is the author of the Studs Lonigan trilogy, among other novels. The language and punctuation of his letter are entirely his.—Ed.)

LABOR ACTION reprints the above verbatim from a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune as a public service.

The headline is borrowed from a World War I song, the last chorus of which went:

If you don't like the stars in Old Glory
If you don't like the Red-White-and-Blue
Then don't be like that cur in the story
Don't bite the hand that's feeding
the hand that's feeding
the hand that's feeding you-u-u

Mr. Farrell is still national chairman of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom.



July 16, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 29

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

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

LABOR ACTION FORUM

THURSDAYS at 9 p.m.

July 19—Sam Taylor
IS THE ECONOMIC
RECESSION HERE

July 26—Richard Parrish
A NORTHERN NEGRO
LOOKS AT THE SOUTH

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

The Powell Amendment Used as a Shabby Excuse as Republicans, Dems. Deal Joint Blow to Schools

By MAX MARTIN

The much-vaunted American Two Party System, praised alike by conservatives and liberals, by big business and labor leaders, was put to the test last week and came up with a fast shuffle which dealt a blow to the needs of millions of children and young people. At stake: federal aid to education, so sorely required by the nation in view of the grave situation in which our school system finds itself. The result: the defeat in the House of Representatives by a vote of 224 to 194 of a bill which would have granted the states the sum of \$1,600,000,000 over a period of five years for the improvement of educational facilities.

The reaction of editorialists, newscasters and commentators was unanimous in one respect: all professed bewilderment. *How could it have happened*, they asked, as they shook their heads puzzledly. *The maneuvering on the floor of the House of Representatives was too complicated and confused*, they all moaned, *even many Congressmen could not understand what was happening*.

POWELL AMENDMENT

Others, more reactionary perhaps, were quick to add to their puzzled attempts at explanation the thought that the Powell Amendment, which would have withheld federal monies from school districts that were not making a start towards complying with the Supreme Court's desegregation decision, was responsible for the fiasco. This theme, which had been sung in advance by so many "liberals" who justified their failure to support the Powell Amendment on the grounds that it would defeat the school aid bill, will undoubtedly now be taken up by larger choruses of apologists for inaction on civil rights.

From one standpoint, the bewilderment is understandable, and even justified. And that is the standpoint of those, unfortunately so prevalent in the country today, who judge by surface appearances only and who take the promises of capitalist politicians at face value. From this standpoint, just consider:

SCHOOL CRISIS

The nation confronts a severe school crisis. A lack of school plant, overcrowding, a shortage of teachers: these are the facts of life for millions of people of school age this year. They were the facts of life last year. They will be the even harsher facts of life next year. The growth of our school population has outstripped school construction and the training and recruitment of teachers.

In urban centers, and especially in their older working class sections, ancient and decrepit buildings which should have been torn down and replaced years, if not decades ago, still continue to "serve" as schools despite the inadequacy of their facilities and despite the fact that they provide class room space for 2 or 3 or in some cases, as many as 10 times the number of students they originally were built for. The same situation can be found in rural areas.

In some respects the situation is worst of all in the rapidly mushrooming su-

burban communities which cluster around our cities. The rate of population growth in suburbia has been so large that it suffers from extreme overcrowding in the schools, even though its school buildings are for the most part of more recent vintage and therefore more modern and with better facilities, than those in the city or in the countryside.

Coupled with the shortage of school plant is one of teachers, a situation resulting from two factors: the inadequate pay which the nation's educators receive, and the inability of the teacher training institutions to meet the demand for new teachers. As a result of low salaries, insufficient numbers of people are being attracted to the teaching field, but even if more were interested in entering it, facilities for training them would be inadequate to meet the country's needs.

FEDERAL AID A MUST

The communities and states engage, of course, in some school construction, but for one reason or another, these cannot keep pace with the growth of school population. In many cases reactionary local realty interests succeed in waging campaigns against increased expenditure for education, since such expenditure involves increased taxation on real estate and other segments of business. Reactionary attacks on "progressive education" and witchhunting smears against "Communism in the schools," spearheaded by such opponenets of public education as the group led by Alan Zoll, have succeeded in convincing voters to defeat school construction programs in a large number of cities. But even where this element does not play a role, the cities and states have proven themselves incapable of solving the problem.

Nor does the prognosis for the future offer much hope of alleviation, given the present basis of financing school construction; on the contrary, things will get worse. Given the high birthrate, the decreasing rate of infant mortality, the tendency toward all children completing their education through high school, the situation can only deteriorate. As one commentator put it, we face the prospect of utter paralysis of the school system in a number of years. Under these conditions, federal aid is a must.

GOP & DEMS FOR IT

For a long time now various progressive groups and individuals have favored such aid. Labor, liberals, the professional and trade union organizations of educators have long been for it. But until recently, the demand for the intervention of the national government into the situation was confined to these groups. In

the last year or so, however, the dire need of the nation has forced practically everybody to declare himself in favor of federal aid. Thus, both the Democratic and Republican parties say they are for it. The president and his administration likewise claim they favor it, and the president even sent a request to Congress calling for Federal grants. Its adoption would thus seem to have been assured.

Seem to have been assured, that is, if one judges by surface appearances and platform declarations. Given such judgement, it is no wonder that surprise, confusion and bewilderment were the reactions to the defeat of the proposal to grant Federal aid. After all, this Congress had just voted vast sums for highway construction, and necessary as highways are, they rank or should rank below schools. After all, this Congress had just voted huge military appropriations, including \$800,000,000 for the building of 100 B-52 bombers which the Defense Department said we do not require. Astronomical as \$1,600,000,000 may seem to the average citizen, it is really a modest sum compared to other government expenditures. Just a drop, in fact.

And yet it was defeated, making virtually impossible, as all commentators testify, the adoption of any aid to education legislation during this session of Congress. It was defeated because reaction has a firm grip on this Congress and on the two political parties whose members compose it. It was defeated in an atmosphere of cynical maneuvering and deceit, one rarely matched for its open unabashed quality.

First on the Powell Amendment. This amendment, so clearly justified from the standpoint of human rights, would have simply required that school districts make a reasonable start toward desegregation in order to receive federal grants. It was a case of simple justice: those in violation of the Supreme Court decision should not receive federal aid with which to be able to carry out their refusal to obey the law of the land. No federal money to build segregated schools in defiance of the court declaration that such schools are unconstitutional! It would have been a powerful weapon against Jim Crow. One would think that every liberal would welcome, support, and fight for it.

VICIOUS AND IMMORAL

The reaction of so many "liberals" was instructive, to put it charitably. They attacked and condemned Powell's proposal. As Clarence Mitchell of the NAACP pointed out in a recent issue of the *Nation*, it was entirely unnecessary for the racist Dixiecrats to lead the fight against it; they let "liberal" Northern Democrats and some Republicans do that for them. Oregon's Senator Neuberger, regarded by many as one of the outstanding liberals in the Senate, branded the Amendment as "vicious and immoral." Others used milder language but were ready to oppose it nevertheless.

Why? Because, they explained, it would result in a defeat for the program of aid to education. The intentions behind the amendment are laudable, said many, but it isn't practical. The Southern Democrats will vote against the bill in its entirety and thereby defeat it, and even if it passes in the House of Representatives it will be filibustered to death in the Senate.

But that means that you are yielding to the blackmail of the racists, doesn't it? To those who are a minority in the country, and a minority in Congress, even though their influence in the halls of government are so much greater than their strength in the country. It means

that the Southern Democrats can blackmail you on every piece of legislation, not on this alone. Yes, but, er-r-r, its not realistic.

UTTER FUTILITY

The utter futility and self-defeating quality of the liberal strategy was revealed even more sharply after the bill had been rejected. According to all newspaper accounts of the event, the Southern Democrats had intended to vote against the measure even if the Powell Amendment had not carried. Their reasoning is that even if the bill had been adopted without the desegregation amendment, such an amendment could be added later, perhaps when actual appropriations are being voted, or next year. Thus they are ready to vote against needed social legislation to guard against possible anti-segregation additions to it at a later date. This poses a real problem, for if this is their attitude on school aid, who can guarantee that it will be different on other legislation. Thus the futility of appeasement is underscored once again.

The actual voting in the House was as follows: first the Powell Amendment was carried in a teller vote, in which party voting lines were not clear. Then it was defeated when a certain whole section of the bill including it was removed. Then it was carried in a record vote, by 225 to 192, in which 148 Republicans voted for and 46 against, and 77 Democrats for and 146 against. The bill as a whole was then defeated by 224 to 194; 75 Republicans cast affirmative ballots, 119 negatives ones; 119 Democrats voted in favor and 105 against.

BLAME EACH OTHER

Both parties of course hastened to blame each other for the debacle. An analysis of what happened shows that they are both right about each other. A

(Turn to last page)

NEW YORK

THE MANDARINS

by

Simone de Beauvoir

will be discussed at

A YSL SOCIAL-EDUCATIONAL

Saturday, July 21 at 8:30 p.m.

333 West 26th St. Apt. 1L (basement)

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

WORLD POLITICS SINCE 1925

Wednesday evenings at 8

- (2) July 18—Cy Jackson
China, 1925-28.
- (3) July 25—George Rawlings
Germany: the Rise of Nazism.
- (4) Aug. 1—Max Martin
France: the Popular Front.
- (5) Aug. 8—Anne Russell
Spain: the Civil War.
- (6) Aug. 15—Sam Taylor
The Second World War.

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

YSL NATIONAL CAMP & SUMMER SCHOOL

EDUCATION

RECREATION

Sept 3-9 Mountain Spring Camp, Washington, N. J.

For further details, watch Challenge, or write
YSL, Third Floor, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

THE GOVERNMENT'S CASE AGAINST THE ISL

rests on

A POLICE AGENT'S INFERENCE FROM AN IMPLICATION
OF AN HYPOTHESIS ABOUT A THEORY
OF CLASS RELATIONS
IN SOCIETY

By HAL DRAPER

Washington, July 10

At 10 this morning, hearing examiner Edward Morrissey reconvened the Department of Justice hearing of the case of the Independent Socialist League versus the "subversive list," for cross-examination of the only witness the government has managed to produce for its side, the well-known McCarthyite James Burnham.

At 4 in the afternoon, after a lethal cross-examination by ISL attorney Joseph L. Rauh Jr., Burnham staggered off the witness stand. "Staggered" is only metaphorical: speaking literally, he did remain upright on his way out, he did appear to be in one piece, and he did smile a grim prim smile.

But if we were the government attorneys in the case, we would now be wondering how to smuggle him out of town and back to New York before Rauh gets hold of him again tomorrow, as is scheduled to happen. Of course, we are not government attorneys, and we are not an unbiased observer, and we are not a legal eagle or a reasonable facsimile thereof, so the reader is advised to treat this opinion as a political observation.

EXTENT OF IGNORANCE

We can't vouch for the juridical niceties, but politically Burnham was astonishing in the feebleness with which he crumbled under cross-examination at vital points—where he resorted to evasion or professorial doubletalk or irrelevancy. Still politically, perhaps the most interesting section of the day was that part of the morning during which Rauh elicited from Burnham the full extent of his ignorance about the organizations he was testifying against—the ISL and its predecessors, the Workers Party and Socialist Youth League—and then prodded him into several expositions of his truly fantastic theory of the ISL's "subversiveness."

When Burnham had originally testified, week before last, it had been brought out that he had been in the organization only a few weeks in all, in 1940. When the Socialist Workers Party split in that year on the issue of support to Russia in the war, Burnham was still a leading member of the minority group which went out to form the Workers Party; but a few weeks after the organization was formed, Burnham, who had already in fact decided in his own mind that he had broken with Marxism, resigned.

This afternoon, under Rauh's questioning, he admitted that even during these "few weeks" before he handed in his resignation, he was already "subjectively" out. He recalled attending only one meeting in all, and that a public meeting of the just-formed organization. He said he "doubts" that he attended any private meeting; at any rate he remembered none.

WITNESS KNOWS NOTHING

In other words, even as far as these few weeks of membership were concerned, he could supply the government case with no testimony whatsoever of the sort they needed.

The question arises, naturally, how

In reporting the questions and answers in this article, I have in most cases not used quotation marks (since the stenographic record is not yet available as this is written), but the passages given in this manner are in fact as close to the verbatim as my notes permitted.—H. D.

much or what he knew or knows about the organizations since then, to justify his status as witness for the government case, rather than a status simply as a McCarthyite-type "expert" on radicalism.

It is no exaggeration to say that he was forced to admit that he knew practically nothing. Specifically...

Rauh: You testified the other week that you read two or three copies of LABOR ACTION last year. How many did you read this year?

Burnham: None.

Q—How many in 1955?

A—Two or three.

Q—What do you remember reading in these issues?

A—I don't remember them in any detail. I remember nothing notable. . . . Some articles discussing the post-Stalin regime in the Soviet Union. . . . I don't remember anything in more detail. . . . They [LABOR ACTION] were still critical of the Soviet regime; the death of Stalin hadn't changed the regime, hadn't yet [sic] caused the ISL to change its position. . . .

HOW MANY LABOR ACTIONS?

Q—How many LABOR ACTIONS did you read in 1954?

A—Not many. . . . I can't give an accurate estimate.

Q—Do you remember anything from LABOR ACTION issues of 1954?

A—Nothing specifically. . . .

Q—How much did you read in 1953?

A—Very little.

Q—What do you remember of it?

A—I have no specific memory.

Same for 1952. Finally Rauh asked him to tell the hearing anything he remembered reading in any ISL publication (LABOR ACTION or New International) since 1949, when the ISL formed out of the Workers Party. Could he give the name of one article, a single article? No, admitted the expert.

Could he give the substance of one, any one? Burnham, after some thought, opined that he could recollect none in detail, but he recalled two or three dealing with Titoism; some dealing with war; articles dealing with the Republican administration; and a few discussions of the situation in Russia and the death of Stalin. "I would not want to give the impression that my judgment of the ISL's basic policy would be based on what I have read," he remarked.

GENERAL ESTIMATE

Rauh: What then is it based on?

Burnham: It would be a general estimate, derived from an acquaintance with Mr. Shachtman himself, his development, the historical background of the ISL's predecessor organizations, the way in which it fits into the spectrum of organizations, and a detailed knowledge of the 1940 split. I never found any reason to believe there had been any basic shift since then [concluded this expert who had just made clear how hard he had been looking].

Rauh thereupon went to work on the four general subjects which the expert had dredged up from his capacious memory.

Q—Take these four items: what in the ISL articles—tell me what exactly what indicated to you that this organization was the same?

A—The mode of analysis in the articles.

Q—For example, take the articles on Titoism. . . .?

A—I don't remember exactly what they said. . . .

As Burnham trailed off into generalities about modes of analysis and such, Rauh mercilessly brought him back to the question: Tell me what was said—not your conclusions, but first what was said in any one of these articles which indicated to you. . . .

When his professorial hemming and hawing ran out, and after a longish but pregnant silence of deep lucubration, Burnham finally offered:

—About Tito: included in one article I remember was some discussion of his past Communist history, the fact that he issued out of the Stalinist movement, and speculations about how far the break from Moscow would develop; what factors were pushing him closer or farther from Moscow; discussing Titoism as a development of a bureaucratic dictatorship which had violated the norms of the proletarian revolution; discussion of the role of the Yugoslav peasantry; discussion of whether a certain democratization of the Yugoslav regime might develop. . . .

All that, he added, appeared "over a period of years" and not in one specific article. Do you remember, asked Rauh, an LA article headed "Hands off Djilas and Dedijer!"?—I don't remember, said the expert.

Didn't you read that the ISL is for more democracy in Yugoslavia?—Yes, "as it interprets it."—Are they for the right of political opposition?—"Within the limits of the Leninist ideology," qualified Burnham.

FOR MORE DEMOCRACY

Rauh: Where have you read anything that supports that qualification?

Burnham [retreating]: Well, they continue the basic Marxian doctrines. . . .

But he conceded that "in terms of the organization's propaganda, there has been more talk of democracy and the possibilities of certain types of democracy than in the official Communist Party or the orthodox Trotskyists."

After some more questioning about what he remembered, if anything, about the ISL position on Titoism, Rauh approached the crux of the questioning: Mr. Burnham, what demonstrated to you in all this [the articles on Titoism] that the ISL advocates the overthrow of the U. S. government by force and violence?

In answer, Burnham gave the first exposition of his theory of how to prove an organization subversive.

Burnham: I will try to explain both positively and negatively. Positively: the ISL continued the mode of analysis that is based on the Leninist principles in making analyses and interpreting events. . . . Negatively: I did not find anything, except in lesser details, which suggested a revision or rejection of the principles which I knew had led to the development of the Shachtman point of view.

GOBBLEDYGOOK

Rauh, of course, would not accept this gobbledygook: Give me one word, or one thought, in the Tito articles that supports your contention that they advocated the overthrow of the U. S. government by force and violence?

Burnham: Well, you know Yugoslavia

is rather distant from Washington, but the implications are rather close. The fundamental idea is this: governments are fundamentally of a class nature, and therefore reform or change of these governments is limited to a basic change in class relations. Consequently, to fulfill this aim, the basic structure of the government has to be altered; and that can only be done by the liquidation of the existing government and the substitution of a different kind of government. . . . This is the heart of the matter, and from this it follows necessarily that they must be for force and violence. . . . This type of analysis is involved in what the ISL has to say about Tito.

Thus, from articles which advocated genuine democracy against Titoist totalitarianism, Burnham demonstrates that to regard the Tito regime as the dictatorship of an exploiting class "implies" advocacy of force and violence in the United States! It was one for the books.

SUBVERSIVE ANALYSIS

Burnham indeed repeated that "all this is implicit in everything in the Tito articles" (since it followed from the subversive "mode of analysis").

Rauh: You say it is implicit. What is explicit?

Burnham answered in so many words: "The class analysis of the Tito government and its relations with Russia," etc.

Rauh then put the question: "Because they use a class analysis of the Tito government, on that you build your case that they're for the overthrow of the U. S. government by force and violence?"

Burnham hedged: "Not exclusively. . . . It is indicative. . . ."

A moment later, evidently realizing that he was out on a limb, he did some more hedging: "My political estimation is based on part—I believe a decisive part—of its history, on my background of general knowledge of its politics, plus what little [sic] acquaintance I have of their day-to-day activities over recent years; all these things are consistent with what I know. . . ."

Then, after government attorney Maddrix had pitched in too, to crowbar his expert out of the hole he had burrowed into, Rauh started the same chase-down on another item among the few articles that Burnham claimed to remember.

CADILLAC CABINET

Rauh: Let's take their article on the Republican administration—what in these articles led you to believe that the ISL advocates the overthrow of the U. S. government by force and violence?

Burnham started on a long analogy on why one might believe that X is a member of the Catholic Church, but, after the usual forceful prod from Rauh, succeeded in returning to the subject:—They [the ISL] analyze the government, and the Eisenhower government specifically, in a kind of sophisticated form of the "Cadillac Cabinet" estimate that liberals make but with deeper class meaning. . . . in the belief that this is an alien government, represents an alien class, to which their opposition is absolute, one which must be eliminated. . . .

Rauh: What was said in these articles that leads you to this analysis of yours?

Burnham [huffly]: I have already answered in the only way I can.

Next, Rauh went after the third of Burnham's four more-or-less-remembered subjects: What was it in the articles on the Stalin government that leads you. . . .?

Burnham: My answer is in substance the same. [But then perhaps he looked at Maddrix's face, so he went on:] The conclusion that they advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence is an inference in this field, the field of their discussion of the Soviet government. This inference is drawn from their doctrinal structure, and from the fact that they are not interested solely in theory but have certain objectives. In analyzing the Soviet regime, as in analyzing other regimes, they refer to it in class terms; they contrast the classes of society, the bourgeoisie, the proletariat, and the newly formed class with no established name which perhaps can be called the bureaucratic class; with their conclusions on the Soviet regime, they apply this class analysis. This analysis commits them to the doctrine that there is an inalienable gulf between the classes in society—each class with its own government [proposed for the future, he means, I suppose—H. D.], with its own

The ISL's Washington Hearing

outlook. Wherever such a view is held, those who hold it are logically [sic] committed—and psychologically committed also, in Shachtman's case—to a view that if a government is a government of an alien class, and if he has the practical objective of changing the government, he can do so only by its overthrow, not by the process of reforming the constitutional structure; and this in turn commits him to force and violence in order to eliminate the power of the alien government.

SUBVERSIVE IMPLICATIONS

(The reader is invited to gaze with awe on this "logical" construction of this ex-professor of philosophy, this ex-radical, this ex-managerial-revolutionist, almost this ex-person, as he sucks all this out of any analysis of society in terms of classes—a "mode of analysis" incidentally which is of course far from limited to Marxists, let alone far from limited to advocates of force and violence.)

In answer to a question from Rauh on where all this could be found in the articles on Stalin, Burnham lifted his nose two inches and replied: My answer is in terms of the implications of the Stalin articles.

Q—From where in these articles do you draw these implications?

A—The answer I gave is the best I am able to do.

Q—You can't give us a single statement in these articles . . . ?

Burnham thereupon resorted to the recollection that somewhere in these articles there was, or was "implied," approval of the Russian Revolution, which was a revolution by force and violence; the ISL's contention is that the proletarian revolution was corrupted under Stalin, the regime was turned into an

"alien regime," and in this way, "the mode of class analysis is carried on." . . . "Is all that contained in these articles?" asked Rauh quizzically.

Burnham: "Their speculations proceed in terms of the same system of ideas . . ."

We have now described in detail the heart of the "theory of the case" which Burnham set forth in the course of the day, or at any rate in this substantial section of the cross-examination. There was nothing more to it; above all, nothing more specific than what has been given above.

As can be seen, it is systematically presented by Burnham as an inference from an implication of an hypothesis about a theory of class relations in society; and this inference from an implication of an hypothesis is not even related to anything ever done or written by the ISL that can be observed with the naked eye but only deduced from admittedly vague recollections of unquoted and unspecified articles of entirely unknown date.

I have no way of knowing, of course, but it is hard to imagine that a fantasy like this was ever pulled in any other public court or hearing room in the land (omitting the star-chamber hearings of some loyalty boards where everything went)—or so it seems to this reporter at the moment.

It is also hard to believe that any fair tribunal in the country will be able to read this testimony without incredulity.

BIG AND LITTLE C

Another substantial section of the morning session dealt with Burnham's way of using the word "Communism." As readers of these Washington-hearing reports know, this question is at the heart of the case. The subversive list labels the ISL "Communist," but the govern-

ment refuses to define the term, i.e., define the charge. "Communist" with a big C, of course, invariably denotes, to virtually all people, the "Communism" of the Communist Parties and their Russian masters.

Under questioning, Burnham admitted that in his books (a pile of which Rauh stacked under his nose) the word Communist is "ordinarily applied to the orthodox Communist movement." Isn't that the most common use of the word? asked Rauh. "It is hard to estimate it quantitatively," answered Burnham in his typical manner of evading a question.—Have you used it a majority of the times to connect it up with the official party of the Soviet Union?—Yes.—Vast majority of the times?—"That's an indefinite term," weasled the ex-prof, but, treed, he admitted that in his "three main books on the subject" he had used it "almost exclusively" in the official sense.

At this time there was an interlude during which the attorneys on both sides had to discuss another point; during this time Burnham started flipping through the books in front of him looking for passages in which he had used the word Communist in some different way. When the other discussion was over, Rauh asked Burnham whether he had succeeded in finding "any place where you used it solely in the 'unofficial' sense."

Burnham came up with a sentence where he had listed "official communists, unofficial communists, socialists, anarchists, liberals," all together. It wouldn't quite do in answer to Rauh's question, but that was all Burnham had.

Rauh: Didn't you always use the word in the official sense till you came in here? . . . Isn't it a fact that its meaning of Soviet Communism is its common use in America today?

Burnham [typically]: I can't answer that; it would take several generations to find out.

Rauh went through the books, referring Burnham to page after page in his works; in each case Burnham admitted that he had been using the word only in the "official" sense.

"Isn't it true," asked Rauh, "that you used it in the 'official' sense whenever you were writing on security matters?"

Burnham: Not always. It's the difference between a principle, and the application of a principle. Take the question of illegalization of an organization. My contention is that the theory of democratic society is consistent with the illegalization of an organization; but decision on the principle doesn't settle whether you do so on any particular day. . . .

FOR OUTLAWING ISL

Not long after this, Rauh came back to "illegalization": "Do you favor outlawing the ISL?" he asked bluntly.

This sent the government attorneys into a tizzy. Maddrix objected with the claim, which he possibly expected somebody to believe, that Burnham's opinion on this could not possibly have any connection with the matter before the hearing; but the examiner asked Burnham to answer.

Burnham: "I have no strong opinion one way or the other. In principle it is proper and permissible, but in practice it doesn't make enough difference one way or the other."

Rauh demanded a less weasely answer. After some more wrangling by the government attorneys in their attempt to block the question, Burnham had to reply. This time he had six slippery words prepared: "Probably not at the present time." After some more prodding, he vouchsafed the explanation that it was like trying to decide whether to jail your neighbor who has stolen four dollars. . . . There was the principle (jail 'em) and the application of the principle (maybe not this time). He wound up: "In terms of expediency I see no reason to outlaw the ISL today."

At this point, for the sake of rounding out a picture of a police agent—the ex-professor with the mentality of a cop—we might as well go to a point which cropped up in the afternoon.

This began when Rauh tried to find out from Burnham whether (in view of his opinions on the "subversiveness" of the ISL, as well as his alleged patriotic sense of "duty") this same Burnham had ever

told anybody—until this hearing—that he thought the ISL subversive . . . a sentiment, surely, that this patriot could not possibly have persuaded himself to keep to his own bosom in view of the lamentable danger to the Republic that would accrue from undenounced subversives.

FBI INFORMER

Rauh: Did you ever say in public that the Workers Party advocated the overthrow of the government by force and violence?

Burnham: I don't remember that the occasion ever arose.

Rauh: Since it is a violation of the law, wasn't it your duty to tell the FBI?

A—I have talked to representatives of the FBI.

Q—And what did you tell them?

Here a storm of objections erupted from the government bench. Maddrix: Anything Mr. Burnham told the FBI should be considered confidential.

But examiner Morrissey let him answer.

Burnham: I don't object to answering, personally. But whatever small relations I've had with the FBI are a matter of confidence. From time to time they have asked me questions and I have answered. It was my duty as a citizen. But I have hesitation about violating my relationship with the FBI by answering questions about it here.

Rauh pressed for answers instead of doubletalk, and the government legal battery went into a close huddle. Maddrix came out of it carrying the ball for a faked pass: If Burnham answers, this might affect the internal security of the country [actually!] . . . If a witness is allowed to mention that he gave information to the FBI, we'll be getting into serious difficulties; if you set this as a precedent, you will hamper us in getting people to go to the FBI and give them confidential information. . . .

Rauh pointed out that there was no confidentiality in the case of Burnham: Burnham is out in public here. He is not here as a secret informer. It is well known that James Burnham has been a secret informer for the FBI for a long time.

BRANDED A LIAR

Maddrix rose in a high dudgeon to defend Burnham's honor, or something, against this last charge, but when Rauh pointed out that Burnham himself had just testified to that effect, the government attorney either subsided or sat down to mull it over, while Rauh continued: Burnham is not here as a secret informer; he's a public informer for the FBI. And I'm trying to prove that he's a liar—that he never told anyone, publicly or privately, before he came to this hearing, that the ISL advocates overthrow by force and violence. . . .

Burnham pitched in at Maddrix's side by unburdening his soul, to the examiner, about his trepidations about violating his confidential relations with the FBI. But Morrissey let Rauh push for an answer to the question, "You testified here that the ISL advocates overthrow by force and violence. Did you tell that to the FBI?"

Burnham: "In the same sense as I testified to in this hearing—yes."

Rauh: You don't talk to the FBI in that language [Rauh is referring here to Burnham's professional gobbledeegook, which he plastered on with a trowel whenever he started seeing spots before his eyes]. I know them, they want it in English; now I want to know just what you said to them. . . .

But, backed up by more speeches from Maddrix about the sanctity of conversations with the FBI ("even if it's just to ask what the weather is"), Burnham clammed up. "I must decline in general to discuss my relations with the FBI," he announced.

It sounded reminiscently like "taking the Fifth Amendment."

NEXT WEEK—

A full report on the final debacle of the testimony of James Burnham

The Federal "Loyalty-Security" Program WDL Hails, Criticizes Report

Labor Action prints below a statement issued by the Workers Defense League in connection with the release to the public of a report on the Federal Loyalty-Security Program prepared by a committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York on behalf of the Fund for the Republic.

From reports in the New York Times it appears that this is the most thorough study yet to be made of the whole "loyalty-security" program, including the subversive list which forms the basis for so much of it.

We plan a full discussion of this report in a forthcoming issue of Labor Action.

In a statement released by the Workers Defense League today, John F. Finerty and Carl Rachlin, co-chairman of the League's Legal Committee, gave high praise to the New York Bar Association's Report on the Federal Security Program, at the same time pointing out certain reservations regarding the recommendations presented therein.

"On the positive side," they said, "we wish particularly to commend the provision that federal employes about whom security questions are raised should either be suspended with pay or transferred to a less sensitive job. It is one of the most shameful aspects of the present program that employes are cut off from all earnings at precisely the point in their lives when they most require financial support."

"Our most important criticism of the recommendations has to do with the standard and criterion for personnel security which are proposed. In suggesting that this standard be whether the employment or retention in employment of the individual is in the interest of the United States, the Report goes far beyond the present standard of clear consistency with the interests of the national security. In so doing, it broadens the criterion to such an extent that the question of security is left behind altogether, and individuals holding sensitive jobs may be subject to charges on a wide

open, catch-all basis which is not at all limited to the purpose which concerns us—namely, security. Thus the protection of persons holding sensitive jobs is still further reduced, and no such person can be certain in what safe-seeming area of his life trouble may arise—from actions having no relationship whatsoever to security.

"The Workers Defense League wishes also to take exception to the proposal that no re-examination of past security decisions be undertaken pursuant to the possible adoption of these recommendations as government policy. The Report claims that such decision should be allowed to stand because much bitterness would result from the re-opening of old cases. It is our contention that a few months of bitterness and controversy are far healthier for the republic than the tolerance of even one life blighted by an unjust security decision."

"In making these necessarily hasty evaluations of this Report, we wish to stress again the value of the thorough and magnificently analytical job done by the Committee, and to express the hope that the Government will consider this Report as a sound starting point for the reform of the entire machinery of Federal security."

NOW READ THIS!

To All Readers of Labor Action

In preparing our sets of the 1955 volume of LABOR ACTION for binding, we find that we lack the issue of June 13, 1955. We request all readers of Labor Action to go through their back files and send us any copies of that issue they may find. As many of the bound volumes are destined for library collections, completing them is a public service which justifies some sacrifice.

Send all copies of the June 13, 1955 issue promptly to:

Labor Action 114 West 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

Kremlin Puts Lid on — —

(Continued from page 1)

ed out further. The "negative effects" were the concentration of power in Stalin's hands, and the arbitrary abuse of that power. But although the resolution states that this process went so far that none of the official bodies of the Russian party and government were assembled to meet and decide questions for years; although the secret police became a willing tool of Stalin and his henchmen against the party and the citizenry in general; although any opposition was met with terror... Russia marched to socialism and is now marching on to Communism. This march was hindered, to be sure for a while by Stalin. But all the "negative effects" of his rule have now been eliminated, and democracy flourishes in Russia as in no other country of the world.

WHERE WERE YOU?

The bourgeois press has naturally picked on one of the most obvious and dramatic aspects of the criticism of the present Stalinist leaders, and hence has attached most importance to the portion of the resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU aimed directly at it. This is the excellent question: "where were you when all this was going on?" To this the resolution answers: we were there, doing our best to limit the "negative effects" of Stalin's rule. But such were the successes of the regime, and such was the fame he had won by his successful fight against the Trotskyites and other enemies of the regime, that anyone who had tried to overthrow him would not have been supported by the people. And they add: remember that after the difficult days of the first five year plans came World War II, and that to this very day the capitalists are plotting the downfall of our regime. To have moved against Stalin in circumstances which would have divided the party and the country, and would have thus exposed them to enemy attack, would have been irresponsible.

The resolution then goes to its most important section. This is the answer to the one question which strikes at the vitals of Stalinism. The question, in a mild form, had been put by the Italian Stalinist leader Togliatti: "The true problems are unanswered, which are why and how Soviet society arrived at certain forms so foreign to the democratic system and legality, even to the point of degeneration... It seems to us that undoubtedly Stalin's errors were tied in with an excessive increase in bureaucratic apparatus in Soviet economic and political life, and perhaps, first of all, in party affairs..."

To this the Stalinist bureaucrats of Russia give the sharpest answer:

"It would, however, be a serious mistake to deduce from the past existence of the cult of personality some kind of changes in the social order in the USSR or to look for the source of this cult in the nature of the Soviet social order..."

"As it is known, the nature of the social-political regime is determined by the nature of the means of production, to whom the means of production belong and in the hands of what class political authority is vested. The whole world knows that in our country, as a result of the October Revolution and the victory of socialism, the socialist means of production have been consolidated and that for nearly forty years have been in the hands of the working class and peasantry..."

The Stalinist leaders go on to insist that democracy today in Russia is superior to that in any other country.

"Unlike any kind of bourgeois democracy, Soviet democracy not only proclaims the right of all members of Soviet society, without exception, to work, education and leisure, participation in state affairs, freedom of speech and of the press, freedom of consciousness and also a real possibility for the free development of personal abilities and other democratic rights and freedoms, but also insures them materially."

"The essence of democracy lies not in formal indications but in whether the political authority serves and reflects in acts the will and basic interests of the majority of the people and workers. The entire internal and foreign policy of the Soviet state proclaims the fact that our regime is a truly democratic popular regime."

The rulers of the Kremlin are not willing to make a single concession on this score. And that is where their resolution shows blindness to which their class position condemns them. For the attack on Stalin's personal rule has opened exactly this whole area to question which was closed before within the ranks of the world Stalinist movement.

DENIED CHARGE

In the past, all Stalinists and their supporters simply denied the charge that there was no democracy in Russia. Now, however, the Stalinist rulers have themselves admitted it. They say that the reason they were unable to oppose Stalin's excesses was that the terror had created an atmosphere in which no one who opposed Stalin could hope to get anything but a bullet in the neck. Stalin's "popularity," was, after all, a function of the fact that no one dared say a word against him.

Their claim that democracy now flourishes in Russia does not rest on the contention that there has been some basic change in the regime. Quite the contrary. They have got rid of Stalin's personal rule, and the power which he once exercised is now wielded by a collective leadership. Whereas he failed to convene party congresses and the like, they now go through with these forms. In claiming that freedom of speech, press and the like exist in Russia, they point to no new developments in these fields. They rest their whole claim that democracy flourishes in Russia on the contention that "the means of production and... political authority are vested... in the hands of the working class and peasantry." But that was as true under Stalin as it is under Khrushchev, which simply means that it is not true at all.

Their difficulty, and the inevitable failure of their resolution to accomplish its purpose, is that this answer, which used to satisfy millions of workers and other followers of Stalinism in the past is no longer sufficient. To the revolutionary socialist opponents of Stalinism these people replied in the past: "what you say about totalitarianism in Russia isn't true, and

it couldn't be in a country where the workers and peasants own the means of production and hence control the government. You are just repeating vile bourgeois slanders." Now these same people, or many of them, are saying to themselves: but now that it turns out that the 'vile slanders' were all true, is it possible that the workers and peasants really own the means of production and control the government?"

To this question the bureaucrats in the Kremlin can only answer with a repeated assertion of the proposition which needs to be proved. And to that they add a warning and a threat.

REMINDED CRITICS

They remind their critics within the Stalinist movement that the United States government has hundreds of millions of dollars at its disposal with which to try to subvert the Stalinist governments in Russia and the satellites. They remind them that the struggle for world Stalinist victory is far from won, and that the Stalinist parties must stand shoulder to shoulder in order to win it. They point to the fate of the Poznan uprising as an example to anyone who thinks that the denunciation of Stalin means that Stalinist regimes don't know how to take care of themselves against their peoples.

And in the country they control most directly, the organ of the Stalinist party, *Pravda* reminds all who can read that "the Communist party has been and will be the only master of the minds, and thoughts, the spokesman, leader and organizer of the people in their entire struggle for communism."

From one Stalinist party after another, delegations are going to Moscow to get completely oriented on the new line. As they return, the party leaders proclaim, with one degree of fervor or another, their "satisfaction" with the "explanation" of the Russian rulers of the new line and of the democracy which exists in Russia. The difficulty is that now, as never before in the history of Stalinism, the answer rises from among their own ranks: "if that is socialism, if that is democracy, we want none of it!"

young socialist CHALLENGE

Blow to Schools — —

(Continued from page 5)

large majority of the Republicans are simply against federal aid to education, notwithstanding the position of the party and their administration. The Republicans voted for the Powell Amendment in a ratio of better than three to one, thus enabling them to appeal to Negro voters in this election year with the claim that they were for a weapon against Jim Crow. Having produced something which will enable them to make election year propaganda, they then voted against both school aid and the anti-Jim Crow weapon.

What of the Democrats? They rejected the pro-civil rights amendment of Representative Powell by over two to one, a majority which includes the Southern racists and many of the appeasing Northern "liberals." But since they produced a 14 vote majority for the bill as a whole, they too will "go to the country" claiming that they had supported aid to education, and aid to education with anti-segregation provisions, moreover. Democratic Party spokesmen were quick to point out that they did vote for the bill by a division of 119 to 105, and that if a substantial Republican minority, i.e., one which was less than 14 fewer than the Republicans opposing the bill, had voted with them, it would have been carried.

WHAT SPURIOUS CLAIMS

What spurious claims! After all, the Democratic Party claims to be the party of social progress and of liberalism, of the New and Fair Deals. Come election time it brands the Republicans as reactionary, as subservient to the special interests, as unresponsive to the people's

needs. Therefore, one presumably cannot expect much in the way of progressive legislation from that quarter. One expects the Republicans to provide a solid majority against social legislation, even social legislation as "safe" and un-radical as this.

The Democratic Party, which has a majority in Congress, should, given its claims and pretensions, provide an even more solid majority for social legislation, than the Republicans produce against it. The paltry 14 vote majority for this legislation which the Democrats came up with, after voting overwhelmingly against the Powell Amendment, hardly fits its claim to be the party of liberalism. If the best that the Democrats can do is provide such a margin for social legislation, then none will be passed, for the Republicans are certain to provide a much larger margin of votes against it.

The rejection of federal aid to education underlines once again the futility of relying on the Democrats and Republican parties. In arguing against the Powell Amendment, Northern Democratic "liberals" called it unrealistic and impractical. They were right, although not in the way they mean it. It is unrealistic and impractical to expect civil rights action from this obsolete, unrepresentative two-party structure which monopolizes political life in the United States. It has also proved impractical and unrealistic to expect aid to education from it.

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Please enter my subscription:

- 1 year at \$2. 6 months at \$1.
- Payment enclosed. Bill me.
- New sub. Renewal.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE