new foundations

THE EARTH SHALL RISE ON NEW FOUNDATIONS

VOLUME 2
NUMBER 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NEW FOUNDATIONS is published quarterly at 575 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York, by the New Foundations Cooperative Press. Subscription $1.00 annually; single copies, 25 cents; foreign subscriptions, $1.25. Entered as second class matter November 26, 1947 at the post office in New York under the Act of March 3, 1879.

The Contributors

Walter Bronson is an American student at Prague University.

Wiley Eisen, veteran, is now writing a novel.

Hans Freistadt is a graduate student at Chapel Hill.

Al Greenberg, veteran, is a graduate student at the Sorbonne, Paris.

Thomas McGrath has written poetry for a number of progressive magazines and recently published a book of his poems. He is now studying for a post-doctorate degree at Oxford University.

Irv Segal is a student of literature at Brooklyn College.

Marvin Shaw, a veteran, is a graduate student of economics. He is also chairman of the Council of Student Clubs of the Communist Party.

Ann Williams is a student of economics.

* * *

NEW FOUNDATIONS is a magazine of, by and for students. In a very real sense, the material printed reflects the progressive and Marxist thinking and writing being done by students in every aspect of their work. Your contribution of an article, short story, poem, book review or graphic arts will be welcomed. Whether or not it is published, we will attempt to evaluate and criticize it constructively. Please send it to us.

—The Editors.

It Is Happening Here

AN EDITORIAL

IF Hans, a German student in 1933, went calmly to his classes, paying little attention to the Reichstag Fire Trial and the subsequent illegalization of the Communist Party, he might be excused because fascism was something relatively new in world history. But today, fifteen years later, the peoples of the world have learned how fascism operates by first eliminating the Communists, then the Jews, the trade unionists, the Catholics, anybody, any nation that disagrees with the ideology and methods of the fascist ruling class. There is not a thinking person who can go calmly about his business while the rulers of our country take a major step towards fascism: the illegalization of the Communist Party by be-heading its leadership and making the advocacy of Marxism-Leninism a criminal offense.

You students of political science, history, and literature may think we are shouting wolf; "It can't happen here in the land of the free." WAKE UP! It is happening now under a false banner of defending the American heritage. Twelve men, members of the National Committee of the Communist Party, have been brought to trial for conspiring to organize a party "dedicated to the Marxist-Leninist principles of the overthrow and destruction of the government of the United States by force and violence."

When did the Communist Party become "dangerous" to the United States Government? It has been on the American scene for almost thirty years. No governmental agency in all these years could find evidence to support the thesis of the indictment. According to the indictment itself, *July 1945* is the date on which the twelve men named, organized and formed the Communist Party.

Let us keep the facts straight. In July, 1945, the National Convention of the Communist Political Association voted to change its name back to the original, the Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA). As America had taken its place as the leading imperialist nation, the CPUSA also adopted a program that correctly indicated the need for struggle against the aggressive policy of imperialism. Did the CP suddenly become dangerous when it exposed the

machinations of the Big Business-controlled government to develop a war policy: armaments, a standing army, atom stockpiles? Did the CP become dangerous when it gave the lie to the "humanitarian" Marshall Plan, exposing it as an attempt to gain political and financial control of the world? Yes, the CP is dangerous because it helps people to understand why prices are high when production is at a maximum; why the government must rattle atom-bombs when the peoples of the world want peace. The CP, using the guide of Marxism-Leninism, provokes "dangerous thoughts" in the minds of the American people. The Big-Business government is afraid of such thinking. The existence of the CP makes more difficult their task of keeping wages down, prices high, and militarizing America. To stifle all opposing thought and action, the government wants the CP out of the American political picture. The people repudiated the first attempt to achieve this aim—the Mundt-Nixon bill—by nationwide opposition; 35,000 telegrams opposing its passage reached Capitol Hill in one week. Now the government is trying to use the courts for the same end by reviving the old myth that Marxism-Leninism is synonymous with force and violence.

Do the principles of Marxism-Leninism advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence? No. Lenin showed that force and violence are the products of capitalism. Wars, depression, police violence, strike-breaking are forms that it takes. Marxist-Leninists constantly struggle against these manifestations of capitalism. Their struggle is to prevent those who control the state from employing force and violence to perpetuate their rule against the peoples' will.

Marxist-Leninists believe that when the state, to achieve imperialist aims, turns to greater use of force and violence to suppress growing numbers of people, the workers and all other oppressed groups have an inalienable right to change the existing government. As the Founding Fathers of America asserted in the Declaration of Independence: "But when a long Train of Abuses and Usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their Right, it is their Duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their further Security." Marxist-Leninists can only give direction to the people, can only show them that they must struggle against the capitalist sources of violence in order to form a society where "every use of violence against man in general" will cease to exist.

Students, learn well the lessons of history! Prevent this move to outlaw "dangerous thoughts!" Stop the illegalization of the Communist Party! Halt the drive of the government towards fascism! Demand an end to the persecution of the Twelve!

HANS FREISTADT

World Government Now —Peace or War?

THE slogan *World Government Now* has attracted a large number of sincere liberals, especially intellectuals and students. Its appeal lies in its apparent simplicity as a solution to the very real threat of war. Supporting it are scientists of international renown and unquestionable good will, such as Albert Einstein. Equally abundant in the ranks of the World Federalists, however, are chronic Russophobes, like James B. Carey, right wing Secretary-Treasurer of the C.I.O.; and certain others, such as W. T. Holliday, President of the Standard Oil Company of Ohio, and F. R. von Windegger, President of the Plaza Bank of St. Louis, whose business activities—the search for new markets and fields of investment to maintain at all costs their present high rate of profit—constitute the greatest threat to peace at this time. Their participation renders any organization claiming to be dedicated to saving the peace questionable.

As an abstract idea, World Government appears to be wonderful; live in one World, the parts of which, in this age of technology, are closely interdependent. One single authority, responsible to the people, to manage the resources of the world, appears to be a step as logical as socialism, a system where those resources will be developed for the benefit of the many rather than the profit of the few. Today, moreover, the slogan of World Government is advanced as an attempt to check the drift towards war. This article aims to examine this slogan in its relation to the present political line-up to determine the possibility of its success.

The war danger is real and the following statement of facts undeniable: "There are no serious negotiations going forward in the world between the two great powers, the United States and Soviet Russia. Almost everywhere, the pattern is the same—total collapse of discussion on the most important problems—in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, in Berlin, in Korea. . . . The maintenance of an armed peace in a two bloc world . . . has . . . his-

torically . . . always led to war."[1] What is the way out of this situation? The World Federalists discuss several alternatives:

1. Preventive war. This is dismissed.

2. Negotiation and settlement of conflicts by mutual compromise, along the lines suggested by Wallace. Most Federalists term this "appeasement."

3. "World Government with limited powers adequate to prevent war."[2] "The World Government movement looks toward a creation of supranatural authority with power sufficient to maintain law among nations. . . . Is this a hopeless perspective? We think not. The American proposal for international control of atomic energy was accepted in its essentials by the nations outside the Soviet bloc. Through its abolition of the veto power in the field of atomic energy . . . this was . . . in substance . . . a world government in a limited sphere."[3]

* * *

This program is powerful in its universal scope. Our quarrel is with it unrealistic treatment of the functions of government and law, and of the causes of war.

To the World Federalist, "government," "law," "order," and "justice," are sacred and practically synonymous. The World Government will not be American or Russian, Capitalist or Communist, it will merely enforce peace; it will be above the opponents in the conflict, and, will render justice and arbitrate in international quarrels in the manner of Solomon. "If a world constitution guarantees security from war, and also assures the right to each nation to conduct peaceably its own internal affairs, we confidently hope that every country would ratify it."[4]

This is a utopian and unscientific concept of the law and of the state. A cohesive body of law is never above the conflicting sides. It is an instrument through which the dominant class exercises its power.

As long as heterogeneity of political systems and the economic relations upon which they rest exist, disagreement as to the side upon which law should be used will ensue; there cannot be a government acceptable to both contestants. Therefore the primary question to ask about World Government is: "On whose side would it be exercised?"

A World Government dominated by the United States State Department would be welcomed by the American rulers—investment

---

[1] Statement by the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists, Albert Einstein, Chairman.

[2] United World Federalists, Convention, St. Louis, Nov. 1-2, 1947.

[3] Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists, loc. cit.

[4] United World Federalists, loc. cit.

bankers and industrialists. Some Old Guard Isolationists might object, but the decisive sector of the American ownership class could be persuaded that World Government is a convenient method of extending its domination beyond the "Western Bloc" to outlaw socialism internationally. It would carry with it complete freedom for monopoly capital to exploit all parts of the world under the slogan of "free trade," unhampered by the national boundaries. It would tie the economy of the whole world to the crisis-bound economy of the U. S., with the eventual prospect of a *Pax-Americana* characterized by international Taft-Hartley Acts and witch-hunts. Such a World Government would doom, for the peoples of Africa, Latin America and Asia, all hopes of rising out of their economic dependence on foreign corporations to a new national dignity of free and full development. It would level all cultural endeavours to the commercialized trash of Hollywood and the funny papers. This is exemplified by the operation of the Marshall Plan to subjugate the nations of Europe economically, politically, and now militarily to the predatory aims of American big business. It is further illustrated by the present policy of the U. S. in the United Nations. World Government would simply mean that the aims for which monopoly capital is striving, and which are now checked by the successful development of the Soviet Union and the new peoples' democracies of Eastern Europe would be realized through legislation enforced by a U.S.-controlled international police force.

Such a World Government would be completely under the control of the U. S., as indeed would be the U. N. without the veto power. The ultimate interpretation of what is *law* would rest with the monopolists who control the U. S. both by their tight grip on our economy, and their infiltration into high government positions.

Not one World Federalist has satisfactorily answered the question: "What mechanism do you propose to assure the Soviet Union that World Government will not endanger socialist nations? Do you believe there can be a World Government, in the setting up of which our State Department would play a leading part, which could fulfil this requirement? Is not the first step toward genuine world peace and international cooperation the reversal of the fatal course of our anti-Soviet policy, and the restoration of friendship with our most valiant war-time ally?"

The view that the veto stifles the will of the majority in the U. N., that even if there is danger that the Law will be used against her, Russia ought to welcome a veto-less World Government is unrealistic. One cannot expect a country, engaged in the greatest social project of our times—the construction of a socialist society—to abandon the unanimity principle for majority rule as long as it is evident that the majority, led by Franco-lawyer John Foster Dulles and white-

supremacist Tom Connolly, is waiting for the first opportunity to trample upon her most elementary rights. The Soviet Union vetoed the American proposal for control of atomic energy, precisely because it would substitute for the unanimity principle, which requires mutual compromise, decision by a majority under American control. The proposal, in effect, would have left control of U. S. atomic projects in the hands of the U. S. corporation-controlled Government, and given it control of Soviet research as well.

It is characteristic for World Federalists, against whom the author has debated, to concede that they would be far less enthusiastic for their ideal if it appeared that the majority in World Government were nations development towards socialism, while the U. S. remained an isolated capitalist country. The U. S. would be unwilling to abandon the unanimity principle in the field of atomic energy in such a case. This was clearly shown at the Danubian Conference last summer where, when the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies of Europe constituted a majority, the U. S. rejected the agreement.

Thus, we have a right to suspect that the World Federalists see in World Government primarily a scheme to "contain" Russia (their expression for subjecting it); and like a child, whose plot has been foiled, they have nothing but angry words for those "Reds" who have the nerve to see through their not-too-subtle scheme.

* * *

The allegation that national sovereignty causes war is unfounded. National sovereignty is a threat to peace only if an imperialist nation does not respect it. To say that national sovereignty leads to war is analagous to saying that a man, being robbed, is guilty of violence if he does not surrender all his possessions voluntarily. There are no conflicts between *sovereign* states that cannot be settled peacefully if a will towards mutual compromise is present, and if the economies of the states are not based on foreign aggrandizement. War arises, not from national sovereignty, but from the fact that capitalism develops unevenly in the epoch of imperialism. World War I clearly arose as a struggle between Britain and Germany to redivide the world by force. World War II was precipitated by the attempt of the Axis to conquer the world's resources. Today the Marshall Plan represents the attempt by American monopolies to achieve world supremacy.

At this time, the looming crisis forces the biggest capitalist monopolies in the U. S. to seek to obtain the whole world as a dumping ground to continue realizing their unprecedented profits; for this they must control the economy and the political life of all countries. The alternative is depression, and the growth of socialist consciousness. Therefore our State Department, acting for the American monopolies,

threatens with war all nations who stand in the way. Surrender of national sovereignty in the face of American expansionism is surrender of the right to move on to socialism, surrender to Wall Street investors. It is truly appeasement of the Munich-type and cannot contribute to saving the peace.

The mere existence of World Government does not by itself make war impossible. Governmest implies not simply arbitration by an impartial body, but also the maintenance and regulation of a political and economic system. Historically, where two economic systems have existed under the same government conflicts have arisen as the beneficiaries of one system have tried to used the government apparatus to regulate both. Thus, for example, the Civil War in the United States resulted from an attempt of Northern industrialists to extend their economic system through the Federal Government, in opposition to the Southern slaveholders. The people of the Soviet Union would not allow their socialist economy to be annihilated "legally" by a World Government acting for the American ownership class.

Does this imply that war between the U. S. and the Soviet Union is unavoidable unless, within the near future, the U. S. becomes socialist or the Soviet Union capitalist? Not at all. They cannot coexist under one government, which, by the very nature of government, would try to ram one system down the other's throat. But they can exist side by side, under different governments, respecting each other's sovereignty, and the right of each people to choose its own form of government. They can even maintain friendly relations with each other and trade for mutual benefit, as was done in Roosevelt's time. The Soviet Union has given every indication that it desires such a state of affairs. The same people who maintained friendly relations with Roosevelt still represent the Soviet Union today. The U. S., however, since Roosevelt's death, has abandoned this course and chosen one which does not respect the right of the U.S.S.R. to exist as a socialist state, outside the sphere of exploitation of American monopoly capital.

In the conflict that has followed this reversal of American foreign policy, the issues become more and more clear. Within this country, opposing the monopolists who would drag us into another war, there has arisen a new people's party, the Progressive Party, dedicated to treating the Soviet Union as an equal and friendly power. The Progressive Party must win a following strong enough to make the waging of an aggressive war impossible. This is the only hope to save peace and civilization. The cure must be applied at home, where the disease lies. Ringing door bells for the Progressive Party is less romantic than publishing manifestoes and drafting World Constitutions; but without organizing strong opposition on every issue to those who would drag

us into war, drafters of constitutions will only mislead others into supporting plans for the war we hope to avoid.

* * *

One idea, which never gets incorporated into resolutions because it might offend many sincere progressives, is widespread among many Federalists who declare frankly: "You can't trust Russia. . . ." Those who ground their plans for World Federalism on this idea oppose the Progressive Party and align themselves with the State Department and Wall Street monopolists, even though they may condemn the latter verbally. They do not conceive of the Soviet Union as a system operating in the interest of its people, here to stay, with which a *modus vivendi* must be reached. They look forward towards the collapse of the Soviet Union, and do not oppose helping that collapse to occur. World Government to them is the most effective kind of anti-Soviet slogan because it diverts the energy of its sincere followers from taking steps that are indispensable for cooperation with the Soviet Union. The State Department, they believe, is simply stupid for not utilizing it. Their *World Government Now* may, if need be, provide the holy slogan for World War III—the "last war" to bring about World Government—against those who refuse to submit to the majority. "World Federalism with Russia left out might split the world into warring camps, but if war should result, the issues would be clear and with the advent of peace a total World Government might be achieved."[5] Thus—far from preventing war—the slogan of *World* Government Now has become the rallying point of those who desire a third war to smash the Soviet Union. Henry Luce, somewhat less subtle, called it the "American century."

* * *

Some World Federalists on the other hand, tell us that they want democratic World Government, controlled by the people, without exploitation by the monopolies. A voluntary union of nations there will surely be some day, as the only logical development in a socialist world. It will no longer be a scheme to avoid war; there is no danger of war under socialism. Under socialism, the workers own the means of production; goods are produced, not for the profits of the few, but of the mutual benefit of the many; no expanding markets are needed, as they are under capitalism, upon which to dump excess goods. Nor will it constitute a state with a police force to enforce world law by suppressing one class in the interests of another; there will ultimately be no classes. Its aim will be instead to allocate the resources of the entire world for the benefit of all its inhabitants. Such a voluntary world union of nations, representing the highest ideals of the inter-

[5] M. J. Adler, speech, to United World Federalists, Chicago, January 31, 1948.

national brotherhood, we must keep in mind as our eventual goal; but it is reactionary to attempt to build it without first establishing the prerequisites for it. It is naive to expect the same Congress which wanted to vote Franco into the E.R.P., or the same State Department which is sending arms to Chiang Kai-shek, as well as the reactionary governments of Greece and Turkey, to agree to such a voluntary union of nations. Our efforts today must be dedicated to oust those who seek to impose American capitalism's rule on the peoples of the world, and, ultimately, to winning socialism in our country. To raise the slogan of *World Government Now* is to direct attention away from these fundamental tasks, and to mislead even sincere progressives into the trap of supporting the drive by the men of the trusts for world domination.

* * *

The slogan *World Government Now* certainly must be opposed; raising it is but an anti-Soviet crusade in disguise. At the same time, the idea of World Government, to which many sincere liberals, confused by the sophistry of the leaders of the World Federalists, have rallied out of an honest desire for peace, should not be completely discredited. Let us never forget that a lasting, just World Government —the administration of things, not the suppression of people—will surely be formed when the peoples' needs and aspirations are satisfied by the development of socialism in each country. Let us show sincere liberals that the slogan of *World Government Now* harms rather than fosters peace; that respect for the national sovereignty of all nations is a prerequisite, not the antithesis, of democratic World Government; that democratic World Government—a voluntary union of nations—can arise only when private ownership of resources and productive facilities is replaced by socialism.

Such Lies They Told Us

In memory, the wild blue geese, lagging behind the spring,
Seemed all summer long to acclaim our extravagant unselfish notions
Of time—for they seemed eternal, each locked to its changeless image
On the lost lake of the past. And, under that dead sun,
Those kissing hours of illusion blessed our foreheads forever—
Or so we thought. For the years, opening their windows on
That tame image of life, promised the use of our powers—
Such lies were told us. Signs seen later made us unsure.
In the first fall frost the wild geese flew up, circled, were gone.

Nobody put us wise. There came a sound of crying
But we didn't know it as ours as we lay on the cold white table
Till the banker came in with a knife and that terrible look in his eyes.
And the judge sent his wicked little men in through the ports of childhood
To cut off the hands of our play and steal the ticket to Pueblo.
In our youth we heard the footsteps whispering up to the door
And the landlord's son came in wearing the false face of kindness
Talking of brotherhood. Later, waiting in darkness,
His gunmen coughed in the alley. But nobody spoke of that war

Into which the poor are born with their eyes blindfolded.
Though many will spend their lives, lost on mortgaged acres,
Shiver in the winds of their weakness, or, on the home quarter
Open their eyes among murderers one day on the summer fallow—
You may not bandage those wounds: allow the light to enter!
Wisdom comes from the struggle, creating the courage and grace
Which under an animal sun, in a world wilder than geese,
Still lets our eyes embrace for the proud and final time
When capital's sickly sheriff drops the hood on your face.

Longshot O'Leary Counsels Direct Action

As I went into the city
(I heard O'Leary say)
Salutes of drunken beggars
Were fired to greet the day.
While prisoner clocks on the bankers' desks
Were busy translating time into money.
Honor into thieves, love into matrimony,
The twenty best questions were never asked.
Despair, infecting the postage stamps of the century,
Carried to summer counties its mortal taint,
Through towns where the ghost-of-the-month had no house to haunt,
And the moon lay cold, lay cold in the penitentiary.
O there is no love and there is no love
(I heard O'Leary say)
But the bastards who have locked up the moon
Will have the most to pay.

As I went into the country
(I heard O'Leary say)
I looked in the old places
But everyone's gone away.
Inside the correct, neurotic towns,
Luck has chopped off its healing hands,
And between the heart and the bold highlands
Hope's London Bridge is falling down.
Losing the scent, the hounds of desire in the baffling
Precincts of choice are charmed. Their ghostly bay
Chills the enchanted sleepers, but hardly shakes
In the Atomic Year, their dream of the buffalo.
The breath of a burgess blackens the moon
(I heard O'Leary say)
You must smash his Fomarian magic
Before hope will come to stay;
But as long as someone is fighting back
It never goes quite away.

The Tampa Incident

HIS mind during the last three years had formed into a waiting mind like that of a man on a long journey, who has decided that nothing can be done beyond keeping an eye on the path and looking, here and there, for shortcuts. It was a journey he thought he should take and engage in with energy but which deadened and narrowed, not unpleasantly, his escape, his awareness. He drove slowly along the Southern road, noting as he often had before, the sand and rough grass, the palm trees, half-brown in summer, the flat country, and his thoughts were easy, passive.

He had been an active tireless soldier these three years. He had risen to his captaincy out of the ranks. And he had a good deal. He was paid enough to have his wife and new-born son with him. He had a job as Information and Education Officer at the Air Base outside Tampa. And so, as he drove along the road to begin his twenty-four hour tour as Officer of the Day, he was not a worried or a fretful man.

His conscience troubled him occasionally, for he believed, more than most, that fascism had to be fought. But someone had to do the job here. Now, he was content, if not particularly happy, and he wanted to stay with his wife. The last three years, apart from the army, he only remembered by thinking of her and the times they would get a sitter and go out to a bar, dancing to a few numbers on the juke box, looking deeply at each other over their drinks.

Before the war, he had fought hard. Eighteen hours a day, even, organizing for the union. Now there was a war on. Everyone had unified behind the safe generalities that required no decision or initiative. And there was really nothing he could do except be a good soldier. Those who before had been his enemies were now on his side. And, though he realized vaguely that afterwards they would be his enemies again, he had slipped, unawares, into the habit of taking all that for granted.

Drab, barren, the outskirts of Tampa slipped by him. Bare-legged girls and soldiers from the Base were walking to the center of the city. He looked at them with an automatic pity. With Barbara his own refuge, he had carelessly observed many hot, dust-settled evenings like

this one when his comrades had grasped for the things that had to interest and satiate—women, young and old, liquor, and, when the men were lucky, cars. All the cities he had been stationed near to in the army centers of surrounding camps and fields, became at twilight, like Tampa, a buzz of the synthetic, a card-house of illusions.

Thinking of this haggard search of the soldiers, Mitchell remembered that he must hunt for Wister. Wister was spending his last leave with him and Barbara before going overseas and he had promised to look Wister up in town tonight. Wister, too, like all the healthy, cursing soldiers and tanned, empty-headed girls, was going to finger the night and the city. Mitchell, with his wife, had never had to try. He wondered if, unmarried, he would have fallen into the rut of other soldiers on pass, who moved down the streets for a while, silently, who were impatient and bored that they should so outnumber the girls—girls with new hardness in their faces, and self-interest in their shifting eyes.

Mitchell understood it, though he couldn't formulate it too clearly. It was not his problem. Still, he was curious, curious enough to be extraordinarily glad when, after he had inspected a few Military Police patrols and some cafes, he came upon Wister in one of the bars.

Wister, who was young and looked it, stood at the bar alone. He looked clean and a little shy as he stood there, glancing now and then at two unescorted girls in a booth in the corner.

"Hi, Ray," Mitchell said, sitting on a stool next to Wister. "Got anything on your mind?"

"Hello, Mitch," Wister said. There was relief in his voice, as if he were glad to be distracted from his problem.

"Anything going on?"

"Well, it's this way," said Wister, sipping his drink, "I've been in town an hour and I haven't found a thing yet. I've got my eye on the quail over there in the booth. But I can't figure out if I should get another guy or if I should go it alone and get rid of one of them."

"They look like a hard pair. Think you'll have much of a time with them?"

"Always do," said Wister, with boyish confidence.

After a pause Mitchell said, "Well, it beats me—just what fun can you find in a pair like that?"

Wister considered as if he felt he had to justify himself to Mitchell, who had not really meant the remark very seriously.

"Well—sometimes you get somewhere but generally you don't. And it's not even that so much, for me anyway. You start out hoping you'll find "the girl"—a girl that will surprise you, though you knew

from the beginning that it wasn't likely she'd be hanging around one of these joints, waiting to get picked up. But anyway, that's what you hope at first . . . and one day the hope just isn't there any more and somehow you've got used to all the girls who never resembled the original model. So—you're used to it, and they—they're there. . . . You figure you're young and afterwards it'll be different, and you can throw all this away."

"And you have fun?"

"Fun?" Wister repeated. "I guess so . . . sort of going along in the pattern . . . taking things as they are."

"Yeah, I guess so," said Mitchell.

"I've got to go on, Ray," he said. "See you tomorrow at the apartment. And luck—with that, if you decide to try it."

Wister grinned. "Smashed glass against the mantle piece and all that."

His face, mocking during this last remark changed as a girl came in alone and slipped into the seat Mitchell had left free. Mitchell went out the door, leaving Wister glancing sideways at the girl, eagerness wiping away his irony and melancholy.

Outside, the summer night had come on quietly. Mitchell started his command car, and noticed that they had turned the street lights on. The end of twilight muffled sound and movement. He drove along the dark and quiet Tampa streets.

Then he saw the three MP's beating a figure huddled under the display window of a bookstore. He gunned the engine and pulled up to the curb, slamming on the brakes.

"Attention!" he shouted, jumping from the car.

Slowly the MP's, a sergeant and two corporals, looked up and turned around. Bewildered at the intrusion, and the sudden head lights, they came uncertainly to attention.

"Don't you men salute any more?" he asked icily, more to adjust himself to what he saw than to tell off the MP's.

They saluted. Mitchell knelt down beside the figure, a huddle khaki shape in the shadows.

"Are you all right?" he asked, loudly.

The man, a private, uncovered his bloody head.

"Are they through?" he asked. His swelling mouth formed the words with slow painfulness. But though he had been soundless before that, his throat seemed to catch on the last word. He lowered his face on to his arms and his shoulders heaved in the convulsive hiccoughs of a man's tears.

"Take it easy, Private, take it easy," said Mitchell. "We'll get you fixed up."

He rose and turned to the MP's, who stood at awkward attention. In the dim light their sunburnt faces contrasted strangely with the white gleam of helmets and leggings.

"What's your story?" asked Mitchell curtly.

"Well, Sir," the sergeant spoke, "the corporal here—Corporal Prince —saw a knife in that nigger's hand. We were afraid he was going to start something, so we gave it to him, Sir. He was hiding it in his pocket."

"I see. Where is the knife?"

"He must have ditched it, Sir. That is, it was the corporal here who saw it," the sergeant said. He glanced sideways at the small wiry corporal who stood stiffly at his right.

"You see, Sir," he went on rapidly, at Mitchell's silence," we caught this nigger looking this store over. Nobody was around, and you know, Captain," here he emphasized the word "you," his tone bordering on the confidential—"you know that it don't look right with a nigger in this part of town . . . it looks mighty suspicious."

He spoke with the confidence of a man whose actions were now clear,

"Yes? Just where is this knife?" asked Mitchell again.

"He might have thrown it someplace." The other corporal spoke for the first time, and there was a sound of fear in his voice.

"Find it." I'll search him myself, Mitchell said, and knelt down beside the soldier again.

"What's your name, Private?"

"Wilkes," the man answered, barely audible.

"Look, Wilkes—I have to search you. Okay?"

"I haven't got a knife. You know I haven't got a knife." The voice was muffled.

"I know. But you can see I've got to search you, Private."

He searched him briefly, while the MP's looked vaguely around, obviously not expecting to find anything.

"All right, that's enough," said Mitchell. "I want your names."

He wrote down what they told him. Then he gently helped the thin, shuddering Wilkes to his feet. He was surprised that the man, slim and scholarly looking, had taken such a beating without losing consciousness.

The sky was completely dark now, except in the West, where a dim circle on the horizon was a deep luminous blue. The few trees along the road to the Base rustled faintly in a wind enfeebled by the heat. He was glad of the dark, for it gave him a chance to pretend he did not notice the shaking back beside him. The silent sobs were uncontrollable, like the lost sorrow of a child.

Mitchell stared straight ahead, his eyes burning.

Finally he said," We'll get you fixed up at the Dispensary. Then, we can get some coffee if you want."

There was an awkward pause. He had the uncomfortable feeling of sounding like a stranger talking to a miserable child.

"If you don't feel like it tonight," he went on, lamely, "we could do it some other time."

Wilkes did not speak. He nodded as people often do when speech of any sort will betray them. As they neared the Base, he straightened up, and kept trying to explain half-hysterically, again and again, that he never carried a knife. There was nothing that Mitchell knew how to say. As he helped Wilkes to the Dispensary door, he noticed how the man bowed his head, making his jaw rigid in order to gain control over himself.

But when the doctor, a captain, walked over to him abruptly with a "What have we got here?" exposing Wilkes face to the glare of the incandescent light, he broke down again.

"Take it easy, boy," said the doctor, in the cool lazy accents of a Southerner. "We're not going to hurt you." He examined Wilke's hand. "What happened," he asked Mitchell. "Somebody got nasty with him, sure enough."

"Three MP's beat him up for the fun of it," said Mitchell shortly. "They said he had a knife. But I searched him, and they looked all over the sidewalk and street, We couldn't find it. I'm going to see that these men get some trouble."

"Those old MP's sure lose their heads every little now and then," said the doctor.

He was deftly and quickly cleaning Wilkes' bruises as he spoke, and he nodded in smiling good humor as though shaking his head at some nice boys who had played a little trick, as boys will, and shouldn't be thought too badly of. This irritated Mitchell.

"As far as I'm concerned, those MP's deserve the worst they can get."

Mitchell was in a position of power, and the doctor said nothing.

Wilkes said urgently again, "I never carried a knife, Captain. Not once in my whole life." His voice was hoarse and rough with the emotion of his simple truth.

"Well, boy," said the doctor jovially, "you're not so bad off. Lucky it wasn't a lot worse. The swelling will go down in a few days. Looks like a fracture in this hand, though. We'll X-ray it tomorrow." He laughed. "Keep you out of work for a few weeks. I bet you won't mind *that,* boy, eh?"

"Thank you," Wilkes said, in perfect politeness, suddenly in complete control of himself. "I'll report tomorrow."

Mitchell was furious.

"If you don't think it's something to get upset about, you try it sometime."

It had grown cooler outside. They both waited in the air, for a few moments, recasting their thoughts.

"How about taking me up on that coffee?" Mitchell asked.

Wilkes hesitated.

"Yes," he said. "I could stand some of that coffee now."

They went over to the Transient Mess Hall which was open all night. Before, with the doctor, they had drawn instinctively together as allies against him, but now they pulled out the benches and sat down with the stiff uncertain movements of two strangers who have been thrown together through chance, and found the silence between them awkward.

"Where do you come from?" asked Mitchell, after they both had made much of sipping their coffee.

"Philadelphia."

"Ever been South before?"

"No." Wilkes answered with a grimace. "I never got here until the army sent me.

"Been in long?"

"Long enough to know what the score is," said Wilkes. His smile looked ugly because of the bruises on his lips.

"Funny how you get used to the Army," observed Mitchell, though he didn't find it strange at all, "even the coffee."

"I'm not used to that yet," Wilkes said. Again he might have been smiling. "But the days go on . . . you shovel coal or drill, or wait on tables in officer's mess. After a while you give up wondering if maybe you'll get a break like a promotion maybe, or a decent job."

For some reason, Mitchell found himself anxious not to let Wilkes finish.

"Yeah, I know what you mean. I used to feel that way. I finally got a good deal, I admit—as good as a guy could expect."

He glanced shyly at Wilkes, as if he were asking his forgiveness for his good luck.

"I don't know whether I'm lucky or not, compared to the other guys." Wilkes looked at his bandaged hand.

"How do you feel now?" Mitchell asked after a pause.

"Oh, all right. But, like the doctor said, I won't be any good for a couple of weeks."

"Well, said Mitchell to finish the joke, "that's not so bad."

"I don't guess it is. No, not *that.*"

"What do you mean?"

"Hell, I don't know, exactly," Wilkes said "Like—the things I remember about tonight don't seem like the things that should be important—I was standing there, looking at the books in the window—there was one I wanted. The MP's came up behind me without me knowing it, and scared me. Asked me suddenly what I was doing there. I turned around and saw right away they were up to something. They asked me some questions—you know the way they talk, like that doctor. Then they ordered me to take my hands out of my pockets. I took them out slowly, and my fists clenched up—I couldn't help it. Then one of the corporals yelled I had a knife in my hand and they started in."

He paused.

"But what I remember most is thinking, just before they started to hit me, I remember thinking that the streets were empty and maybe it wouldn't happen if somebody came. But then I felt—I felt sure that if the streets had been full it wouldn't make any difference. And that's what makes it so bad."

Mitchell thought back to that obscure street with the dusk falling fast on the bookshop, and the MP's in their pressed uniforms and white leggings. He thought of himself in that scene and realized, now, that even when he, their superior, had exposed them, he had felt a helplessness growing in him, almost the way Wilkes had. The pressure of ignorance and numbers behind the MP's made the victory seem theirs. He might get them sent overseas, but would it really make any difference?" And suppose he had not been OD. The appalling probability was that most of the other officers would have pretended not to see what happened or would have taken the side of the MP's.

"I heard all the stories about the South," said Wilkes, "and they're true, all right. But up North, you can get away from it a little, and you figure your own problems are enough to worry about."

"Sometimes," Mitchell said, "you get caught in your living and you think you're safe from it all. At least," he added, not to be presumptious, "white people do."

"So do we, Captain. When I was young, I used to see danger everywhere. But I never felt helpless. I did something. I didn't think I had any choice. I was active as hell."

He paused, "I worked at it for quite a while."

"But you stopped."

"Yeah, I did," said Wilkes, discouraged at the fact.

"Why?"

"Oh, I guess I get to feeling how little a man can do. There didn't seem to be enough people with me, and some of them—they didn't seem to give much of a damn, anyway. I tried to get out of it. I had gone half-way through college, and I got a job in a library. It was nice there

for a while—the smell of books and the tables spread out through the room, sort of shut off. Of course, I didn't get away. . . . But, kidding myself along, I saw, without much caring, that life was working on me, instead of me trying to change life. . . ."

"I guess the Army makes you feel more that way," Mitchell said.

"I kept out of trouble . . . kept my mouth shut like everyone else. Yeah, I thought I could shrug it off until tonight."

He waved his bandaged hand.

"I've been thinking about it all this time . . . about what you did, sticking your neck out, and I'm getting to feel like a fighter again. Because when you meet up with someone on your side who doesn't just talk. . . ." He stopped, aware of the broken barriers.

"Well," said Mitchell, very embarrassed. "I mean—hell, every place you go there are guys would do the same."

But he felt a secret glow which his embarrassment concealed.

"But," Wilkes said, a bewildered look on his face again, "but that isn't it. The thing is you did something. You made a choice."

He paused, looking carefully at Mitchell, his head tilted.

"Maybe you only did it without thinking, from instinctive decency. Maybe you don't have a position on these things."

This speculation had a hidden contempt in it which startled Mitchell. He saw what his modesty had led to.

"I have a position all right," he said defensively.

For some reason as yet unclear to him, he felt dishonest—compelled to convince Wilkes again that he was "all right."

"I used to be a union organizer." He considered this final proof of his strong position. Yet again he was plagued by that first inkling of dishonesty. What if he had once been an organizer? What was he now? After years immersed in the army he thought, he was like good steel in water, grown rusty and rough. So bad, he thought, with a flash of honesty, that it took something as violent as this to shake him. It took a beaten man who talked to him as if he needed to be persuaded, to make him come to. And suppose it hadn't been Wilkes, but just a poor, ignorant, defeated guy who accepted the beating, took it for granted and was afraid to talk about it? But he knew, in his stricken confusion, that there was something he could do for Wilkes.

"I was an organizer," he repeated. "And not in one of those Jim Crow unions. I knew what was going on. I knew a lot of guys, white and black, beaten up down South, who are with us if they're still living."

He could tell that Wilkes was convinced by the appreciation on his face, almost obscured by a reticence Mitchell had grown to like in GI's.

"Yeah," Wilkes said softly, talking slowly as if his face was hurting.

"That's right. It sure helps a lot, though, Captain, to meet one of those guys. Tonight—I guess you know it makes a difference for me."

"It helps, even if you're already okay," Mitchell said.

"Well," Wilkes went on, "I'll probably never see you again—I hear we're shipping out. But—I'll know."

They got up and walked out into the dark. They shook hands.

"Watch out for that hand," Mitchell said, "and remember we're out to lick this thing and we will.

"You bet, Captain."

They walked in opposite directions down the thin, straight road, away from the circle of light which shone by the mess hall door under which they had shaken hands when they said goodby.

All the next day Mitchell held inside himself the knot of conflict represented by Wilkes, guarding it covertly. He spoke to no one but the commanding officer about what had happened the evening before, and arranged for the MP's to be transferred from the Base, probably overseas. He felt in an alien world, felt the same cherished secret urgency that he remembered from the early days of unionism into which he had been swept. His sensibility was entirely remolded, thrown back to his young, exhausting days.

He came home in the evening to his garage apartment, the knot still hard inside him. Barbara was cooking dinner, and the baby was crying his almost humanless cry without much conviction. Wister was quiet, preoccupied, drinking beer. They exchanged a few words, and he went into the kitchen to Barbara, who hadn't heard him come in.

He kissed her hard, and held her tight when she would have slipped out of his arms, as if the very insistence of the embrace would make her aware of his emotion, let her share the hard excitement inside him. He was grateful when she hugged him back for a moment, very tight, silent in his arms as if she understood some difference in him.

"All right," she said, after a few moments. "I've got to feed you."

He walked to the crib and smiled absently at his tiny son, who had given up his vain cries. But the thing inside him left him in no mood to offer his finger to be clutched. He walked past the window, and paused there, restlessly, to look out. He saw the clouds grip the low sun in flame, but he paid no attention.

He was filled with a sense of vague and bitter disappointment. He had been hoping, unreasonably, that Barbara and Wister would have seen that something was happening in him.

They sat down to dinner in the disordered way that people do who know each other well. When he told them the story, he waited impatiently for their reaction.

Wister said explosively, "The bastards!" and reached for a piece of bread.

Barbara looked straight into her husband's eyes.

"He must have been a wonderful guy," she said.

Mitchell felt something new within her. She paused and he knew there was more she would say. He realized that for the first time in their married life, they were sharing an experience together. She had admired him in his fight to organize, loved him fiercely for it, but she had only accepted his struggle. Now he felt for the first time that they would learn and grow together.

"We're out to lick this thing," she went on with determination.

What was remarkable, he was beginning to see, was that it really was not for Wilkes' sake that he had stopped the MP's, and tried to persuade Wilkes that he was a right guy. It was for his own peace that he had, for that fine moment, following a long light sleep, found reassurance for Wilkes.

It was the peace within the struggle, and he and Barbara would find it together.

"How slack we've been, eh, Wister?" he said, giving his friend a slap on the back.

"How do you mean, Mitch?"

"Forgetting these things in the war."

"Yeah, we sure have," said Wister heartily.

Mitchell saw himself of the day before yesterday in the remark. He understood that to Wister, but only for now, the single thing in his life was leaving for overseas. Let him. Let him hunt his girls and think about aerial gunnery for a while. He would know what it meant when he came back.

Mitchell knew that there were some things he and Barbara would lose—security, contentment, the comfortable part of them for the last three years. They had been aging. The price of youth was to fight again, the rejection of shelter, the insistence on struggle.

He felt their youth seep back with a sort of terror, the old smug sands of peace begin to vanish. Yet, even if they never heard Wilkes voice again, he knew they were not alone.

MARVIN SHAW

STUDENT NOTES

Nov. 2nd and After

THE coming generation of political science classes will spend many an hour reviewing the 1948 Presidential elections. It will make a fine topic for academic dissertations and doctoral theses. For the present student population however what happened on November 2nd, and what will happen in the months ahead, holds deep, one might even say life-and-death, interest.

About one-third of this country's eligible voters went to the polls. Forty-nine percent of them gave victory to Harry Truman and the Democratic Party. In doing so they rejected the "Grand Old Party" of extreme and open reaction, and re-elected an administration which, although it set no limit to its liberal campaign promises, is equally an instrument of Wall Street's imperialist foreign and domestic program. While a real choice did not exist between the bi-partisan political twins it is obvious that millions of voters thought that it did. On the one hand the confident Republicans seem to consider even lip service to a progressive democratic program unnecessary; on the other, Truman quickly found that the only way he could breathe spirit into his supposedly hopeless campaign was to hammer away at the real issues the American people saw before them. In speeches that out-New Dealed the New Deal, a curtain of oratory was drawn over the sorry reactionary record that had been compiled in Washington during the past three and a half years. The inanities of Dewey were answered by promises: repeal Taft-Hartley, more housing, civil rights, price control—even a peace program of sorts.

Some voters chose what they believed to be a lesser evil. They simply voted against Dewey. Others were convinced by a flood of unprecedented demagogy—Truman at least *promised* a good program —they thought there was at least some chance of electing him.

In the face of this Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party emerged with a vote far smaller than had been expected . . . but also with some

solid accomplishments. Out of nothing a Party and an organization had been built in less than eight months. In all but three states the right to a place on the ballot had been won. Most important, Wallace and other Progressive spokesmen effectively brought their program for peace, liberty and abundance before the American people. In thousands of speeches and radio broadcasts, in millions upon millions of pieces of literature the Marshall-Dulles foreign policy was exposed as one that benefited only the monopolists and hurt the interests of democratic peoples the world over. The militant struggle waged against Jim-Crow, particularly through the various Southern trips, and the emphasis on the economic needs of labor and the people made these questions major ones in the campaign.

As an editorial in the University of Michigan *Daily* put it, the Progressive Party "forced one of the mjaor parties to adopt enough of its platform to take away its votes."

Yet, as important as the accomplishments are they do not change the fact that the vote was both smaller than had been expected and smaller than it might have been. The "lesser evil" theory and the demagogy of Truman are the major factors accounting for the smallness of the Wallace vote. Other factors include the organizational weaknesses of the new political movement, the illusions that exist concerning the Marshall Plan, the far too few activities and struggles launched in support of various sections of the Progressive platform, the limited organization of trade union support, and the failure to consistently attack and expose those labor leaders (especially connected with the ADA) who were among the most virulent opponents of the Wallace candidacy.

The weaknesses are minor compared to the historic fact that in spite of enormous difficulties a mass militant anti-imperialist movement has been created in the very citadel of world imperialism. In post-election statements and conferences Wallace and the other leaders have emphasized that the election on November 2nd was only the first important skirmish. The Progressive Party is preparing for the even tougher battles ahead.

The campaign for Wallace and Taylor had more of a student flavor and more student participation than that for any other candidate. The "Students for Wallace" movement (now part of the Young Progressives of America) began developing early last spring, on the heels of the many campus rallies addressed by the former Vice-President. In an amazingly short period of time perhaps 300 or more clubs sprang up in the grass roots of American higher education. For the first time in the history of the student progressive movement, it was one not limited to the big northern and mid-western universities. Em-

phasizing the issues of peace, militarism and military training, "S 4 W" showed the potential exhibited by the entire Wallace movement at a slightly later period.

Students played no small role in the actual organization of the Progressive Party. Hundreds were present at the founding convention in Philadelphia, and, particularly in the states of the south, southwest and in the agricultural areas of the mid-west, they gave leadership in organizing many state conventions. Students were often elected officers of the New Party, and many were designated as candidates. During the petition drives to put the Party on the ballot, and later on during the actual election campaign they did yeoman service. In some states (Iowa, North Carolina, Oklahoma, as well as others) the campus actually carried the entire campaign. Not that this was good. It resulted from the objective weaknesses of the labor and progressive movement in those areas, and the inability of the Progressive Party to overcome them in the brief period since its creation. But for the student movement the record is not one to be ashamed of.

On the other hand the tempo of activity and growth on the campus itself later in the campaign showed a real let-down, especially during the fall semester. To a large extent this was due to the concentrated efforts put into off-campus work. Some students simply never returned from the summer "Operation Gideon"; others acted as if they had not. They canvassed the precincts, not the dorms; they organized shop gate meetings, not quadrangle rallies. It was good work, good experience—and more important than campus activity. But it did not help the student progressive movement to grow as rapidly as it could have.

There were—and still are—issues in the colleges that demanded action: academic freedom, cases of discrimination, vets' problems and educational needs. The campaign for the repeal of the unnecessary draft that will put thousands of students into the uniforms of a jim-crow army is still to be waged. Red-baiting and the greatly increased activity of Young Democratic and Republican groups needed to be answered. The campus does not stand still. If it does not go forward, it goes back.

This was not the story everywhere. In some schools the middle road was found. Work was done off campus, but a real job was also done on it. In City College, "S 4 W" was the moving spirit in the campaign to oust two anti-Semitic and an anti-Negro instructor. In Michigan, they led struggles for academic freedom. At UCLA, a fight against discrimination took place. And experience showed that out of such activity the campus progressive movement grows.

On November 20th and 21st the National Council of the Young

Progressives of America held its first post-election gathering. Whatever the weaknesses of past activity, the picture was a bright one. There was determination to go forward. To build. To grow. To fight.

It is so on the campus too. The Student Division of YPA has taken over the job of the National Students for Wallace Committee. Working together with all young people, two main areas of work have been charted: to fight for peace and to fight against jim-crow. Other issues, of course, must not be neglected. Side by side with the entire American people's movement, youth should fight to force Truman and the Democratic Congress to carry out their campaign promises. Nor may student issues such as academic freedom be ignored. But for the months ahead this program correctly indicates that activity should be centered around these two main questions.

The fight for peace must not be permitted to relapse into support of an abstract concept. Everybody is for it in general—but it is the particulars that count. Students can only fight effectively for peace if they understand the source and aims of American foreign policy. Illusions of Marshall Plan beneficence must be shattered: support to reaction in Palestine, Greece, China, France, *ad infinitum,* is a continuance, not an aberation of it; the Baruch atomic energy plan is not heaven-sent; there is more than the State Department's side of the Berlin question. . . . Perhaps what is needed is a new kind of "headline mentality"—a heightened awareness of the necessity to explode the myths created by reaction to obscure its role on every issue. As each issue arises it should be dealt with, not as a separate event, but as one aspect of the imperialist foreign policy. It is on the issues that the policies of Truman fail to measure up to his demagogy.

Students may be organized to fight imperialism if they are shown the effects of imperialism on the peoples of other nations. There is a tradition of international student cooperation on the American campus which may be developed by focusing attention on the struggles of students in key areas of the world. For example, China is in the headlines today. Only American dollars and guns stand between the Kuomintang dictatorship and collapse—and even they appear insufficient. Students have been in the forefront of the struggle against Chiang Kai-shek. Hundreds have been murdered by American bullets. Important sections of the student movement in America, mainly in the Christian movement, have spoken out—albeit softly—against this terror. A "hands off China" campaign in American colleges can both help our Chinese fellow students, and awaken American students to the lesson emphasized in a letter from the Students of the National University:

It is certainly a great tragedy in human history that a great nation like

yours should have a government in the hands of a capitalist group who put their own interest before anything else. They have been abusing your generosity and created everywhere hatred. Wherever there is a most corrupt backward, reactionary government or clique around the corner of the world you will certainly find it having the most ready backing from your government. Think of Greece, of Korea, of Italy and of China, to these countries your government has been lavishing money, foodstuff, and bullets just to help a corrupt body in power. Money to swell the purse, and food to swell the stomach of the governing class, while bullets for slaughtering the people. And these materials are sent under the disguise of "relief." Do you think the people of these countries must feel grateful to the United States for these?

Students can make their biggest contribution to the fight for peace by fighting that aspect of the war program that affects them most: the draft. During the coming month, the draft will begin to pull students out of their classrooms. And the militarists, not yet satisfied, have received the promise of Democratic support in the 81st Congress for the complete Universal Military Training program originally presented by President Truman. American youth are being organized to carry the American Century to every area of the globe. They are going to do so in a jim-crow Army—an Army complete with loyalty tests and indoctrination programs.

The "repeal the draft" campaign is intimately related to the struggle to defeat the entire foreign policy, but it has an importance all its own because of its immediate and personal effect on thousands of individual students. When a student is asked to give part of his life, he questions the reasons closely.

While opposing the draft itself, a campaign must be waged to abolish the obviously undemocratic features of the draft, particularly segregation and political discrimination. The power to act on these partial demands lies in the hands of the President. Here again, the people must fight to force the carrying out of the pledges of the campaign.

The fight for civil rights is essential to the struggle against the effects of imperialism at home. Students have indicated through their organizations and as individuals that they will participate with vigor in whatever struggles develop around civil rights (anti-lynching and anti-polltax, etc.) and will fight to abolish those examples of discrimination that exist *within* so-called non-segregated universities. Major attention should be given to breaking down the barriers that keep Negro students out of some universities and limit their attendance and the attendance of students from other minority groups in many more. Some victories have already been won. In New York State the pres-

sure of a broad coalition of forces, with students playing a leading role, forced the passage of the Fair Educational Practices Act, somewhat weak it is true but nevertheless a real advance. The Supreme Court decision calling for the establishment of equal facilities was another step ahead, although here again too many loopholes were left.

On November 7th the Student Division of the National Lawyers Guild, by a resolution of its national convention, sent a message to the convention of the NAACP Youth Division, meeting later that same week, calling for a unified national campaign by the entire student movement to wipe the blot of discrimination from the record of American higher education. The campus is ripe for such a movement. Students, both north and south have demonstrated their support of equal, unsegregated educational opportunity. There is growing realization that discrimination hurts every student. Every national organization should be called upon to act. NSA should be forced to carry out its stated program opposing discrimination. On local campuses there is need for committees that would not only participate in a national campaign, but also work to break down the barriers that exist, either through outright segregation or through quota systems, in each particular school.

While the fight against jim-crow will undoubtedly not be undertaken by the student YPA alone, that organization will undoubtedly play a leading, in fact an initiating role in such a campaign. In doing so it will establish itself even more firmly as the center of the student liberal and progressive movement and as the leading spirit in fighting for all-campus unity in the interests of every student.

The potential for the Student YPA is a vast one. The need is even greater. In the 1948 election campaign the post-war student movement learned its most profound lessons. In the months ahead it must learn to apply those lessons to win the campus for peace, freedom, abundance.

Pastoral

On our summer street
The fire hydrant is a fountain
And the gutter is a swimming pool
For naked feet.

In our summer homes
The flower pots are gardens
And window sills are balconies
For budding Juliets.

The pigeons fly between the roofs,
Between the boundaries of the sky.

The child asks, "Mamma,
What's a mountain?"

And mamma looks among the meadows
Framed upon her summer wall.

Death of a Huk

After McArthur, after Roxas,
When peasants' land and peasants' gun
Became illegal;
After escaping the Japanese six times
The new cops caught him with the goods:
Rifle in hand, dust from the rebel hills
On his shoulders.

Then the heat was on.
What they did was simple, logical;
With small sharp knives
They carved daylight through his arms
And demanded an answer.

They planted his throat with his teeth
And waited for betrayal to sprout
From his broken mouth.

They hacked his brown sides with bolos,
Furious before this miracle of silence.

(Who tore the sun loose from its socket?
It floats and explodes!

The huts dance up to the hills
Down to the black earth I love my

The sugar cane sticks my sides
Marguerita
Bernardo Manuel I love the hands of my

Wife the huts jump up to the sun
That crazy sun it explodes because

I know why it explodes because
The huts jump up to where it floats)

At San Tomas, without hammers spikes wooden cross,
They crushed him
Hating his open eyes
And stared at the hills
Where one thousand Jesus Christs were waiting.

ANN WILLIAMS

*Against the Equilibrists**

GEORGE J. STIGLER, Professor of Economics at Columbia University and writer of pamphlets for the National Association of Manufacturers, begins his texbook with this declaration: ". . . to say that economics is a science is a description, not an encomium."[1]**

As Marxists, we must agree that political economy *is* a science in the sense that it enables us to understand the laws of development of the real phenomena of capitalism, and thus provides us with a guide to action. But the theory of prices as set forth by Dr. Stigler and the majority of professors in American universities does not provide that kind of a science; rather it constitutes a rationale which holds the Capitalist System to be sacrosanct and immortal.

This paper draws extensively on Stigler's textbook because it is a revised edition published in 1947, presumably fairly up-to-date. Further, it contains a very explicit discussion of method, with which this paper is primarily concerned.

Our task as Marxist students studying this "science" in the universities is not easy. On the one hand we must learn a maze of unrealistic theories and methods to obtain our degrees from the Stiglers. On the other hand we must learn to reject those concepts and ideas and ideas which are aimed to inculcate in us a false patriotism, not to the welfare of the American people, but to "our country"—and its economic and political rulers—"right or wrong." We must grasp and develop those tools which will enable us to stand side by side with the working class in its struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

The difficulties of our task are illustrated by the distortions we occasionally introduce into our own investigations by attempting to interpret problems of political economy in terms of the concepts of these

---

* This paper is a revised report given to a conference of students of political economy in June, 1948.

** Despite his brave assertion, Professor Stigler declares in his Preface,

> One cannot present a wholly coherent and satisfying formal analysis nor can one concentrate on the (unknown) important phenomena of the real world. . . . In short, economics is in an unsatisfactory state—it is hard to write a textbook.

[1] Stigler, G. J.: The Theory of Price, 1947 Edition, MacMillan Co., New York, p. 3.

philosophers of capitalism. Fundamentally, these distortions flow from a failure to comprehend fully the nature of Marx's historical materialist analysis in contrast to the theories of price taught in our classrooms. This report aims to contrast Marx's historical materialist analysis of capitalist reality with the static, idealist theories and methods prevalent in the universities today, and to develop what may be characterized as a "first approximation" to the approach we must develop in our work in political economy.

I. THE EQUILIBRISTS VERSUS THE HISTORICAL MATERIALISTS

Political economists have been faced with the historical necessity of explaining two fundamental aspects of capitalism. First, they have been called upon to explain the source of profits. This is necessary because the search for profit has been the expressed motive of the capitalists in revolutionizing the means of production. Second, political economy has been faced with the necessity of explaining the nature and cause of the manifold developments of capitalism: the early rapid development and expansion of industry and transport on the one hand, and the growth of unemployment, monopoly, crises, imperialism, and war on the other.

The classical economists, especially Smith and Ricardo, writing in the period of the growth of capitalism and the destruction of feudalism, aimed to discover the *way* labor was used in the process of capitalist production to augment the wealth of mankind. Thus Smith introduced his famous book, "The Wealth of Nations," with the assertion: "The greatest improvement in the productive powers of labor, and the greater part of the skill, dexterity, and judgment with which it is anv where directed, or applied, seem to have been the effects of the divisior of labor."[2] Smith and Ricardo held that long term prices were determined by the amount of socially necessary labor time used in producing commodities. But they declared, at the same time, that profits, which were included in the prices of commodities, were the return to capitalists for their risks and abstinence. In other words, the money price. obtained for commodities in exchange, included profits. This concept apparently contradicts the assertion that long term prices are determined by value. Once this contradiction was exposed, it became necessary either to reject the labor theory of value or to reject the belief that profits were the just returns of capitalists for their efforts. The attempts of

[2] Smith, A.: An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations, 1937 Edition, The Modern Library, Random House, Inc., New York, p. 3.

economists to solve this apparent contradiction and to discover the source of profits have split them into two camps: those who use Marxism-Leninism as a guide to action on the one hand, and the philosophers of capitalism on the other.

The neo-classical economists, characterized by Marx as "vulgar," rejected the labor theory of value. Their basic assumption has been that capitalism, the profit system, is the best possible system. They have incorporated this belief into a model in which prices tend through competition towards the static norm where supply equals demand. Professor Stigler describes the nature of this belief in the following manner:

> Modern economics is frequently called *equilibrium* (*his emphasis—AW*) economics, for the study of the nature and conditions of equilibrium forms the core of price theory. In any specific investigation, the economist is interested in, e.g., the outputs of various commodities and their prices, in light of the data of the problem (the demand and supply conditions). These outputs and prices are in equilibrium if, given the governing data on demand and supply, there is no tendency for the outputs and prices to undergo additional changes. The conditions of equilibrium are the relationships which must be fulfilled before outputs and prices are in equilibrium; *these conditions summarize the important determinants of economic activity.*[3] (*our emphasis— AW*)

Equilibrium economics is concerned with money price. Money prices are established where the price for which the seller will sell a given amount of goods equals the price which the buyer is willing to pay. In contrast to the classical economists, the vulgar economists do not aim to examine the way labor is used in production. Looking through the clouded eyes of businessmen, they consider labor as merely another of the factors to be included as a cost in calculating supply price. They aim only to explain the "uncontrollable" mechanism by which prices are determined for the businessman:

> The motivating force in business activity is the hope of pecuniary profits, pecuniary profits depend upon successful buying and selling, successful buying and selling depend upon favorable conditions in an *uncontrollable world of prices*—here is the argument that states the major problem of business. And these are the facts which make the price system the dominating and all-important factor in modern life.[4] (*our emphasis—AW*)

As Professor Stigler declares, "Its (the theory's) essential feature is that all economic relationships are *impersonal.*"[5] (*his emphasis—AW*). As Marx put it, "The relations between men appear to be the relations between things."

---

[3] Stigler: Theory of Price, *op. cit.*, p. 26-27.

[4] Mills, F. C.: Statistical Methods, 1938. Henry Holt and Co., Inc., New York, p. 3.

[5] Stigler: The Theory of Price, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

The basic assumption of the equilibrists, that capitalism is the best possible economic system, provides their answer as to the source of profits. Profits are simply justified. Two theories are advanced as to their source: one, that profits are part of costs, the other, that profits are the reward for abstinence and risk. But these are advanced only to bolster up the empty circular reasoning of this idealistic* theory. Supply and demand are said to determine price, while price, in turn, is said to determine supply and demand. Therefore profits are the return on capital included in the supply price which determines the money price in conjunction with the demand price; and the money price, in turn, determines the supply price, including the profits. But the *source* of profits is left undiscovered.

Any attempt to examine the causes of growth and change of the manifold aspects of capitalism are consciously excluded by the vulgar economists. This, then, is their answer to the second problem faced by political economists. Professor Stigler explains quite succinctly:

> Most economic phenomena cannot be completely explained in a scientific sense, i.e., they cannot be forecasted. In such cases, the economist may be able to provide a useful analysis of the phenomena by assuming that the fundamental data are stationary, even though he cannot explain dynamic and historical elements of the problem.[6]

In other words, the equilibrists confine themselves to a study of each growing phenomenon in isolation, ignoring from the outset any possible interaction that may occur with others. In this way they construct theories of "business cycles," money and banking, and foreign trade, and append them to their static equilibrium frame of reference.

Change cannot be completely excluded, however, even from this idealist theory created in the seclusion of university halls. Businessmen require a theory which enables them to explain away the most glaring of the excrescences of modern capitalism, even though they cannot always control them. Before the 1930's, the economists held that the norm of equilibrium existed only under conditions of full employment. The shock of the Great Depression proved the inadequacy of that concept; it was inevitable that it should be modified to admit of equilibrium at levels of less than full employment. The fault, the professors of the "new economics" (Keynesians) declare, lies in inadequate investment (and/or demand which flows from investment) because the

---

* Idealist in the philosophical sense that it is founded on a belief rather than on examination of reality.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

capitalists' expectations of profits are too low.* Other modifications have been introduced into the superstructure of the theory to explain the effects of monopoly. For example, the Harvard Professor, Dr. Chamberlin, created a "hybrid value theory" of monopolistic competition which defined monopoly as the production of any commodity which differed in the least from all others. In this way, adjustments are made in the theory's superstructure to "explain" changes in real phenomena. But never do these philosophers of fate search for the conditions peculiar to capitalism which give rise to the constant growth and change of its many aspects.

These are theories which, as Keynes pointed out, dominate "the economic thought, both practical and theorical, of the governing and academic classes of this generation, as it has for a hundred years past."[7] But we must go further than Keynes: these are the economic theories which despite Keynesian modifications, contrive to provide the rationale for the ruling capitalist class. Modifications in its superstructure are made only insofar as they increase the "ability" of the capitalists to continue their rule despite the problems arising out of the general crisis of capitalism. Ultimately, such theories provide the smokescreen for fascism just as Keynesian theory was used by the Nazis in executing their economic policies in Germany.

The communist or historical materialist, "world outlook," in contrast to that which is drilled into us in our classrooms, is founded on the study of the growth and change of the real world. Thus Marxist-Leninist political economy is based on the extension of the principles of dialectical materialism to an examination of capitalism.

Philosophical materialism holds that the world is by its nature material, existing outside of men's minds; it holds further, in contrast to the equilibrists who begin with the assumption that we cannot know the laws of development, that the laws of nature are fully knowable. There are no things in the world which are unknowable, but only things which are still not known, which too will be more and more disclosed and made known by the efforts of science and practice.

The *dialectical method* is diametrically opposed to the static con-

* The bankruptcy of this approach is illustrated by Keynes' declaration:

"If the Treasury were to fill old bottles with banknotes, bury them at suitable depths in disused coal-mines which are then filled up to the surface with town rubbish, and leave it to private enterprise on well-tried principles of *laissez-faire* to dig the notes up again (the right to do so being obtained, of course, by tendering for leases of the note-bearing territory), there need be no more unemployment and, with the help of the repercussions, the real income of the community, and its capital wealth also, would probably become a good deal greater than it actually is." (*The General Theory*, p. 129)

[7] Keynes, J. M.: The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money, 1936, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, p. 3.

cepts which we are taught in school. The principle feature of the Marxist dialectical method, as summarized by Stalin,[8] are:

1) Nature is not an accidental agglomeration of things, but a connected and integral whole in which things, phenomena, are organically connected with, dependent on, and determined by each other.

2) Nature is not a state of rest and immobility, stagnation and immutability, but a state of continuous renewal and development, where something is always arising and developing and something always disintegrating and dying away.

3) Development passes from insignificant and imperceptible quantitative changes to open, fundamental changes to qualitative changes through a leap.

4) Internal contradictions are inherent in all things, and the struggle between that which is being born and that which is dying away constitutes the internal content of the process of development.

Clearly this dialectical method is opposed to the static equilibrium concept of our professors. More than that, as Marx declared,

> . . . It is a scandal and abomination to bourgeoisdom and its doctrinaire professors, because it includes in its comprehension an affirmative recognition of the existing state of things, at the same time also, the recognition of the negation of that state, of its inevitable breaking up; because it regards every historically developed social form as in fluid movement, and therefore takes into account its transient nature not less than its momentary existence; because it lets nothing impose upon it, and it is in its essence critical and revolutionary.[9]

Historical materialism, the method of Marxist political economists, is an extension of the method of dialectical materialism to a study of society. Throughout the history of mankind, all peoples have had to wrest a living from nature by their labor. Therefore historical materialism, in searching for the motivating force of historical change, discovers it in the forms in which men use their labor in production—i.e., in the (class) relations of men to the means of production which determine how labor is allocated. The law of value as developed by Marx is thus a science which lays bare the motive force of capitalist political economy.

The nonsense about the necessity of proving the concept of value arises from complete ignorance both of the subject dealt with and of the method of science. Every child knows that a country which ceased to work, I will

---

8 History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), 1939, International Publishers, New York, p. 106-9.

9 Marx, K.: Capital, Kerr Edition, Volume I, p. 25-26.

not say for a year, but for a few weeks, would die. Every child knows too that the mass of products corresponding to the different needs require different and quantitatively determined masses of the total labor of society. That this necessity of distributing social labor in definite proportions cannot be done away with by the *particular form* of social production, but can only change the *form it assumes,* is self-evident. No natural laws can be done away with. What can change, in changing historical circumstances, is the form in which these laws operate. And the form in which the proportional division of labor operates, in a state of society where the interconnection of social labor is manifested in the *private exchange* of the individual products of labor, is precisely the exchange value of these products.

The science consists precisely in working out *how* the law of value operates. So that if one wanted at the very beginning to 'explain' all the phenomena which apparently contradict that law, one would have to give the science *before* the science.[10] (*His emphasis—AW*)

Capital exposes the source of profit in the contradictory capitalist relations of men to the means of production in which a handful of capitalists own the means of production, and thereby own and may sell all the goods that are produced through their use. The workers, owning nothing but their hands, are forced to sell to the capitalist their only commodity, labor power, at its value—i.e., the wages necessary to cover the costs of living and raising a new generation of workers—for a given period, say eight hours. The capitalist puts the labor power of the workers which he has purchased, his variable capital (which is of course inseparable from the workers) to work with his machinery and raw materials, his constant capital. The constant capital (machinery and raw materials which have been produced by labor) is merely used up in the process of production; it creates no value. But each worker produces goods equal to the value of his labor power, which he has sold for wages, in less than the whole period for which he sold it, i.e., the eight hours. During the remainder of the period, he produces goods over and above those needed to cover the cost of his labor power, ie., surplus value. All the goods produced, of course, belong to the capitalist by virtue of his ownership of the means of production. When he sells them at their value, he receives payment equivalent, not only to the value of the constant capital and the labor power of the workers, but also to the surplus value produced by the workers. The money equivalent of the surplus value he appropriates as profit; it is his, not because he produced it, but because he owned the means of production which the workers had to use in the process of production. This exposure of the source of profit in the con-

---

10 Marx: *Letter to Kugelmann,* Selected Correspondence of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels 1846-1895, 1942, International Publishers, United States, p. 245.

tradictory relations to the means of production lays bare the real nature of capitalist exploitation: the expropriation of the surplus value produced by the workers.

The reason why the vulgar economists, concerned primarily with the prices in the sphere of circulation, can only obscure the source of profit is now clear. Commodities exchange at their values (in the later stages of capitalist production at their prices of production—see *Capital,* Volume III, Chapter 8) around which long term money price fluctuates. Money, as historically evolved, is merely a socially recognized universal equivalent of the relative values of commodities. Because the vulgar economists concern themselves only with money price, however, and reject the concept of value as the socially necessary labor time used to produce commodities, they are blinded by the "money veil" to the real nature of capitalist relations to the means of production. Profit appears to them only as an accretion of money, not the expropriation of surplus value.

Once having exposed the source of profits in the production of surplus value, Marx was able to answer the second question as to the cause of the development of capitalism. Competition and the constant drive to increase profits forces the capitalist to reinvest his profits, to constantly expand and revolutionize the means of production. On the one hand he uses the surplus value to buy more constant capital, more machinery and raw materials. On the other, he must obtain an ever larger working force to produce value and surplus value. But the very expropriation of surplus value limits the possibilities of capitalist expansion. The growth of constant capital leads to the falling rate of profit and to monopoly, to the growth of the labor reserve army of unemployed, the cyclical crises, the necessity of imperialist expansion in search of new areas of investment and markets, and to wars. Analyses of these phenomena cannot, therefore, be isolated in the manner attempted by the equilibrists. On the contrary, they must be analyzed as arising out of the basic contradiction of capitalism, and interacting with the many other phenomena of capitalist development. Ultimately, with the growth of these phenomena, the working class comes to recognize that it "has nothing to lose but (its) chains," and ousts the capitalist class, ends the contradictions inherent in capitalist relations of production, and builds socialism.

The theory of the vulgar economists, based on an idealist, antiscientific concept of capitalist reality, serves merely to mask capitalist exploitation and the way capitalism is "digging its own grave." Marxist political economy, on the other hand, derives from an historical materialist examination of the real world, aiming to expose the motive force of capitalism and to provide a weapon for the work-

ing class and its allies in the struggle for socialism. Economic theory is partisan. In accepting one theory or another as a guide in our work in political economy, we may, of necessity, ally ourselves only with those who would maintain the capitalist *status quo,* or with the working class in its struggles to build a society dedicated to the welfare of the masses of the people.

II. OUR APPROACH TO FURTHER STUDY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY

Because of our understanding of the nature of capitalist development as laid bare by the law of value, we do not undertake to study the same kinds of problems as those examined by the equilibrists. They are concerned primarily with the problems of businessmen: how prices are established, why businessmen fail to invest, which kind of foreign trade is the most advantageous—for American business. They may spend hours diagramming a theoretical demand curve, such as the Keynesian consumption curve, and even "testing" it by gathering statistics. To them monopoly, for example, is merely a problem of price. But such analyses, by their very nature, must obscure from the working class and its allies the basic contradiction of capitalism.

We, in contrast, must examine the reality of phenomena as they develop out of the contradictions inherent in capitalism. We cannot become involved in studies of theoretical supply and demand curves as they determine price; the "psychological" incentives for investment; or the abstract comparative advantages assumed to exist in foreign trade. Rather we must investigate such realities as rising prices and profits, the causes of the coming crash, and the extension of a Marshall Plan to tie the economies of Europe to that of the United States. Our studies must be aimed to provide information which will enable the working class to struggle more consistently and effectively for socialism.

In studying these phenomena, we must utilize the law of value, the law of development of capitalism, as a guide. We cannot rely on the equilibrium concepts of our professors. We must appropriate in detail all material available, examine its interrelations and interconnections, they way it is affected by the contradictions of capitalism, and trace out its laws of growth. Once we have obtained this information, we can then describe the dialectical development of the phenomena in question. Thus for example, we must study the way the phenomena, monopoly, has grown out of capitalism, how it, in turn, reacts upon the other aspects of capitalism, how it leads to imperialist expansion and wars, on the one hand, and to the decay of capitalism on the other.

Clearly much of the material we use in our investigations will

have been collected by the equilibrists themselves. Here in the United States, it is they who operate the facilities and receive the endowments. To examine monopoly, for example, we have as a major source of information the Temporary National Economic Committee's investigations. But we may not simply accept the conclusions of the authors of such work, precisely because they have constructed them on the bases of their own theories. One of the authors thus concluded that small enterprise was less efficient than large, and therefore held that monopolists would voluntarily break down their control of large aggregates of industry; this utopian idea is well "substantiated" with *selected* statistics, but completely ignores reality. We must analyze the data which has been collected, they way they have gathered it, and use it critically in the light of the understanding of the nature of capitalism which we have obtained in mastering the law of value.

Particular caution must be exercised to avoid the enticing tendency to draw conclusions from statistics because they appear to constitute a tangible and concrete representation of reality. First, it is a mistake to conceive of the possibility of "proving" the law of value, or measuring price deviations from it (as Dobb appears to suggest[11]) by gathering statistics. No theory coincides precisely with reality in any given instance such as statistics may describe. Rather, *"all* concepts, regarded from the standpoint of reality," may be criticized for their failure to coincide precisely with reality. "The concept of a thing and its reality run side by side like assymptotes, always approaching each other, yet never meeting . . . (N)one (of the economic laws) has any reality except as an approximation, tendency, average, and not as immediate reality. This is due partly to the fact that their action clashes with the simultaneous action of other laws, but partly to their own nature as concepts."[12]

Furthermore, as Marx points out:

> The vulgar economist has not the faintest idea that the everyday exchange relations need not be directly identical with the magnitudes of value. The point of bourgeois society consists precisely in this, that a priori there is no conscious, social regulation of production. The reasonable and necessary in nature asserts itself only as a blindly working average. . . .[13]

Second, a statistical study can only describe an aspect of reality at a given moment or over a series of moments. It cannot lay bare the seeds of change which may exist within a given situation. Therefore it cannot provide the bases for prediction as to future change, nor even

---

11 Dobb, M.: Modern Quarterly. Centennial Issue, 1948, London, p. 75.
12 Engels, F.: *Letter to Schmidt,* Selected Correspondence, *op. cit.,* p. 527.
13 Marx: *Letter to Kugelmann, op. cit.,* p. 247.

conclusive bases as to the nature of the phenomena in the past and present.

Third, statistics do not constitute the only data available. Theory must be drawn from rational considerations as well as political economic reality: the existence of profit, recurrent crises, the growth of monopoly, the export of capital, etc., all of which are to be explained by the law of value. Even the equilibrists themselves recognize this in theory (although in practice the rule is violated):

> All that we may say of statistical evidence, on the positive side, is that it is not inconsistent with a given hypothesis. Supporting statistical evidence strengthens our confidence in the hypothesis, of course. Its tenability must be determined on the basis of rational considerations as well as empirical evidence.[14]

But we must use statistics in light of our understanding of political economic reality, not in light of the "rational" considerations of the equilibrists, Lenin pointed out, in amassing factory statistics to show the development of capitalism in Russia:

> This is not merely a matter of statistics, but a question of the forms and stages which the development of capitalism in industry assumes in a given country. Only after the substance of these forms and their distinguishing features have been made clear is there any sense in illustrating the development of this or that form by properly prepared statistics.[15]

III. CONCLUSION

As Marxist students, we must use our understanding of the laws of capitalist development to determine what we aim to achieve in our studies in the universities. This will affect our attitude towards our work in our classes. On the one hand, we must avoid the extreme of memorizing everything we are taught simply to repeat it on exams. Further, we must not permit ourselves to become enamoured of the complex and apparently logical superstructure of the idealist, anti-scientific rationales which masquerade as "theories." Finally, we must not allow ourselves to become paralyzed by the concept that students must not be critical of prevalent theories until they "know everything" that has been written; this concept apparently stems from our equilibrists' fear that if students should criticize before they are fully immersed in the idealist frame of reference of supply and demand, they will raise questions, based on their experience with reality, which supply and demand cannot answer.

---

[14] Mills: Statistical Methods, *op. cit.*, p. 470.

[15] Lenin, V. I.: Selected Works, Volume I, International Publishers, New York, p. 178.

On the other hand, we cannot swing to the opposite extreme of simply ignoring these "theories" since they constitute weapons in the hands of the capitalists and their lieutenants in obscuring reality and thus weakening the working-class movement. From the negative point of view, we must become cognizant of their assumptions and their conclusions in order to expose their class position; we must understand their methods in order to criticize specific concepts such as those of the Keynesians, which are used by the misleaders of labor (the Reuthers, Dubinskys, and the Murrays).

From a more positive point of view, we must obtain all the facts and certain limited methods available to accomplish practical tasks. We recognize that the universities, precisely because they are actually, as well as ideologically, controlled by the capitalist rulers of our country, have the facilities—the books, laboratories, funds for research—which we must use to learn more about capitalist reality. At the same time we must maintain a critical approach, constantly developing our understanding of the weapon of historical materialism, in order to contribute to the struggles of the working class to defeat the imperialist threats of war and fascism, and, ultimately, to win socialism.

AL GREENBERG

Paris Letter

THE atmosphere that Messrs. Marshall, Bevin and Co. found in Paris upon the opening of the UN General Assembly here, was not, one can imagine, exactly to their liking. Instead of finding a model "Western democracy" welcoming American "aid," "their" France had just undergone a series of governmental crises that bordered on the comic. Dr. Queuille's prescriptions notwithstanding, more serious difficulties appeared in the offing. The trouble lay far deeper than the apparent inability of the governing parties to gain a parliamentary majority. In point of fact, there has been no substantial change in the political make-up of France's cabinets since May, 1947; even the same personnel has been kept largely intact, though slightly reshuffled, since that date. While there are some conflicting interests within the Third Force coalition, the real cause for the "reign of instability" can hardly be considered to stem from Socialist "objections" to the military expenditures or wage proposals of their colleagues. The real cause lay in the simple but incontestable fact that the overwhelming majority of the people of France were thoroughly dissatisfied with the bankrupt and undemocratic policies their "Marshallized" government was pursuing.

The popular reaction to the sabotage of France's constitution represented by Reynaud's "Law by decree" (which allows for widespread changes in the operation of social security, nationalized industry, state administration, and government financing by simple executive decree) that was slipped through the Chamber this summer was perhaps the first indication that Gallic indignation was running high. The waves of petitions and demonstrations of protest that accompanied the railroading of this measure was unquestionably a leading factor in the Socialists' decision to "make an issue" over their demand for a token reduction in military expenditures.

What particularly aroused the ire of the working masses about the "decrets lois" was the implied danger to the right to strike, a right that had become all-important to the well-being of the people because of the inability of the Third Force governments to check mounting inflation. Since May, 1947, (when the Communists were forced out of the cabinet) prices have continued on a dizzying ascent, although wages have remained frozen since last December. All the possible combinations of Third Force cabinet ministers could not alter the resulting

drastic cut in the average workingman's real wage, nor turn the weekly "hausse" (price increase) into the daily-awaited "baisse" (decrease). The series of governmental crises reflected the beginning of the crystallization of nine months of experience on the part of the French masses: experience which taught them that the Force Ouvriere's policy of give-the-government-a-chance-to-lower-prices was dangerous day-dreaming; experience which taught them that Marshall aid meant devaluation, shortages, price spirals, and loss of economic independence to Wall Street's monopolies; experience which taught them above all that France's only road to stability and a healthy economy lay through a government of Democratic Union in which the working class and its Communist Party would play a leading role.

The proof that these lessons were learned was being demonstrated daily by factory committee after factory committee of CGT, Force Ouvriere, and CFTC (Christian Unionists) taking joint action for increased wages, while the heads of the two latter unions were continuing their ridiculous policy of waiting for the "baisse." With their membership rapidly dissolving and going over to the CGT, even these reactionary-led unions were forced finally to resign from the government's price-fixing agency and to agree upon the joint action with the CGT that had long since been undertaken by their members. The government's insistence upon postponing elections was a further indication of their fear of the people, and the few by-elections seemed to substantiate that fear—showing in most cases marked increases for the Communists. Most important indication of all, of course, was the complete unity and exemplary combativity shown by the workers in the series of strikes and stoppages that began to unfold in early fall and are continuing, at this writing, in a 100% effective national coal strike. Finally, proof that the French people are learning the lessons of the past is given by the strong indications of de Gaulle's loss of popularity.

The General, whose strength was never as large as some American circles would like to believe, had appealed to various sections of bourgeois opinion ranging from sincere republicans to outright fascists. His early fall campaign tour, and in particular his speech at Grenoble, however, proved to be an eye-opener for many of those who believed he represented the democratic spirit of the Resistance. It was not that this speech was filled with any different platitudes than ordinarily mark the General's demagogic orations, but rather because de Gaulle, in his efforts to show the Americans how authoritatively he would be able to handle the French "rabble," completely exposed the storm-trooper character of his RPF. Entering Grenoble through the working-class sections, the general's escort (several jeeploads of Marseilles thugs, armed with rubber hoses and clubs as well as firearms) proceeded to

clear a path in the most brutal manner through the crowds of hostile observers. Then in the afternoon, following de Gaulle's speech, these same boys went to work on a counter-demonstration that had been called *after* de Gaulle's meeting had broken up. One republican was brutally killed and many more severely injured. Public reaction was immediate. The local MRP passed sharp, condemnatory resolutions against the general, while Grenoble's RPF mayor resigned. So great were the protests that the rabidly anti-working-class "Socialist" Minister of Interior, Jules Moch, was forced to make public the fact that the government had been supplying de Gaulle with gasoline and heavy police and army protection, and that the government knew the size of de Gaulle's huge "personal army," though all he promised was that efforts would be made to disarm and disperse them.

While it is reassuring to peace-lovers to know that the French people are more firmly determined than ever before to safeguard their national independence, the American representatives at the UN were leaving no doubts that they were greatly disturbed. Speaking before the political Committee of the General Assembly in its discussion on the Soviet arms-reduction proposal, bombastic Warren R. Austin expressed horror at the fact that the French working classes wanted permanent peace and thought that socialism could bring it to them. Recalling that "in April, 1948, a Communist Party publication in Paris defined final victory over war as 'victory over capitalism'," Mr. Austin wailed, "Is this not a ghastly definition of peace?" He also implied that the French worker, whose real wage has been slashed beyond recognition, was striking, not to improve his standard of living, but in response to Cominform orders to "wreck and destroy" the French economy. What really infuriated this hypocritical war-monger was that the official Communist newspaper, *L'Humanite,* could have the "brazenness" to announce on October 1 that "The people of France will not, will never wage war against the Soviet Union." ("What is Mr. Austin so indignant about?" Soviet delegate A. Vishinsky asked. "Would he prefer them to say that they *will* wage war against the Soviet Union?") What hurt Mr. Austin was not the audacity of the French Communist Party's resolution, but the plain fact, which even reactionary French circles would not deny, that the French people were firmly entrenched in the camp of peace, and that they were there to stay.

* * *

Another international body terminated its deliberations in Paris just before the UN discussions got under way, having shown a spirit of cooperation that the Palais de Chaillot meetings might profitably emulate. Early in September, the International House of Cite Universitaire was the scene of the third annual Council meeting of the International

Union of Students. Delegates and observers from more than 40 countries participated in analyzing the achievements and shortcomings of IUS' previous work and in drawing up a plan of activity for the coming year around the program of students in their fight for peace, national independence, and the democratization of education. American progressive students would do well to study the documents of this historic council meeting, for they indicate clearly that the forces of progress in the international student community have been tremendously strengthened at the expense of those divisive elements who would isolate the student from his social responsibilities, or, even worse, place him in the anti-democratic camp of those working for a third world war.

In order to understand the extent of the victory over these divisive forces, it is necessary to be acquainted with some of the events preceding this Council meeting. On August 16, at the request of the Canadian students (NFCUC), the Student Federation of Belgium sent out invitations to 17 "Western" countries' national student unions to meet in Brussels from September 4 to 6 to discuss their common attitude toward the IUS. There can be little doubt that the planners of this "information" conference wanted to organize the withdrawal of the "Western" country students from the IUS. When their conference convened, however, it became obvious that they were in no position to accomplish this; only 7 (plus Belgium) of the original 17 invited countries were present, and, of them, only one, Scotland, was a full-fledged member of the IUS. Not only was a withdrawal impossible, but it became immediately clear that most of the organizations present would not support any rival organization. With the Scottish students determined to remain within IUS, with many other "western" national unions among IUS' firmest supporters (e.g., the French and British), the original intent of the Brussels meeting was completely defeated. The Canadian and Belgian delegates arrived at the IUS Council ready to request affiliation.

The case of the Canadian request deserves particular attention, since their "story" could be used by American NSA officials for anti-IUS propaganda if the facts are not known. Mr. Livingston, the head of the Canadian delegation, had by his actions up to the Brussels conference, indicated that he was no friend of the IUS. His reasons (and in fact his mandated authority) for requesting affiliation were therefore suspected by the Council meeting. That these suspicions were well founded was shown by Mr. Livingston's stand after the Council had voted its support of the IUS Secretariat's decisions on the Czechoslovak events. While previously maintaining that his mandate for affiliation was in no way tied to his mandate to express disapproval over these events, he now stated that the Council's vote against the position of his organization made it practically impossible for the Canadian Federation to

affiliate. In short, he apparently wished to join only to resign in protest over a democratic decision of the Council. In this he was foiled by the Council's decision to await the Canadian Federation's convention decision in December before accepting affiliation.

In addition to membership questions—on which most decisions were taken unanimously because of the excellent job of documentation by the Credentials Committee—heated discussions were held over the IUS position on the Czechoslovak events, the Executive Committee report, and the main resolution. On the first point, the Secretariat was criticized for not having sent out information quickly enough and for not having taken action on the unfavorable situation within the Czech NUS before February. But the conclusions of the Secretariat, backed by ample factual evidence, were accepted by an overwhelming majority of the delegates.

The discussion of the Executive Committee report was the most fruitful, since it included detailed reports of activities by the member organizations. Several delegates introduced evidence to show the harmful effect of the Marshall Plan on the lives of students, though the Council took no position other than affirming the right of student organizations to reach their own conclusions.

The main resolution presented some serious difficulties. Though all delegates were agreed that the fight for peace was the most important task facing students, several were unwilling to place the blame for the war threats on the shoulders of the responsible parties. In the light of the evidence given by the Chinese delegates, for example, it was impossible for any delegate to deny that Anglo-American interests were behind the corrupt Chiang Kai-shek regime that was causing so much misery for the students of China. Yet Messrs. Wood and Trouvet (England and France respectively) and Dr. Lown (from the American Association of Internes and Medical Students, USA) among others, were reluctant to have such specific material inserted in the resolution because they felt the students of their respective countries "might not understand." The majority thought, however, that while certain compromises in formulation were necessary in order to reach the greatest number of students, it would severely damage the cause of peace if world student opinion were not alerted to combat those imperialists who were directly responsible for the main war danger facing us today. The final resolution, supported almost unanimously, demonstrated the sincere desire of all to maintain unity while at the same time moving the IUS forward to a position that would strengthen the student struggle for a better life all over the world.

The officers elected are almost all the same as last year except that following Bill Ellis' (and his deputy, Jim Smith's) shameful resigna-

tion, there is now no American Vice-President, although a position has been left open on the Executive for an American to be named by representative American students wishing to affiliate to IUS. Since NSA, by its action at its last convention, has effectively isolated itself from the international student community, the burden rests with democratically-minded American students to carry the IUS program to the American campus in spite of NSA's leaders, and, if it is not possible to change the NSA program, to organize some other form of American participation in the IUS. The Council meeting demonstrated that the progressive students of the world have greatly underestimated their own strength and greatly overestimated the forces of reaction. Progressive American students must learn a lesson from this and not hesitate to advance a program that truly represents the needs and desires of every honest student anxious to complete his studies in a peaceful world.

* * *

The French students have already shown that the IUS program can be a reality. Unity has been achieved among all important sections of the French student population on such issues as combatting colonialism, fighting for increased student benefits, and better educational facilities, and opposing the soaring cost of living which affects all Frenchmen. Already meetings have been held on these issues with M. Trouvet (President of the French National Student Union, UNEF, and French Vice-President of the IUS) speaking on the same platform with representatives of the Catholic students, the UJRF students (Republican Youth), and the Communist students. And all these sections of student opinion are united in their determination to make November 17, International Students Day, a day felt on every French campus, a day of "revendications," of student demands, and of solidarity with the struggles of their democratic comrades in every country.

WALTER BRONSON

Prague Letter

AS IN many other countries throughout the world, the new peoples' democracies began their 1948-49 school year a few weeks ago. But going to a school in a people's democratic republic is very different than in America.

In Czechoslovakia, the universities had been closed from 1939 to 1945. Only selected students were permitted to continue in Nazi-supervised middle schools. In Poland, over 80% of the intelligentsia between the ages of 21-45 was killed in three extermination camps; the average age of professors in the faculties of medicine at Wroclow (Breslau), for example, was over 60. In these countries, as well as in Hungary and Roumania, only from 2-8% of the students at higher schools were from worker or peasant origin. In all these lands, the laboratories and schools and libraries were stripped of all equipment and books by the fascist invaders before they were driven out by the Soviet and peoples armies. In all these lands, too, there remained in the schools a small number of people who had supported or actively collaborated with the invaders.

What is the picture today, three years after the liberation, and the seizure of power by the working class, allied with the peasantry and lower middle classes?

In Poland, 17,000 more students than last year attend universities constituting a total of 88,000 students united in the new federation of Polish student organizations. Xenon Wroblowski, the president of the FPSO is a member of parliament, constantly working for the students' interests in the various legislative commissions. A spirit of enthusiasm and confidence in the future permeates the Polish schools, based upon the secure knowledge that there will be work for all. Already, the last graduating class has been absorbed in industry, agriculture, government service, and education.

In Hungary, 37,000 children of workers and peasants live and study in the new People's Colleges. Admission to such a college is an honor. In addition to his regular studies, each student discusses his national literature, art and language, learns about the cultural and economic problems of his country, and participates in brigade work. Meals and board are free; the student need only study hard to prepare himself for the job which is awaiting him.

In Roumania, one-third of all places in the universities are reserved

for children of workers and peasants. The youth coming from these classes may also compete for the remaining 66% of the available facilities, so they constitute an even greater proportion. An extensive system of cooperatives, selling everything from text-books to food and clothing, eases the economic burden of the students.

In all these countries, as well as in Czechoslovakia, there is an extensive system of state scholarships which are granted to all students who need such help. Students sit on the academic seats or governing bodies of all the universities, as well as in all the governmental or administerial commissions dealing with student questions. These student delegates guarantee that the point of view of the students is heard and acted upon. In all these countries, student canteens, dormitories, and publishing houses, which publish good textbooks at low prices, are operated by the students.

The people of these nations must still overcome many shortages and problems. Inadequate supplies, teachers, equipment, buildings, and textbooks, are only a few of these. Creating a new people's intelligentsia devoted to the service of the people and to socialism is another. But all these are being energetically tackled by the student organizations and their solution is assured by the very existence of the mass workers and the Communist parties at the head of the state.

In none of these countries are the students talking about war, but rather of the problems connected with increasing agricultural or industrial production, in which ministry or industry they will seek to work, or how soon they can finish their examinations and start working. Strong representative student organizations look after the needs and interests of their members, and even provide services for the students, while at the same time, involving them in educational programs, brigades and other activities to break down the traditional isolation between the student and his community.

* * *

Here in Czechoslovakia, the new term began, as the headline in Predvoj (Avant-guard), the student journal, declared, *"With a Clean Slate";* this was the significance of the February events for the schools.

A new unified educational system has been developed for young children in which all curricula is identical, and which prepares the student for either the university or technical school. This unified system replaces the former chaotic and undemocratic division of schools into gymnasia, or schools whose diplomas were recognized by and led only to trade or apprentice schools. Furthermore, where the costs of tuition at the gymnasia had previously served as effective barriers to children of workers and peasants so that few of these reached the universities, the new system is free and compulsory for all through the age

of 15. Outside the materske skoly (kindergarten) musical bands greeted the children on their first day at school. Child psychologists in America may take note of this interesting way of handling the usually difficult and so very important introduction to the life of pencils books, and homework.

In the universities, entrance commissions, composed of professors and students, interviewed the incoming freshman. The purpose of this was to ascertain the level of development of the new first year class, as well as to preventing out-and-out fascists from infiltrating into the schools. A few of the latter were found, but the most interesting result was the revelation of the effect of a Nazi secondary school education on the Czech and Slovak youth, and the results of insufficient concentration during the past three years upon developing the middle schools. Students applying to the medical faculty thought the pancreas was an island in the ocean; students at the High School of Politics and Economics believed Benelux was the British Foreign Minister; students at the School for Political Science wanted to be ambassadors because "they go to many receptions"!! Only a minority wanted to study in order to contribute to the development of the national economy, or to prepare themselves better to serve their people. The student and youth newspapers and organizations are examining this problem thoroughly in open debates and articles in a self-critical manner, and there is no doubt that the result will be an intensive effort to overcome this weakness. That it must be overcome is evident from the fact that the technicians and specialists who will guarantee the 5 year plan just proposed and adopted will come from these students. That it will be overcome is evident from the efforts already under way to tackle the problem.

The students are being divided into groups of twenty, electing their own leaders. The groups have as their functions to provide a collective where mutual study and discussions will stimulate increased efforts on the part of each student, and so raise the level of the entire group. Already, groups are competing for better results at examinations, finishing ahead of time, conducting independent research, etc. These groups have not only scholastic significance, but they are the basis for voluntary brigades in industry and agriculture, and for discussion of political problems facing the nation. They thus will help overcome the effects of improper training in middle schools and will stimulate a new social consciousness among the students.

The student unions and faculty associations have working conferences to discuss how to improve the existing students services in restaurants, dormitories, publishing houses and recreational camps. The construction of new hostels and camps is envisaged in the five year plan,

The students are more actively involved than ever before in work in the unions and associations of the people. However, there still remains much to be done before the student body as a whole takes its place alongside the rest of the nation in a united effort toward the building of socialism.

It may be easily understood that much must be done to strengthen student support of the People's Democracy, since even today less than 10% of the student body is of worker or peasant origin. The other students come from the classes who have lost their "sacred liberties"; the "freedom" to own a factory and exploit 500 or more workers and the "freedom" to own a large estate upon which peasants will work for next to nothing. In short these classes have lost the "freedom" to do nothing and live well off others' labor. It is to be expected that these classes, constituting about 15-20% of the nation, are not happy with the present situation and long for the "good old days." And it is on these classes that foreign reaction pins its greatest hopes in the countless plots hatched under the aegis of infamous "Plan X" of our State Department. From these people stem the countless rumors the visitor hears in the country, rumors about butter going to Berlin and Moscow (claimed to be the cause of the small ration as yet available), about shoes and other items needed by the Czech people being sent East to the Red Army, about new reductions in rations, and about new concentration camps. A few people are only too eager to tell the foreigner the "real truth" about what is going on.

But there is the other side of the story. There is the Two-Year Plan fulfilled in September by 106%, the highest yet, the certainty that it will be overfulfilled by the end of the year in all but the construction industry, and the enthusiasm, interest and participation of the working people in discussions of the Five-Year plan adopted by the government. This new plan aims to increase industrial output by 50%, and to raise the living standards, already higher than prior to the war (in sharp contrast with the "Marshall Plan" countries), by 33%. The factories are now drawing up their individual quotas to be filled as their task in completing the over-all plan. And in all this, the voice of the worker through his trade union is loud and firm. Socialist competition is catching on, although slowly as yet, its spread will be the guarantee that the necessary increase in production per worker (a necessary prerequisite for the establish of socialism) will be achieved.

The class struggle has become sharper, and the truth of the experience of the CPSU in building socialism becomes daily more evident. The wealthy peasants in the countryside, and former owners of the newly nationalized sector of industry attempt constantly to sabotage the fulfillment of the national plans. Spurred on by reactionary elements

in the Catholic Church and their western allies they try incessantly to impede the people's progress towards socialism. The government and the Communist Party do not hide these facts from the people, but rather discuss them openly and mobilize the greatest mass of them to struggle actively against these attempts to restore the old conditions of rule and exploitation.

The answer of the people is clear. Over 30 million voluntary hours of brigade labor were contributed by the C.P. in fulfillment of its pledge at the beginning of the year. An average of 10 factories and industrial enterprises a day fulfill the entire Two-Year Plan 10 weeks ahead of schedule. The September fulfillment of 106% of the plan was perhaps the best indication of the people's answer; they have found the path to socialism, and will let nothing interfere with their work.

Book Reviews

Our Lives, American Labor Stories, edited by Joseph Gaer. Boni and Gaer. New York, 1948.

This collection of thirty-two stories about American Labor, the first selection from Our Book Club, is a welcome and heartening addition to the season's books. It is good to find gathered in one volume stories of insight into the real America—not the sugar-coated America of the slicks, but the lives of over two-thirds of America's families who have less than enough to live on. One samples here the varied toil of the disinherited and unhistoried, the millions who do the labor of production.

Here, in Dreiser's *St. Columba and the River,* one may share the tenseness and danger of the man who risked his life in building the underriver tunnels now used unthinkingly by New Yorkers. Or one may know with the young worker in Don Ludlow's *The Furnace* his first experience with the giant furnace whose heat scorches sweaty overalls even as men wear them, and roasts human flesh lucklessly exposed.

Indeed, one strength of the collection is the fairly broad number of occupations represented. Included are two stories of child labor, one of them London's *The Apostate,* the unforgettable deadened child who is a product of the cash nexus. Three picture the lives of farmers, with Garland's *Under the Lion's Paw* remaining one of the finest treatments of the disappearing "independent." Others are of Negro workers, factory and mill laborers, and white-collar workers. As one puts down the volume, a blurred and fuzzy impression comes into clear focus and leaves a portrait, incomplete and meager though it is in some respects, of working America, and the lesson of struggle for unity.

Unfortunately, the volume has grave weaknesses. One wonders whether it was necessary to include as selections four chapters taken from well-known novels. Each loses much of its power and effectiveness by being thus torn out of context.

An even greater weakness is the poor choice of some stories. Despite the editor's brave assertion that "the creative workers (writers) enlist in the cause of people who with their labor create the wealth of nations," this shortcoming illustrates the shocking paucity, in our dominantly bourgeois literature, of well-written short stories about working people. There is no point here, either, in belaboring the occasionally deserved criticism, harrying Marxists in critics' columns for decades, that their writings are lifeless social tracts, portraying the outward shadow, the externals of the poverty they so earnestly seek to reveal, with no understanding of the human spirit existing through them. Stories like the Norris scraps, and Reed's *The Capitalist* had best been omitted entirely. Others, such as Davis's *Dresses for Eve,* are such tissue-paper thin slices of life that they have little significance.

O. Henry's smart alecky and shallow humor about two Irishmen exploiting some natives certainly has no place in this volume, or, for that matter, any other. In contrast, the selection about that endearing man, H*Y*M*A*N K*A*P*L*A*N, is true humor, good natured and sunny, growing out of a real human situation, with no trace of condescension towards these new Americans just because their unfamiliarity leads them into delightful—and intelligent—mistakes.

Two stories simply fail to come off. In *Song For My Time,* Miss Le Sueur strives to catch the moment in which a girl, only selfishly bereaved at the loss of her brother in the war, understands for the first time the unity and comradeship felt by workers who are consciously allied in the anti-fascist cause. Unfortunately, this delicate and moving conception is not realized in the story. It becomes sentimentalized when the author allows the girl such over-precious and self-conscious descriptions of her own state of mind as: "The black grief ran inside me like an underground spring I once saw falling over the mossy face of a white rock." Similarly, Miss Bell's story fails to realize an intense and moving event because of awkwardly handled transitions, badly done dialogue, and an over-insistently stressed ending.

But the total effect of the collected stories, as well as many fine individual stories among them, more than compensates for these weaknesses. One need only mention Anderson's sure and gentle probing of the neglect and lovelessness that choke off the life and passion of a sensitive shop girl, turning her into a bedeviled spinster. Or the magnificent haunting courage in Albert Maltz's *The Happiest Man in the World.* Or, though they lack the excellence of the first two, the fine-edged irony of *Loyal Miss Ferch,* an incident of the loyalty purge, and the sharp folk wit of Ben Field's *A Lesson.*

Even in the least of these stories we find the bitter distillation of what capitalist crisis means in human terms. And the best of them, seeking beyond the externality of the blight of economic circumstance, reveal the unsung resources of resilience and courage, the deep wells of human motivation and feeling. After the tons of slick white paper printed with the heroic grandeur of neglected wife in Kelvinator kitchen winning erring hubby from wiles of pretty secretary; after the reams of turgid darkness concerning deep young men who with intricate and infinite psychological woe woo deep young women—this volume, with a measure of pure insight into the real problems that actully face the majority of Americans, is a breath of fresh air.

—Elizabeth O'Bryan.

The Inside Story of The Legion, Justin Grey, with Victor H. Bernstein. Boni and Gaer, New York, 1948.

Justin Grey spent nine months as a national organizer for the American Legion and one year at research before writing *The Inside Story of The Legion.* He joined the Legion with some knowledge of its reactionary

policies, but with the belief that the progressive could help alter these policies. His book is the story of what he learned, the story of the Legion brass and the NAM, of anti-Semitic and anti-Negro propaganda, of anti-Communism and strike-breaking.

On his first day as organizer, he learns that "the National Commander is always right," and that loyalty to the Legion, right or wrong, is the primary duty of a good Legionnaire. He learns of the close collaboration between the Americanism Committee (NAM style) and the FBI. After nine months in the Legion, when he takes a stand in favor of veteran's housing, his Post is suspended from membership, and he is fired from his job.

In his analysis, Grey shows that most of the money for founding the Legion was furnished by big business concerns. He quotes a letter sent out by Swift & Co., in 1919, to various Chicago packing houses and published in *The Nation* in 1921. "A national drive is being made for the Legion and the amount asked from Illinois is $10,000, Mr. James B. Forgan, Chairman of the First National Bank, being treasurer of the fund for Illinois. . . . We are all interested in the Legion, the results it will obtain, and the ultimate effect in helping to offset radicalism."

The direct tie between the National Commanders and big business is just as strong as the financial tie. Out of twenty-nine National Commanders examined by Grey, twenty-six "were either officers and directors of large industrial or financial institutions or corporation lawyers representing such institutions."

Grey points out that the NAM and the brass have built up a tremendous propaganda machine to sell the Legion "line" to the members. In 1943 an Americanism Endowment Fund was established, and a committee was formed to raise not less than ten million dollars. Part of this was to be spent on "development of an educational program designed to build support for the American system of competitive enterprise." Americanism is defined as the "willingness to defend our form of government against all who would change or *misinterpret* its principles." (Grey's italics.)

At the same time, the Legion leadership opposes measures designed to benefit the veteran. The chairman of the Legion Housing Committee declared, in supporting real estate interests: ". . . this whole public housing business is nothing more than a Marxist plot. Control the housing and you control the people." In 1937 the Legion was instrumental in preventing the USA from signing an agreement with forty-four other nations to ban poison gas. It was revealed that their lobbyist, Taylor, while lobbying against the gas ban, "was also serving as treasurer of a trade association of chemical manufacturers known as the National Association of Chemical Defense." Contrary to what is generally thought, the Legion brass even opposed the World War I bonus. It was only as a result of the pressure exerted by the rank-and-file membership that the bonus bill was passed. The Legion leadership's position on every issue is clear. Everything for the trusts, nothing for the veteran—except when enough veterans get together and enforce their rights.

Grey, showing the tie-up between the Legion and fascism, goes back

to the early thirties when the Legion looked with favor on the rise of fascism in Germany and Italy. He states: "Not secret, but merely forgotten, is the fact that back in 1931 National Commander Ralph T. O'Neil relayed through the fascist Ambassador in Washington, Giacomo De Martino, the greetings of the Legion's National Executive Committee to His Excellency, Benito Mussolini. Two years later National Vice-Commander William Edward Eastman, Jr., made a trip to Italy and in an overenthusiastic moment conferred honorary Legion membership on the Duce —an act which aroused so much excitement back in the United States that the Legion brass thought best to declare it 'unconstitutional.'"

The Legion's bow to public pressure did not prevent it, in 1934, from attempting a fascist coup. Grey relates, ". . . sensational testimony was placed before the MacCormack-Dickstein House Committee on Un-American Activities linking top Legionnaires with a plot to institute a fascist coup in the USA. The plot included a plan to raise a Legion army of 500,000 men to be headed by General Smedley Butler, then commanding the U.S. Marines." General Butler, refusing to fall in line, revealed these plans to the Congressional Committee, and the Committee was forced to admit: "Evidence was obtained showing that certain persons had made an attempt to establish a fascist organization in this country. There is no question but that these attempts were discussed, were planned, and might have been placed in execution when and if the financial backers deemed it expedient." Of course, the unnamed "financial backers" were Wall Street, and for Wall Street exoneration was easy.

This same combination—Wall Street and the Legion—failed in another fascist attempt in 1938, during the New Deal. Wall Street deemed it expedient to establish a fascist coup from the "outside"—utilizing the Legion as a core.

Today, the situation is quite different. The alliance between the NAM, the Legion brass and the Government is complete. Men of the same caliber as those who attempted the fascist coup in 1934 and 1938 are now in the driver's seat.

The main weakness in Grey's book is his failure to see that the Legion grows out of the nature of capitalism, and that capitalism—not merely individual reactionaries—is the enemy of the people. In one place, Grey says, "The NAM has a perfect right, of course, to stand up for what it considers the best interests of its own members." He doesn't stop to consider that it is not because of individual desires to act on principle, but because of the nature of monopoly capitalism that the NAM *must* act against the interests of the working class and all progressives.

Regardless of Grey's failure to see fully the economic basis of the Legion, he doesn't withhold any facts in showing the NAM-Legion tie-up and its fascist nature. The facts speak for themselves. And on a factual level, the material is well organized and presented in a simple and straightforward manner. For anyone who wants to know more about the Legion, Grey's book is recommended.

—A. A.

Education for What?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Marxists have made almost no comprehensive effort to examine the role of education in the class struggle in America. Yet every year since the war three million students, half of them veterans, have attended colleges and universities; every year three million future teachers, politicians, lawyers, businessmen, doctors, and scientists are "educated" to perform their jobs. For that role in society does the education they are receiving prepare them? What tools can Marxist and progressive students hope to acquire in the modern university which will help them to build a better America?

NEW FOUNDATIONS, in printing the series of articles on education which began in the last issue, aims to begin to answer some of these vital questions. We hope that this bibliography will enable you, our readers, to contribute to sharpening this analysis as an aid both in daily political activities on the campus, and in the future tasks which all of us hope to undertake after graduation to strengthen the working class and progressive movement of our country.

—The Editors

CHARACTER OF STUDENT BODY

Clark, T. A., *Discipline and the Derelict,* New York, Macmillan, 1922. 203 pp.

Chauncey, Merlin R., *The Educational and Occupational Preferences of College Seniors,* New York, Teachers College, 1932. 72 pp.,

"Inventory of Student's General Goals in Life," Educational and Psychological Measurement, No. 2: 87-95, 1944.

McNealy, John, "College Student Mortality," U. S. Education Bureau, Bull. No. 11, 1937.

Tombo, Rudolf Jr., "The Geographical Distribution of the Student Body at a Number of Universities." Columbia University Quarterly, Vol. 8, pp. 20-27, 1905.

Weeks, Helen Foss, *Factors Influencing the Choice of Courses by Students in Certain Liberal Arts Colleges,* New York, Teachers' College, 1931. 62 p.

Marketing Surveys indicating general level of purchasing power of students, as compared to the typical American citizens.

Associated College Press, *Purchases and Preferences in the College Market.*

California University Associated Student Publications, *The University of California Market.* (Includes direct comparison with purchasing of public in general.)

Erwin, W. & Co., Inc., *The Buying Power and Brand Preferences of American College Students,* 1931.

ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

Broome, Edwin C., *An Historical Discussion of College Admission Requirements,* New York, Macmillan Co., 1903. 157 pp.

Fine, Benjamin, *Admission to American Colleges,* New York, Harper & Bros., 1946. 225 pp.

TUITION FEES

Academic Fees in the United States, Educational Review, Vol. 50, 1915. pp. 136-43.

"Trends in Tuition Fees in State and Endowed Colleges in the United States from 1928-29 to 1936-37," General Education Board Publications, Occasional Papers No. 11.

STUDENT LIFE

The College Fraternity and War, 1942.

College Settlement Association, Annual Report, 1-25, 1890-91—1913-14.

Griffing, Edward S., *Some Statistics of Some Fraternities,* 1929.

Macadam, Ivison S., *Youth in the Universities,* 1922.

Musgrave, Wayne M., *College Fraternities,* 1929.

Patterson Homer L., *Patterson's American Educational Directory,* 1904.

Report of the Committee on House Clubs, Michigan Alumnus, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1913, Vo. 19. pp. 396-407.

Student Organizations Representing the University Before the Public, Columbia University.

Warner, John D., *Medieval Student Societies,* 1912.

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR NEGROES

"Evaluation the Quality of Educational Programs in Colleges for Negroes," Quarterly Review of Higher Education Among Negroes, 12: 65-9. April, 1944.

Dwight, Oliver Wendell Holmes, *The Evolution of the Negro College,* New York, Columbia University, Teachers' College, 1934. 221 pp.

McCuistion, Fred, *Higher Education of Negroes,* Nashville Tenn., Committee on Approval of Negro Schools, 1933. 40 pp.

WOMEN IN EDUCATION

Mills, Herbert Amer, *College Women and the Social Sciences,* 1934.

Thwing, C. F. *The College Woman,* New York, 1894. 169 p.

Woody, T. *A History of Women's Education in the United States,* New York, Science Press, 1929.

CURRICULUM

Beesley, Patricia, *The Revival of Humanities in American Education,* California University Press, 1940. 701 pp.

Chen, Theodore Haien, *Developing Patterns of College Curriculum in the United States,* University of Southern California Press, 1940, 154 p.

Cooperation in General Education by the American Council on Education, 1947.

Crawford, Albert B.; *Incentives to Study,* New Haven, Yale University Press. 194 pp.

Dartmouth College, *The Report on Undergraduate Education of the Dartmouth College Senior Committee,* 1924.
Duffus, Robert L., *Democracy Enters College,* 1936.
Dunkel, Harold Baker, *General Education in the Humanities,* Washington, American Council on Education, 1937, 321 pp.
Hudelson, Earl, *Problems of College Education,* Minnesota, University of Minnesota Press, 1928, 449 pp.
Marshall, L. C., *The Collegiate School of Business,* Chicago, Ill., 1928 University of Chicago Press. 68 p.
Snow, Louis F.; *The College Curriculum in the United States,* New York, 1907. (Teachers' College contribution to Edition No. 10.)
Young, Elizabeth B., *A Study of Curriculum of Seven Selected Women's Colleges of the Southern States,* New Yor Teachers' College, 220 pp.

ADMINISTRATION

Academic Patronage and Superintendence, Harvard Univ. Graduate School of Education, Occasional Pamphlets, No. 3, 1938.
"Administration and Organization in American Universities" *Peabody Journal of Education,* 22:328-43 (May, 1944).
Cattell, James McKeen, *University Control,* New York, Science Press, 1913. 84 pp.
Cooperation and Coordination in Higher Education, American Council on Education: Studies Series 1, Reports of Committees of the Council, 1938, April p. i-xi, 1-110.
Firth, C. H., *The Faculties and their Powers,* 1909.
Kent, Raymond A., *Higher Education in America,* 1930, 689 pp.
Kirkpatrick, John Ervin, *Academic Organization and Control,* 1931, Yellow Springs, Ohio, Antioch Press, 246 pp.
Lindsay, Ernest E., and Holland, E. O.—Administration, MacMillan, 1930. 166 pp.

UNIVERSITY FINANCES

American Alumni Council Handbook, Series No. 5, (An Alumni Council Survey).
"Costs of College Study, " Phi Delta Kappa, 28: 286.
"Private Colleges in a Profits World," South Atlantic Quarterly, 43: 131-42.
Sattgast, Charles R. *The Administration of College and University Endowments,* 1940.
"Sources of University Income," Higher Education, 1: 8-9, June 1, 1945.
Wood, Strugthers and Co., Trusteeship of American Endowments, New York, Macmillan, 1932. 156 pp.

COLLEGE ASSOCIATIONS

Davie, Calvin O., *A History of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools,* Ann Arbor, Mich., The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 286 pp.
Kelly, Robert F., *American Colleges and their Associations,* 1935.

ROLE OF BIG BUSINESS

Beck, Hubert Park, *Men Who Control Our Universities,* New York, Kings Crown Press, 1947.

Counts, George S. *The Social Composition of Boards of Education, A Study in Social Control of Public Education.*

Davis, Jerome, *Capitalism and Its Culture,* New York, Farrar Rinehard Co., 1935.

"The Economics of University Education," Science, Progress in the Twentierth Century, Vol. 1, pp. 364-380.

Elliot, Edward C., M. M. Chambers, and W. A. Ashbrook, *The Government of Higher Education,* designed for use of University and College Trustees, American Book Co., 1935.

Higher Education, Philanthropy, and Federal Tax Exemptions, American Council on Education, 1944.

Kelly, Fred J., and John H. McNeely, *The State and Higher Education: Phases of Their Relationship.*

Kirkpatrick John E., *American College and Its Rulers,* New York, New Republic Inc., 1926.

Kirkpatrick, John E., *Toryism in American College Government,* Ann Arbor, Mich, George Wahr, 1923.

Lindeman, Eduard C., *Wealth and Culture,* New York, Harcourt and Brace and Co., 1936.

Lundberg, Ferdinand, *America's Sixty Families,* New York, Vanguard Press, 1936.

McGrath, Earl J. "Control of Higher Education in America," (1860-1930) Educational Record, Vol. 17, April 1936. pp. 259-72.

Taussig, F. W. and C. S. Joslyn, *American Business Leaders.*

HISTORY

Bradby, Edward, *The University Outside Europe,* Oxford University Press, 1939. 332 pp.

Carlton, F. T., *Economic Influences on Educational Progress in the United States,* 1820-1850. Bulletin of Univ. of Wisc., 1908. No. 22. 135 pp.

Edwards, N., "Historic Relationships of Colleges and Universities to the Communities and Societies in Which They Have Flourished," Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, Proceedings, 1945.

Haskins, Charles H., *The Rise of the Universities,* New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1923. 134 pp.

Jordan, David Starr, *The Trend of the American University,* Stanford University Press, 1929. 126 pp.

Laurie, Simon S., *Rise and Early Constitution of Universities,* New York, International Education Society, 1903. 302 pp.

Marx, G. H., "Some Trends in Higher Education," Science, N. Y. 1909, Vol. 29, pp. 759-87.

Norton, A. O., *Readings in the History of Education,* 1909.

Schachner, Nathan, *The Medieval Universities,* New York, Stokes, 1938. 338 pp.

Sears, Jesse B., *Philanthropy in the History of American Higher Education,* Washington, Government Printing Office, 1922. 112 pp.
Thorndike, Lynn, *University Records and Life in the Middle Ages,* New York, Columbia University Press. 476 pp.
Thwing, C. F., *History of Higher Education in America,* New York, 1906. 506 pp. Information on expansion of curriculum and typical view of role of higher education at turn of century.
Thwing, C. F., *History of Education in the United States Since the Civil War,* Boston, 1910. 347 pp.

RELIGION

Braisted, Paul J., *Religion in Higher Education,* 1942.
Hershey, Charles B., *Historical Aspects of Church and Higher Education in the United States,* 1923.
"Higher Education and Religion," Christian Education, 29: 365-8, Sept. 1946.
Kelsey, F. W., *The Religious Census of the State Universities and of the Presbyterian Colleges in the Collegiate Year, 1896-97.* Ann Arbor, Mich., 1897.
Morgan, William H., *Student Religion During Fifty Years,* 1935.
McCosh, James, *Religion in a College,* 1886.
Porter, David R., The Church in the University.
"Religion in the Colleges," Conference on Religion in Universities, Colleges and Preparatory Schools, 1928.
Shedd, Clarence P., *Two Centuries of Student Christian Movements,* Association Press, 1934. 466 pp.
Shedd, Clarence P., "The Church Follows Its Students," Yale Studies in Religious Education, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1938. 32 pp.

GENERAL

Most Recent:

Harvard Committee Report, *General Education in a Free Society,* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1945.
President's Commission on Higher Education, *Report on Higher Education,* Wash., D.C., Government Printing Office, 1947. 6 vols. (Excerpts reprinted by Harpers Bros.)
President's Science Research Board, *Steelman Report: Science and Public Policy,* Wash., D.C., Government Printing Office, 1947.

NEW TRENDS

"American Area and Language Courses in Slavic and East European Studies 1946-7," American Slavonic Review, Vol. 5, Nov. 1946. pp. 162-90.
"Areas and Services of University Extension in Industrial Relations

Programs," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 20, April 1947. pp. 484-9.

Brown, L. C., "Catholic-Sponsored Labor-Management Education," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 20, April 1947. pp. 510-12.

"Can Colleges and Universities Contribute to Industrial Peace?" Colleges and Universities, Vol. 23, Oct. 1947. pp 86-95.

Connors, J. D., "New Frontier: Workers' Education and the University," Higher Education, Vol. 3, May 1947. pp 3-5.

Fernbach, A. P., *University Extension and Workers' Education,* National University Association, W. S. Bittner, Secretary, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. 25¢.

Fine, B., "Yale Prepares for One World," Foreign Area Studies, Forum, Vol. 104, Nov. 1945. pp. 251-3.

"Foreign Service Institute of the United States Department of State," Higher Education, Vol. 4, Oct. 15, 1947. pp. 37-40.

Hurwitz, H. L., "What to Teach About Russia Now," bibliography, Scholastic, Vol. 51, Nov. 3, 1947.

"Institute of Government at University of North Carolina," Schools and Society, Vol. 60, Oct. 14, 1944. pp. 244-5.

International Studies for Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 42nd Annual Report, 1946-7. pp. 3-13.

"Labor Education," Business Week, Oct. 6, 1945. p. 106 ff.

"Labor Fellows at Harvard," Higher Education, Vol. 4, Jan. 15, 1948, p. 119 ff.

Posey, T. E., "Workers' Education: A Challenge to Negro Colleges," Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 16, Jan. 1947. pp. 112-15.

Price, M. T., "Proposal for Foreign Area Studies," American Association of University Professors, Bull. 31, Nov. 1945, pp. 648-67; Vol. 32, Sept. 1946, pp. 562-7.

Shank, D. J., "Higher Education and Labor Relations," Educational Record, Vol. 27, Oct. 1946, pp. 412-21.

"Special Institute for Labor Groups at the Pennsylvania State College," Schools and Society, Vol. 66, Sept. 27, 1947, p. 230 ff.

Starr, M., *Labor Looks at Education,* Harvard University Press, 1946, $1.00; Excerpts: Educational Digest, Vol. 12, Dec. 1946, pp. 8-13.

"University of Wisconsin School for Workers," American Teacher, 30: 7-8, April 1946; 28:3-4, May 1944; 29:7-8, April 1945.

Ware, C. F., *Labor Education in the Universities,* American Labor Education Service, 1946. 138 pp. 1776 Broadway, $1.00.

"Wisconsin Institutes for Industrial Workers," Higher Education, Vol. 2, March 15, 1946, p. 6 ff.

Send your entry of a short story, poetry or a one-act play for our literary contest to NEW FOUNDATIONS. The deadline is January 30, 1949.

SUBSCRIBE TO NEW FOUNDATIONS — RENEW YOUR SUBSCRIPTION

NEW FOUNDATIONS
575 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK 25, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription for one year, beginning with Vol. .....

No. ..... (Domestic $1.00; Foreign $1.25.)

Name..... Date.....

Street address .....

City..... Zone..... State.....

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946, of NEW FOUNDATIONS, published quarterly at 575 Avenue of the Americas, New York 11, N. Y., for October 1, 1948.

State of New York }
County of New York } ss.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Marvin Schachter, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is a co-owner of New Foundations and that the following is to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily, weekly, semi-weekly or triweekly newspaper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Acts of March 3, 1933, and July 2, 1946 (Section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations), printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of publisher, editor, managing editor and business managers are: Publisher, New Foundations Cooperative Press, 575 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.; Editor, Ann Williams, 575 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.; Managing Editor, none; Business Manager, Bert Edwards, 575 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)

Herbert Shore, 335 Clark Avenue, Los Altos, Calif.; Marvin Reiss, 606 West 115th St., New York, N. Y.; Marvin Schachter, 79 West 101st Street, New York, N. Y.; Socrates Zaferiou, Windmill Farm, Mt. Kisco, New York.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state) None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect inthesaidstock,bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is (This information is required from daily, weekly, semi-weekly and tri-weekly newspapers only.)

MARVIN SCHACHTER, co-owner.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 29th day of September, 1948.

MANUEL LICHTENSTEIN.

(Seal) (My commission expires March 30, 1949)

new foundations

A STUDENT QUARTERLY

THE SOVIET UNION

- THE BULWARK FOR PEACE
- STUDENTS IN THE USSR
- PROFESSOR HAYES AND THE "WESTERN BLOC"
- GENETICS AND THE COLD WAR

SPRING
VOLUME TWO
NUMBER THREE

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

The Principles . . .

NEW FOUNDATIONS is a publication devoted to the political, cultural and intellectual problems of American students. Its purpose is to stimulate clear thinking and progressive social action in all fields of study and activity and to express the needs, activities and aspirations of student America. NEW FOUNDATIONS actively combats reactionary and fascist ideologies in all their manifestations and presents a positive approach to the solution of the problems of American students—an approach infused with the creative spirit of socialism. The orientation of this magazine will be militantly progressive, with the aim of stimuating Marxist thought and practice.

The Staff . . .

Cover and colophon designed by Miss Hannah Heider of Graphic Arts Workshop.