

politically important case?

PROSPERITY WITHOUT WAR? Prof. Galbraith Proves a Point

. . . pag**e 6**

... page 3

The NAACP Warns Both Parties

Murray's Strategy Didn't Pay Off

... page 2

nature is the information on the basis of which the attorney general drew up his notorious "subversive list"? What must we think of this whole expanding structure when-almost accidentally-we find out the readiness of the authorities to take action on a drunken tip, in a

We remind our readers that it is not only the American State Department which gets mad when it finds that its tipsters are unreliable, and turns upon them. In the land where the secret denunciation is glorified most, in Russia and the other totalitarian Stalinist states, much publicity is given every now and then to cases of false informers who get put away in the freezer. For the system of stoolpigeons and secret denunciations can be a Frankenstein monster even for the regimes which encourage it.

That goes a hundred times more for the American people.

The Sunday editorialist, in pleading for more international understanding. writes. ... Washington is the capital of the world and we are the nation on whom the future

The august legislative bodies in Washington last week demonstrated what manner of world capital it is and what kind of future it envisages by their actions on price control and immigration, the effects of which are only beginning.

Virtually all price controls were wiped out, including those on fruits and vegetables-11 per cent of the housewife's grocery bill. Rent controls will go in September of this year, except for a few critical areas and unless local option decides otherwise.

But wage controls were upheld. They are to be continued for one year beyond the June 30 expiration of the Defense Produc-

Materials allocations were continued under pretext of the continuing "emergency," but the jurisdiction over disputes by the

tripartite Wage Stabilization Board-urged by organized labor-was withdrawn.

Congress thus opened the till to the profiteers, speculators, chiselers and lobbyists and slammed the lid on the fingers of housewives and consumers.

CRAWLING WITH LOBBYISTS

The House had voted to scrap controls altogether: The New York Times (June 29) reports:

"All last week the corridor across the back of the House chamber was jammed with representatives of industrialists, retailers, real estate men and other anti-controls groups. During the hectic House debates Wednesday and Thursday, the lobbyists buttonholed their congressmen friends and handed them anti-controls amendments which in some cases were submitted on the House floor without even a prior reading by the sponsoring representatives."

The CIO News (June 30) portrays the mood of the House, as it "during its rampage acted with far less dignity than the (Turn to last page)

British Labor Left Wing Attacks Yalu Bombings

The political storm raised by the American government's new "get tough" military policy in Korea has continued to build up during the past week. The mass bombing of the power plants along the Yalu river, and the statements accompanying it issued both by officials in Washington and by generals in the field, have given emphasis to two major issues in the war in Korea which have remained alive under 🔍 the surface from the beginning:

First, under what conditions will the American generals be free to extend the war to the territory of China through the air? Second, what con-

ings had become a major is- of the major military moves sue in British politics, which are fraught with pospokesmen of the Truman litical significance, on the plain them as a purely mili- military" tactics imposed on tary action with no political the UN by the fortunes and significance. It should be dispositions of battle. noted that the same kind of explanation was given when and British public opinion has MacArthur ordered the generally tended to accept crossing of the 38th parallel this idea. But this time, the

trol do the Allies have over by the UN forces last year, the military and political de- when he ordered UN troops cisions of the American gov- to advance to the Yalu, and ernment concerning the war when he requested authority to bomb the "privileged sanc-As soon as it became tuary" of Manchuria. The known that the Yalu bomb- idea is to cut off all criticism administration sought to ex- ground that they are "purely ed the failure of the Ameri-

In the past, both American



political implications of the bombing are so obvious that almost NO section of British opinion has been willing to accept the explanation that the Yalu bombings were a more or less "routine" military operation. Most British newspapers published since the bombings have denounccans to consult the British before taking such action, and this applies even to those who tend to belittle or justify the action itself.

The political storm in Brit-(Turn to last page)

Murray's Dependence on Truman Hasn't Paid Off in Steel Strike

By GERRY McDERMOTT

Page Two

PITTSBURGH. June 25-The strategy that Phil Murray has been pursuing in the steel situation has backfired. As a result, the steel worker's union and the steel strike are seeing hard days with no relief in plain sight.

Murray's policy of conciliation, postponement and "reasonableness" since last November was based on a certain strategy. First, he hoped to win public opinion for the union's case. This is difficult enough in the face of capitalist-controlled newspapers, radio networks and magazines; and even if labor -does have "public opinion" on its side-as it often does -there are very few channels by which the average citizen can bring his pressure to bear very effectively. tat least at the present.

If public approval of the union's aims was not enough, it was hoped that the "moral authority" and prestige of the Wage Stabilization Board plus the administration would pressure the industry into a decent settlement. Truman and the WSB did their bit, but it wasn't "enough. Basically loyal to the capitalist economic and so-'cial system, the Democratic administration is perfectly willing to pass out a favor to labor here and there in exchange for votes, but it is neither willing nor able to lead any real fight. And the present attitude of the steel companies is such that only a determined battle will bring them to terms.

Finally, Murray was counting on government seizure to deliver the goods if all else failed. He expected that the government would then sign a contract with the union, granting all the important demands, as 'was done with the mine workers during the war.

BOSSES' CLUB

The seizure took place, as selves to justify a continuaexpected. What Murray ap- tion of the strike. In fact, the declared that she would "die in parently forgot was that the companies would like to ma miners won their contract neuver Murray into a posigovernment; that the gov- if the union does not win this ernment was at the time en- demand, it will appear to be DETROIT, June 30-A major orgaged in a gigantic world a defeat. war; and that the labor movement in general was in a very explosive mood at the

have ever gotten its demands from the administration un- Murray has charged for unanswered question. The is by no means reconciled to evidence seemed to indicate unionism and would like to approach, which would have Murray's answer to this actually benefited the indus- drive. It is an argument from try. Government seizure, far weakness, actually, because from being "friendly," be- Murray evidently sees it as gan to raise the specter of a a substitute for real day-toform of industrial dictator- day union building at the ship which would be worse plant level. Actually, if the than Taft-Hartley. The Su- union were stronger, the un- in the Detroit area. Chrysler's nique which has weakened so

preme Court decision post- ion shop issue would not poned-but by no means per- seem so important. manently settled-this ques-

tion. As the present strike drags on, the union is taking something of a mauling. The main club being used by the industry and their hired newspaper apologists is the "union-shop issue."

The "union-shop issue" is not at all the issue which is holding up a contract. The union has said as much very plainly. The main issue is the so-called management clause, which defines the rights of the companies to change job classifications, create and abolish jobs, and set rates. In short, the issue is speedup tion was bad enough in the mills before the strike; if the clause which the companies are insisting on were accepted, the companies could take back every penny of any wage increase with interest, and they could cut the union to pieces in the mills.

The union needs a satisfactory management clause and an improved grievance procedure. The present contract so severely limits the number of grievance committeemen that in some mills there is one committeeman for every thousand men, and a grievance backlog that sometimes takes years to get settled. It is true that the union would like to win more retroactive pay and the union shop, but these are subsidiary issues.

UNION-SHOP ISSUE

However, the reactionary newspapers and company spokesmen are playing the union-shop issue for all it is worth. They want to make it appear that this is all that is holding up a settlement. They know that this is unpopular with the public, unpopular with strikers' wives. and not popular enough among the strikers them-

This is not to suggest that Whether the union would ious indeed for the union shop. It is now apparent, as

In the meantime, the mood of the men is bitter. The union is now in its third strike this year. The earlier two were very short—only a day or two-but each time, the men lost almost a week's pay until the mills got back into production. Then, too, the period of "on again, off again" striking was exasperating. As one local union leader said recently, you can't keep a team keyed up for the big game indefinitely. As it stands now, many steel workers are already applying for relief, a humiliating process which means selling cars and TV sets, cashing in and rate-cutting. This situa-, insurance policies, and so on.

It is no secret in union circles that the rank and file made the leadership back down on the proposal to re-

Judge Confers Free Martyrdom **On CP'er with Stoolpigeon Demand**

By DAVE BERN

ANGELES, June 28-Fed-LOS Judge Mathes has ruled eral Oleta O'Connor Yates, California state secretary of the Communist Party and one of the defendants in the Smith Act trial here, in contempt yesterday for refusing to name her associates and for failure to answer five government questions concerning the activities another defendant, Frank Spector, and an alleged Stalinist party member, Harry Glickson, a Area longshoremen's leader. Bay Mrs. Yates was ordered confined in jail "indefinitely," without bail, until "you purge yourself independently for each question."

"I am willing to tell you anything about myself," said Mrs. Yates, "but I won't become a government informer." Judge Mathes blew up: "You'll answer the question. The court orders you to answer it You refuse to answer?" The defendant answered "ves." Then, "I hold you in contempt of court. Mrs. Yates." After similar refusals to answer later questions concerning party identities and activities, the judge ordered her locked up indefinitely between court sessions.

iail before I'll answer any of those questions." Attorney A. L. Wirin suggested that her sentence for contempt might seriously prejudice the jury. Judge Mathes replied, "The jury might feel they would do the same thing under the same circumstances. The jury might admire the witness.

open some plants for war

production. The leadership

agreed to do this, but when

they heard the reaction of

the picket lines, they quickly

backed down and insisted

that they had only agreed to

let finished steel be taken out

In the meantime, in a well-

timed and well-publicized

move, Weirton Steel, the only

important non-union pro-

ducer, has signed a contract

with the "independent" un-

ion in the plant-a union

which is really a jackal com-

pany union. The basis for

the contract, which was

reached as always without a

strike, was the last offer of

the major producers to the

union, minus any real griev-

ance protection, of course. It

was an obvious move to pres-

sure the strikers to settle on

industry's terms.

of some plants.

It is a revealing admission for a federal judge to make concerning the character of his own ruling, regardless of the jury's reaction! It seems apparent that the government attorneys wished to place the CP leader in a position where she would inevitably be charged with contempt, instead of depending on the strength of their own case.

In fact, the entire strategy of the government prosecution in this case seems to revolve around stoolpigeonry. As our previous reports showed. the government's positive presentation depended on parading a bevy of informers to the stand. Now its tactic would seem to be to force the CP witnesses into the same position. It is a tactic not calculated to expose the REAL crimes of the Stalinist party but rather to foster sympathy for its leaders. The sympathy would be misplaced, but Mrs. Yates is reported to have, its motivation would be understandable.

UE Local Goes Over to CIO

LABOR ACTION

In Philadelphia By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA, June 30-The only local of the independent (CPrun) United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers in Philadelphia has in the last two months lost an estimated 60 per cent of its membership to the CIO. After an unsuccessful move within Local 155 of the UE to oust Stalinist follower Dave Davis as business agent, most of the dissidents seceded from UE and were granted a charter as Local 123 of the International Union of Electrical Radio, and Machine Workers (IUE-CIO). The Davis machine controlled the local's executive board and canceled membership meetings at which Davis was to be impeached.

The revolt was led by Thomas Delaney and Sam DiMaria, organizers of the local and hatchetman for Davis for many years. While many of their charges against Davis, of misusing the union funds and name for furthering the Cont munist Party, etc. are true, their main argument for a change in 155 was that "the house must be cleaned before congressional investigating committees come to town." Delaney and DiMaria have been elevated to the status of public-spirited, patriotic American unionists by the public press. The IUE News is more reserved but welcomes them back to the fold and makes no mention of the black record they have left in the union movement. However, many in the District 1 Council of the IUE are frankly skeptical and regard the two as fellow-travelers and 07portunists

UE A SHADOW

The newly split shops were not taken into the existing amalgamated Local 165 of the IUE, which was the original local set up for the few shops which left UE 155 when the IUE was formed. Instead a new charter was issued and Delaney and DiMaria were selected to service these shops until permanent officers and organizers are elected.

Davis will undoubtedly be able to hold a few shops but the UE is truly but a shadow of its former self in this area. The only remaining pillar of strength is Local 107 at the Westinghouse plant in nearby Lester. It is possible that, the local leadership of that union may follow the path of Delaney and DiMaria.

There are bound to be struggles within IUE locally for power but despite its hysterical and opportunistic aspects, by and large the break in Local 155 UE will be for the progress of labor. It is fortunate that the final trend was overwhelming to IUE for there was at first danger of the revolt splitting into fragments, going to three or four CIO unions, AFL, and an independent union.

with the government only after striking against the union shop. Even now,

ganizational test faces the United Auto Workers (CIO) in the strike called against the Chrysler Corthe union leadership, at poration at its Michaud tankleast, is not very, very anx- engine plant in New Orleans, Louisiana

What is involved is the principle of equal pay for equal work, and the extension of the Chrysler nader seizure status remains an some time, that the industry tion-wide agreement to cover new plants going into operation.

Under the area wage-differential plan which is the policy of that Truman was adopting a reduce the union to complete the Wage Stabilization Board, on "plague on both your houses" impotence. The union shop is which the UAW is still represented, the Chrysler Corporation pays much lower wages in New Orleans than in Detroit. It amounts to from 29 to 51 cents per hour difference on many jobs.

The UAW takes the position that workers in New Orleans are entitled to the same pay for the same work as Chrysler workers

that the wage rate was fixed by the government and it was helpless to do anything about it.

Likewise, Chrysler argues for a specific local union agreement at the Michaud plant (recently organized by the UAW) instead of making the Michaud union part of the national Chrysler agreement.

The importance of this struggle for the UAW is quite obvious. Its organizational drive in the South depends on the kind of victory it achieves here. For the lure o "Detroit wages" is what attracts the Southern workers to the UAW.

In long-range terms, the acceptance of the equal-pay-forequal-work principle would block any move on the part of the auto companies to engage in the notorious "run-away" shop tech-

argument in negotiations was many unions in the Northern states.

> By covering the Michaud plant with the nation-wide agreement, the workers there would be entitled to the kind of shop committee and chief steward setup which is the backbone of the stronger Chrysler locals. It would give them some bargaining rights in the plants.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

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

A sub is only \$2 a year!

democratic society in recent years, benighted elements resorted, during 1951, to a new instrument of terrorthe hate bomb." The words were chosen thoughtfully, and they are sober. The bombs bursting in the air of Mims, Birmingham, Dallas, Atlanta, Nashville and California in 1951 and the barbarity of Cicero were indeed a response to the civil-rights movement and to the first real steps toward integration achieved by Negroes since the Civil War and Reconstruction. This is worth noting, if only

as the saying goes, to explain

their gradualism.

as a result of this convention. REPRISAL POLICY

rights program.

The meeting this year was in a presidential year, the first time since 1948. Inevitably the mapping out of its political strategy for the fall of 1952 was the organization's main convention busiress. This aspect of the convention is of interest, not because of anything new in the NAACP's thinking, but because the convention held up a good civil-rights mirror to national politics, and also because it showed the organization's determination to intervene in the coming election contests in furtherance of its civil-

NAACP Convention Warns Both Democrats And GOP Against Sellout on Civil Rights

By KATE LEONARD

July 7, 1952

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People held its 43rd annual convention in Oklahoma City, June 24 through 29. In absentia, Harry T. Moore was awarded the Spingarn medal.

On the eve of the convention the association released its balance sheet on civil rights for 1951. The report is entitled "1951-The Year of the Hate Bomb." The report is also a memorial to Harry T. Moore, State Coordinator of Branches for Florida, who "on the Lord's day," Christmas night 1951, lost his life in the Mims, Florida bombing of his home, an outrage in which Mrs. Moore was also fatally injured.

The association begins its report: "In a desperate effort to halt the progress made toof this policy to the coming presward the attainment of a idential election, and it could not avoid coming up with a halfway house. Since 1949 the NAACP has reiterated the obvious and the

because these are days of much and idle talk about progress. There are U. S. representatives abroad, both Negro and white, who see "progress" through an amethyst glow. There are also some at home-usually not Negro -who take it as an earnest of their intransigence that they see no progress at all, but rather its opposite. The NAACP sees the problem plain. The leadership of the NAACP may be gradualist to a man, but it is not their ability to measure progress-present and accounted for along the weary road, however slight in terms of the goal-which makes them so. There are other forces at work,

Just as the 1951 balance sheet is a sober appraisal, so this 43rd convention inched along. There is no fundamental change in NAACP tactics, prospects, activity or membership to record as a result of the last year's labors, and none projected for the future

In 1948 because of the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, To Secure These Rights, the association gave its support wholeheartedly to President Truman, abandoning its nonpartisan stand. Since then, because of the record of the Democratic Party it has recaptured its ground, as firmly as is possible within the framework of the two-party system. Between 1948 and 1952 the NACCP" has indicated again and again that on a local scale and nationally, it intends to emphasize the punishment side of the "reward your friends and punish your eneies" policy, its traditional method. This is a weak weapon, but the organization in present day U. S. has no other. In the absence of a third choice (we mean a labor party) it feels it has to preach

and practice ballot-box reprisal. The current convention was preoccupied with the application

where punishment is long overdue. Political retribution, ballotbex reprisal which can be counted against both major political parties, awaits the day when the NAACP membership can "vote labor." It only remains to say that this state of affairs is not of their making.

SOLEMN WARNING

The difficulties the organization faces are symbolized by Walter White's statement on Senator Richard B. Russell, leader of the Southern wing of the Democratic Party and would-be presidential or vice-presidential nominee. White said, "If Senator Russell of Georgia gets a position on the Democratic ticket, the Negro vote will go down the line for his Republican opponent." (New York Times, June 28.)

This statement leaves no doubt of the NAACP attitude to Russell, but it is a bit like robbing the devil by slipping his lady pin

money, gratis.

Operating under this handicap, the association spoke its piece on the parties, the coming elections, and the candidates. It of course called upon both major parties to incorporate the organization's civil-rights program - which is the same as the program To Secure These Rights-into their platforms. This is both its privilege and its right.

White in his last speech at the convention said, "Let us here solemnly warn both parties that if either side sells out on this most fundamental of principles it will bring down upon itself the wrath of millions of independent voters.

"Not least among these independent voters and more determined on this issue than most is the Negro vote, now nearing 2,000,000 in the South and holding the potential balance of power in no less than 17 Northern states with 281 votes in the electoral college. . . . The Negro vote of

Ohio, Illinois, and California decided the 1948 presidential election. Since then the number of Negroes of voting age has grown by close to 1,500,000. Many of these live in the 17 states where the Negro vote is large enough to make it impossible, except in a landslide, for either party to win without it."

Page Three

GOP REJECTED

Specifically with regard to the Republican Party, the convention rejected out of hand the party" two most likely candidates, Tan and Eisenhower. Concerning Taft the feeling of the membership was made clear as a clear day in June. It is true that the convention put General Eisenhower once more on the spot with the demand for a comprehensive statement of his views on civil rights, but it would be a mistake to suppose that at this stage of the game there is a warm heart left in the organiza-

(Continued on page 4)

Knowland's Bipartisan Victory in Calif. Reinforces Case for Labor Independence

By FRANK MORSE

SAN FRANCISCO, June 25-The outstanding feature of the California primary election held June 3 the defeat suffered by labor and liberal forces as a result of the sweeping victory of Senator William F. Knowland, the anti-labor Republican. Knowland won not his own Republican nominafor U. S. senator, but he was clso able to capture the Democratic nomination from Clinton D. wcKinnon by a good majority.

just, that considering the records

of both major parties, the asso-

ciation has been between the fry-.

ing pan and the fire. Unfortu-

nately they are in no position to

deal out thorough punishment

On a local level, the trade-union movement of Alameda County (Oakland and Berkeley) likewise uffered a bitter blow when GOP Congressman John J. Allen, also an extreme reactionary, took the Democratic nomination for repreentative from the 7th Congresional District.

Under California's unique crossfiling law, a candidate can file for the nomination of political parties other than his own, regardless of his declared political affiliation. If the candidate receives a plurality of the votes cast on the primary ballot of the other party as well as winning his own party's nomination. he is then listed on the general election ballot as the candidate of both parties.

Thus Knowland and Allen, both avowed Republicans, will be listed her hallot as the on the Nove publican and Democratic candidates for their respective offices. In this way a cross-filing victory. on the primaries is tantamount to election unless an independent candidate is able to win.

KNOWLAND OF FORMOSA

On the Democratic ballot, Knowland, the Republican, polled close to 950,000 to McKinnon's 625.000. He carried every county except San Diego, McKinnon's own. In his own Republican party in which McKinnon had crossfiled, Knowland piled up 1,500,000 votes. The total result was a three-to-one victory for Know-

Knowland's victory, unprecedented even for a California primary, can't be dismissed with a shrug on the assumption that what occurred was no more than a political fluke. Knowland was the man that the California labor movement was out to "get."

For years the AFL, CIO and Railroad Brotherhoods had threatened to wage an all-out campaign to defeat him. Labor, as well as Americans for Democratic Action

and other liberals rightfully considered Knowland to be one of the most reactionary senators in the Senate. They explained his election in 1946 on the grounds that he had been backed by the Warren machine and had been swept into office as a result of the national GOP victory that year.

However, 1952 was to be different. The AFL, through its labor League for Political Action, promised to raise one million dollars for his defeat. The CIO and the Railroad Brotherhoods likewise talked of doing everything possible to unseat this enemy of labor.

Knowland's politics are best summed up by the fact that he has been given the apt title of "the Senator from Formosa." That thoroughly discredited and corrupt despot, Chiang Kai-shek, has no more loyal supporter than Knowland. Mere aid to Chiang is not sufficient for Knowland. He goes far beyond this to demand an extension of the Korean conflict and an all-out war against Stalinist China.

LABOR'S POLICY FAILED

However, what is not so widely, known is Knowland's extreme reactionary domestic program. When not touring the country on behalf of the China Lobby, he finds time to appear in the Senate to oppose all progressive acts and he has been a consistent advocate of the most vicious anti-labor legislation.

That Knowland defeated Mc-Kinnon in the Republican primary is neither unusual nor surprising. But his victory in the Democratic Party, the party supported by labor and liberals, how is this to be explained?

It cannot simply be said that Knowland's sweep was the result of the nation-wide reactionary trend. The California primary showed no pronounced swing in the direction of Knowland's politics. In fact the LLPE claims that 74 per cent of the candidates it endorsed for congress and state legislative positions were either elected or nominated.

Nor were the labor leaders unaware of the difficulty they would have in unseating the powerful Knowland. They knew that crossfiling would aid the incumbent and they were well acquainted with the fact that he had tremendous financial and propaganda resources at his disposal.

The simple fact is that labor's ocratic candidates.

policy of supporting any Democrat failed miserably. The labor movement is finding it increasingly difficult to carry out such a policy with any amount of vigor, enthusiasm or conviction. Thus, early this year when the Democrats began the task of selecting a candidate to oppose Knowland, the labor movement and the ADA. were in a quandary. They could not find an individual with sufficient political stature willing to run against Knowland. Despite all their previous talk, when the time came for an actual fight against Knowland, they could not produce. The task of selecting a candidate was left to the Democratic Party machine. Finally, after much effort and to the delight of the GOP-controlled press. Congressman McKinnon announced that he would run.

THE DEMOCRATS' MAN

Who is McKinnon? This is the juestion most of the voters must have asked when they went to the polls. The man is a comparative unknown in California politics. Publisher of the San Diego Journal and owner of a radio station there, McKinnon had been elected to Congress in 1948 and 1950 with labor support. He was pro-labor as far as the California labor movement was concerned. In Congress he followed a straight Fair Deal line. He was a man whom the labor leaders could easily support and when he announced his candidacy they gave him formal endorsement.

But the campaign told the story. McKinnon had been ten times the pro-labor man he is supposed to be, it would have meant little if the voters had never heard of him. And the labor movement was just unable to work up the enthusiasm and energy necessary to put Mc-Kinnon over. The usual formal endorsements were made and perfunctory mailings on his behalf were sent out from union offices.

Knowland, on the contrary, campaigned vigorously. His signs and billboards flooded the entire state. Radio and TV networks carried his speeches and those of his supporters. That he was working hard to capture both nominations was no secret. Only an allout campaign by labor could have put across the unknown McKinnon. This is where the labor movement failed. And in failing it showed the lack of enthusiasm in its own policy of supporting Dem-

The result was an utter dehacle for labor. Instead of having a candidate to face Knowland in November, labor's choice failed dismally to capture his own party nomination. In a state where the registered Democrats outnumber the Republicans by almost a million voters, where the AFL itself claims over a million members. and the CIO and various independent unions several hundred thousand more, a vicious spokesman for reaction like Knowland sweeps the Democratic primary.

WHAT COMES FIRST?

Now what is the California labor movement going to do? For several years the labor leaders have been telling the rank and file that they must get out and vote. They have set up the PAC and the LLPE. They have been explaining that to ensure price controls, to get a fair tax program, to fight anti-labor legislation, the workers must elect friends of labor. And they have assured us that these friends of labor could be found in the Democratic and even in the Republican Parties. Their strategy has been to work in the old two-party sys-

But what happens when Knowland; an utter reactionary, runs on both tickets? Obviously labor's come incompatible. Either the labor leadership must abstain and forget about this important office of U. S. senator, forget all it has said about the necessity of political action, or-the labor leadership must put up an independent candidate. Which comes first: labor's standard of living and labor's rights or the two-party system?"

As things stand, the case for an independent candidate could hardly be stronger. Rumors of more anti-labor legislation have been growing, particularly since the present steel dispute. And there a strong possibility of a swing to the right in the November elections. Should the labor movement abstain, Knowland will go to the Senate with all the prestige his sweeping victory has given him. The labor leadership will have missed a golden opportunity to allow the workers to show what they think of men like Knowland and Allen. It will be their way of saying that they prefer to work within the two-party system even if this leads to the election of reactionary, anti-labor Page Four

The ISL Program - in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



APT

STATE.

CITY

ZONE ...

MARXISM for []] HA

Charity, Welfare State, and the Walls of Jericho

By PHILIP COBEN

"I will give it you: come thou with us, and we will do thee good . . . "-Numbers, 10:29.

We see by The Tidings, a Catholic paper published in California, that Cardinal Griffin, archbishop of Westminster, devoted a London sermon recently to warning against the Welfare State in the name of the social principles of Christianity.

"Many of these things which the state has taken to itself of late were first of all the province of the Church. But with a difference. Charity was the theme and the reason for the Church's endeavors in the field. She desired to serve Christ in her neighbor," he said. And also: "He [the individual] may receive justice, but justice without personal charity can be a cold and un-Christian thing."

As against such socially reactionary grumbling, we would spring to the defense of the Welfare State idea-but not uncritically. We will have to take a second look at the Welfare State too, having in mind not merely current politics but a principle which we would put at the heart of the democratic spirit of Marxism.

The cardinal prefers personal charity to the impersonal justice of a community which recognizes its responsibility to its citizens. He is no doubt thinking of the spiritual benefits which are gained by the giver of largesse when he opens his hand in Christian charity. But is he also thinking of the recipient of this charity? Not very much, it would seem. For the former is necessarily the rich man, easing his plush-upholstered soul by scattering his crumbs to the multitude; the latter are the multitude who stretch out their open palms to share in the lord's beneficence. And for some reason the latter never like the role.

Whether they cringe in fact or cringe in spirit (depending on the social customs) the relation established is one of superior and inferior, of domination and submission. Personal charity as a social institution assumes the rule of one class over another.

"For the poor shall never cease out of the land: THEREFORE I command thee, saying, Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy, in thy land."-Deut., 15:11.

CHARITY, CLERICAL AND SECULAR

It was of such churchmen as the cardinal that Marx and Engels were thinking when they wrote in a joint article in 1847:

"The social principles of Christianity preach the necessity of a ruling and an oppressed class, and all they have to offer to the latter is the pious wish that the former may be charitable. The social principles of Christianity transfer the reparation of all infamies to the realms of heaven and thus they justify the perpetuation of these infamies on earth. The social principles of Christianity declare that all the villainies of the oppressors against the oppressed are either the just punishment for original or other sin, or tribulations which God in his inscrutable wisdom causes the redeemed to suffer. The social principles of Christianity preach cowardice, self-abasement, resignation, submission and humility, in short, all the characteristics of the canaille, but the proletariat is not prepared to let itself be treated as canaille and it needs its courage, confidence, pride and independence even more than it needs its daily bread."

When a worker, who wishes to be proud. selfconfident and independent in the living won by his own hands, has to apply for charity, it may be difficult to determine which strikes deeper: the curtness of the charity worker who seems to regard clients as just a cut above beggars, or the saccharine sweetness of the enlightened type who wishes be oh-so-kind and tactful. This charity corrupts. But it is not mainly the clerical advocates of charity as a social institution that we are interested in, for the Cardinal Griffins will not really succeed in turning the clock back to the days when

soft shoulder of an oppressive social system. We are more interested in the Welfare State itself in this regard.

But hasn't the cardinal made clear that the Welfare State is the very opposite of what he has in mind? Not quite. He is denouncing the Welfare State as a rival giver of charity. He is against secular charity, on the ground that it muscles in on his territory. For him, Social Security and the Salvation Army face each other on the same terrain. And there is something to that. It does indeed bear upon a prevalent liberal concept of the Welfare State, implicit or explicit in liberalism.

The liberal wants to fight for the interests of the people. The sentiment does him honor. But he wants to fight for the people's interests, and more often than not, when it comes to the point, he be comes as uneasy as the powers-that-be when the people insist on doing their own fighting for their own interests. Then he tends to counsel "patience," restraint, and gradualism.

For us this is a difference which goes right to a basic dividing line between the liberal and Marxist approach to social struggles. The liberal wants to rouse the masses-to support "good" men who will "do good" unto them rather than evil. The Marxist tells the people to organize their own strength, to depend for their aims on their own fighting spirit, their own self-movement. Leaders there will have to be, but not merely ones that the people "trust" but ones that they control. In a real sense, it is the difference between leaders who are "friends" of the people and leaders who are spokesmen of the people; between "friends of labor" in the Fair Deal, or a Labor Party organized by and answerable to the workers' organizations; between a government of the best-intentioned liberals and a workers' government.

THE HEART OF MARXIST DEMOCRACY

If you saw Viva Zapata, it was the difference between a President Madera who, once installed, thought it natural that the people give up their arms, since he was quite sincerely going to take care of their interests for them, and the Zapatista peasants who felt in their bones that the arms in their huts represented their control over the far-off state. It is the idea which says, in Marx's terms, that the emancipation of the working class is the task of the working class itself-not counterposing this against the need for a vanguard party which points a road and leads, but against any movement or sect which thinks to substitute itself for the mobilization of the masses from below.

It is strange: "substituting itself for the masses" is one of the standard charges against Lenin's party (and it is, to be sure, Stalinism which deserves the accusation) but this is precisely the line of Philanthropic Liberalism.,"Come thou with us, and we will do thee good . . ."

This is the democratic heart of Marxism: For the first time in history it has become possible for the "lowest" class to rule, that class on whose labor all the rest of society depends. For the first time, therefore, a new social order is possible in the interests of the most numerous class, whose rule by that token means the abolition of all class rule. It cannot substitute itself for the private rulers of property by itself gaining private control of property; it can rule only through the collectivity, only democratically. Those who reject this as "visionary" are saying not only that socialism is impossible but that democracy is impossible.

As against this, philanthropic liberalism is as retrogressive as Cardinal Griffin's concept of Christian charity. This is why the International sings "We want no connding saviours.

There is a straight line from the image of the beneficent lord to that of the Leader or Fuehrer. Even the reading of the Bible has been corrupted by the image. We are thinking of the story of Joshua at Jericho. According to a common impres-

sion, the walls fell down at the blast of Joshua's trumpet. That isn't what the Bible says:

"And it came to pass, when the people heard the sound of the trumpet, and the people shouted with a great shout, that the wall fell down flat, so that the people went up into the city, every man straight before him, and they took the city." (Joshua, 6:20.)

It is good to have a leader who blows the trumpet, rather than one who counsels infinite reliance on petitions and pleas, but the city will be taken when the people shout with a great shout and go forward, every man straight before him.

Don't miss a single week of

LABOR ACTION

A sub is only \$2 a year!

by the News Chronicle here indicates that 5 out of 6 peo-

tudes.

Bevan's support. The story that Hugh Dalton is "anti-German," or a "Vansittartst," is not true, of course. He has made it clear that his attitude is largely conditioned by the fact that the German Social-Democrats are opposed to West German rearmament. At this time of writing, the U.S. conditions under the Labor govbombing of the Yalu River power ernment," he said.

in touch with reality.



(Continued from page 3)

LABOR ACTION

tion for Eisenhower. Remembering Walter White's courting of the general in early 1948, we are grateful for small ogress. The convention diagosed Eisenhower as "to the right" of Taft and Russell. Nor is it likely that a Republican dark horse, loaded down with Taft or Eisenhower's baggage, can appeal to the Negro

The proceedings of the convention made it evident that the NAACP hopes to influence the Democratic nomination for the presidency. It rejected all current contenders with the exception of Averell Harriman, director of Mutual Security, who has entered the race with a New-Fair Deal toga wrapped around him. Harriman is the only candidate who has come out for the full civilrights program, including an FEPC with teeth. The other Democratic contenders rejected by the NAACP, Russell, Kefauver and tevenson, all reflect the situation within the Democratic Party, which is riddled with rumors of compromise and attempts to compromise between the party and its

The fundamental long-range aim of the Southern wing of the party is to defend its sectional interest by retaining the Southern stranglehold on the Senate. but they also intend to catch-as-catchcan along the way. For this election, in the words of the NAACP, they aim "to put over at the Democratic national convention either an anti-civil-rights candi-

of them. Southern wing.

really tight pinch.

man heir.



farmers. The Labor Party's promise LONDON, June 24 - The latest Gallup Poll published

July 7, 1952

SCIENTISTS IN THE DOGHOUSE by Kirtley F.

This is one of a series of articles making up

the current issue of The Nation, entirely devoted

to the question of civil liberties. Mather is the

retiring president of the American Association

of the witchhunt which have hit the scientist, of

whom he says: "if there enters his mind the

suspicion that perhaps in times of ideological

conflict a little thought control might be desir-

able, he has only to remind himself of the sorry

plight of the biological sciences in the Soviet

Union." Some of the crucest attacks have been from private agencies, like the American Legion,

Counterattack, and the beetle-brows of the Na-

tional Council for American Education. But the

subtlest, and in the longer run the most dan-

university laboratories," he writes, "is subsidized

by federal agencies-which makes the universi-

"The major portion of research activities in

gerous, have been from government agencies.

Professor Mather deals with several aspects

Mather.—The Nation, June 28.

for the Advancement of Science.

LONDON LETTER

ple in this country expect the

Labor Party to win the next

general election. The clue to this

feeling seems to be provided by

the publication of the final analy-

sis of the results of the local

The Labor Party gained no

less than 1,955 seats and lost only

103. This represents a net gain

of 1.852 council seats. In England

and Wales, Labor holds majori-

ties on 38 out of 83 county bor-

oughs; 61 out of 309 county bor-

oughs; 161 out of 572 urban dis-

tricts; and 23 out of 475 rural

The final results do bring out

the real need for a vigorous Labor

onslaught in the rural counties

where the relics of feudal habits

and attitudes have enabled the

Tories to keep their hold over many

agricultural laborers and simple

elections.

districts.

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

ties and science particularly vulnerable to the congressional witchhunt. Consequently, political screening, rather than mere technical competence, has been accepted as necessary at many academic institutions even when the work is completely unclassified and does not involve access to anything that could be considered a military secret. Administrators dare not risk charges that might be made by congressional committees or radio and newspaper commentators that they are employing 'red' scientists. Visits of FBI agents to heads of departments, project directors, deans and presidents did not cease with the war. Some institutions have their own security officers, who are concerned not only with classified projects but also with research projects not covered by security regulations. Particularly where academic tenure has not been a stumblingblock, it has been comparatively easy to dismiss, or bar from employment, capable scientists accused of past association with organizations now considered questionable or subversive." (Emphasis added.)

British People Expect Labor to Win

to remove tied cottages during its next period of office, made by Hugh Dalton at the last party conference, will certainly assist the breakup of these medieval atti-

The National Executive of the Labor Party has now published its statement on foreign policy. The statement comes out against West German rearmament unless the latest Russian offer is tested and free elections are held in Germany (or in Western Germany, if the Russian offer proves to be only a maneuver.) Hugh Dalton is the main spokesman for this policy. Naturally, he has Aneurin

stations, close to the Manchurian border, at a delicate point in the Panmunjom negotiations, looks as if it is going to touch off a row between the Labor Party front benches and the Tory government. In addition the Koje Island affair. and the exposure of the rotten Synaman Rhee regime, seem to provide some cause for believing that the Labor Party will be forced to break with its bipartisan foreign policy.

British Laborites have been encouraged by the results of the provincial elections in Saskatchewan (in Canada) and Victoria (in Australia). The "Liberal Party" of Menzies received a resounding blow in Victoria, where the Labor Party gained 7 seats and the Liberal Party lost 8. As Dr. Herbert Evatt said, these results had a national significance. The Liberal government was "deserving of severe censure for having undermined the prosperous

READING from LEFT to RIGHT Readers Take the Gloor

On SP Convention

To the Editor:

I am one of those socialists who are disgusted with the outcome of the recent Socialist Party convention at Cleveland. Not that I expected a great deal from the delegates as a whole, but I, and others, did expect at least a real fight by the left-wing delegates for a Third Force position against both imperialist war blocs. What really happened at the convention, especially in the resolutions committee? If, as reports say, only two out of eleven committee members represented the Thomas-Kreuger point of view of "critical support" to the Washington - Wall Street war drive and the attempt to bully other countries into tying up their economies and sovereignty with the American drive, why did a frankly compromise position result which can satisfy no one for long because it deals in platitudes and Utopian-style "recommendations" which can never be implemented?

What has happened to the party of Eugene Debs and Kate O'Hara? Has it died on the vine? I don't speak of its actual membership decline and lack of influence, particularly, but of the SP's mealy-mouthed official declarations and its practices. Why did the California anti-war delegates, for example, not try to carry out the fight for a Third Force position which they had promised and which the June 1952 issue of the California SP paper states Briggs and his comrades would represent? Why was the YPSL position on war not given due consideration? Is unity with the right wingers, who often threaten to leave the party if they don't get their way, more important than fighting for one's convictions, for socialist principles? A lot of us would like an explanation, including what sort of deals were made the "smoke-filled room."

A THIRD FORCE ADVOCATE

Slum Clearance

To the Editor:

Some recent facts have come to my attention which, if someone were to take the necessary time to put them together would, I believe, open an excellent opportunity for an article in LABOR AC-TION. I refer to the manner in which slum clearance is undertaken in areas like Harlem. Blocks of rat- and vermin-infested tenements and cold-flats are being torn down-a fact which can only be praiseworthy. But in too many cases it happens that buildings are erected in their stead which cannot serve as new homes for the evicted former occupants of the old.

Only today, for example, an ticle appeared in Times announcing two proposed new slum-clearance projects. In one of these new developments abartments will rent for \$29.50 a room per month. According to a N. Y. Department of Welfare source, I am told that many of the present occupants of this area national issue, and more than the pay as little as \$30 a month, not per room but for a six-room apartment. In the present condition of the dwellings now standing there, this is no bargain, but even allowing for increased rent for a decent place in which to live, most if not all of the present site tenants will be unable to afford to live in the new apartments.

So what happens? A few lucky ones get placed in low-cost city housing and the rest go to further cvercrowd already badly overcrowded slums elsewhere, perhaps even in the next block, thus worsening the situation which slum clearance is supposed to alleviate. Even if all the site tenants are relocated in public housing, the situation is no better, for their priority merely creates an increased backlog in the lists of previous applicants. Paul is taken care of only to Peter's detriment.

I have no statistics, nor time to obtain and sort them, but in rough algebra, it comes out something like this: A group of organizations led by Columbia University is sponsoring a slum-clearance project in Manhattanville. one of the city's most overcrowded areas. Assume that, by virtue of overcrowding, there are at present 5x people living there. A coop is built, requiring down payments which exclude any Manhattanvillite. Also a low-cost project is planned and will accommodate, say, x people. That leaves 4x evictees to be housed. Where? UNLESS HOUSING IS BUILT FOR THEM, THEY HAVE TO MOVE TO AREAS WHICH ARE ALREADY INHABITED BY OTHERS LIKE THEM. This means bigger and worse slums somewhere else. As soon as buildings deteriorate anywhere, small apartments will be made out of big ones, and tiny ones out of the small until finally even large closets will be rented out as rooms to these people who have nowhere else to live. And on the other hand, why

are so many expensive apartment buildings being built? They seem -if the daily Times classified is any clue-to be a drug on the market.

There is admittedly nothing sensational about all this; it's not "news." And nobody seems very excited about it, although there are dribblings of information in the press from time to time. . . . And somebody must point out to them that slum clearance in itself

is not the evil thing (in their bare-handed approach to the immediate problem, tenants tend to react like the machine-smashing proletarians of the Industrial Revolution), but the point is rather to what use the "slumcleared" areas are put.

Roy HOLLISTER

On "The Strange Behavior Of the French PCI"

A letter to our "Readers Take the Floor" department last week quoted an item from the Paris Le Libertaire, which requires a follow-up. Briefly: several revolutionary groupings in Paris had gotten up a leaflet protesting against the Siqueiros exhibition, Siqueiros being the organizer of the first attempt on Trotsky's life in Mexico. The PCI, official section of the 4th International, had signed it, but its paper printed extracts from the statement "in a fragmentary manner, at the bottom of page 2"-and without the PCI signature, no further explanation of the omission being given.

The next issue of the PCI's Vérité gives an explanation. It says that the draft for the statement had been submitted to it but had to await approval by the responsible leading body. While it was sent back, signed, in a couple of days, in the meantime the editors of Vérité decided to publish it immediately with the others' signatures, in order not to hold it up till the next bi-weekly issue.

Grace Carlson Breaks with SWP To Return to Catholic Church

Grace Carlson, vice-presidential candidate of the Socialist Workers. Party, has announced her break with the party to join the Catholic Church.

The news, carried by the N.Y. Times on July 1, was confirmed by phone by the office of the SWP. The AP dispatch reported:

"Grace Carlson, a leader in the Socialist Workers Party and its candidate for vice-president of the United States, disclosed today that she had renounced the party and returned to the Roman Catholic Church.

"She was automatically excommunicated from the church when she joined the party 16 years ago follow the teachings of Karl Marx and Leon Trotsky.

"She was one of 18 party leaders convicted in 1940 under the Smith Act of plotting to overthrow the government [in the Minneapolis trial]. She was sentenced to serve 13 months in the Federal Prison for Women at Alderson, W. Va.

"Mrs. Carlson, who is 46 years old, said she had left the party 'because of a difference in basic philosophy-a case of atheism against Catholicism.' She declared, however, that she would not become an informer on party members and would write no books.

"Mrs. Carlson has been engaged by the Newman Club at the University of Minnesota to catalogue its library.'

YOU ARE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of LABOR ACTION. "Readers Take the Floor." Our policy is to publish all letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words. Letters must be signed; names withheld on request.

Beginning Next Friday— The N.Y. Socialist Youth League presents

Marxism and Philosophy

A Series of Four Class Sessions by

Hal Draper

This class will center around the relationship between scientific method and the Marxist approach to philosophy, discussing dialectical materialism in this context.

FRIDAY EVENINGS at 8:30 p.m.

July 11-MARXISM vs. PHILOSOPHY. July 18-DIALECTICS AS SCIENTIFIC METHOD. July 25-MORALITY AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE. Aug. 1—(Topics to be decided by class.)

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 W 14 St.; New York City

date and platform, or failing this, this development are mounting. In a compromise ticket and plank." the last few days an FEPC of sorts The first perspective with which was reported favorably to the Senate through the Senate Comthe NAACP credits the Russellites is grandiose, the second is mittee on Labor and Public Welfare. (In 1950 Senator Lister Hill The South has chided its Dixiebragged concerning a similar bill, The committee dropped it like a crats, "its kissing kin," on method foundling on the Senate's dooronly; Russell, Lister Hill and othstep.") Truman in his speech before the ADA, more recently at Howard University, and in his mes-

age to the NAA

has returned to a vigorous public espousal of his 1948 platform.

"The day my civil-rights program

is adopted, people will begin to

wonder what all the fuss was

about and why it wasn't done

sooner." With the steel strike,

Taft-Hartley has re-emerged as a

third ear is bent toward labor's

well-modulated voice. Already it

is rumored that President Truman

will tap Harriman as his successor,

The NAACP is playing hard

Next week we will discuss some

other aspects of the convention.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 W. 14 Street, N. Y. C.

specializes in books and pam-

phlets on the Labor and So-

cialist movement, Marxism.

etc., and can supply books of

all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

one of these whistle stops.

toward this end.

ers say, "Your way is not the best way to gain our common objective." Temporarily the South is united by the gospel, "Beat Truman and his civil-rights program from within." Russell leads the Southern faction. He has no real hope of success for his personal candidacy. He is there to steer, to bargain, or to thwart. The South would love a compromise candidate. They also dream of throwing the election into the House of Representatives, to defeat a Tru-

STRAWS IN THE WIND

The candidacies of Kefauver and Stevenson are compromise moves, as the NAACP recognizes withholding support to either

It remains to be seen how the Democratic convention will go. But it is far from excluded that Truman's advisors, aligned as they are with the labor officialdom and mindful of the balance-ofpower factor of the Negro vote in the Northern cities, will again produce a Fair Deal program and a Fair Deal nominee, a tactic so highly successful in 1948 when the Democratic Party was in a

Straws in the wind to indicate

LABOR ACTION



PROSPERITY WITHOUT WAR? Prof. Galbraith Assures Us that Peace Would Not Mean Depression

By HAL DRAPER

Page Six

Behind all the touchy questions among American political and economic issues is one of the touchiest of all: What would happen to U.S. economy and its social system if real stable peace broke out with a consequent cutback in the present war economy?

It can be dealt with basically only from the viewpoint of economic theory, of course, and it could lead to some abstruse discussions. Yet this "theoretical" problem is closely knit with current politics. It cuts across the lines within the U.S. camp between liberals and reactionaries, isolationists and "internationalists."

Its touchiness, in fact, is due to the fact that it touches the very heart of the capitalist system. For if prosperity AND peace cannot coexist under capitalism, then all of the popular prescriptions for solving the world crisis become quite meaningless, illusory or inadequate; then the fight for peace becomes united with the fight for a new social order.

The liberal must be as touchy about it as the rightwinger-indeed more so, since most often it is the liberal who has reconciled himself to soft-pedaling the fight for a better world in order not to stand in the way of gaining peace-through-strength, that is, peace through rearmament and military strength. The conservative isn't sacrificing, because present war prosperity and its accompanying political trends suit him fine.

And yet, absolutely fundamental as the peace-andprosperity proposition must be for any supporter of capitalism and its war policies, there is the greatest doubt about it in the most respectable and responsible quarters! That is a remarkable fact in itself, fairly new for our profit system.

The New York Times has brought up a big gun to slay the dragon of doubt. Its magazine, on June 22, featured the Harvard professor of economics, government adviser, and author, J. K. Galbraith, who rushed in to prove that "We Can Prosper Without War Orders." Professor Galbraith's demonstration was greeted warmly on various sides. Max Lerner, liberal columnist, gave it an accolade. Even I. F. Stone approved its central thesis, though with some important doubt about the political feasibility of prosperity-without-fear.

Galbraith will no doubt accumulate further complimentary references, if only because he rushed in where others feared to tread. Pundits who themselves would not dare to go out on the limb are now in a position to dismiss the gnawing uncertainty with "As Professor Galbraith proved in his cogent and scholarly article....

What Professor Galbraith proves in his article is that, when it comes right down to it, we've just got to have prosperity-without-war because otherwise we're sunk. What he proves is that he can think of no more substantial reason.

What we want to present here is not primarily a rebuttal of his arguments-still less a positive discussion of the opposite proposition, that only its new Permanent War Economy keeps capitalism from its chronic crisisbut simply the demonstration that his effort adds up to no more than the above. In a way, the unkindest comment on his article is that no more is necessary.

A Few Distinctions

But first, to introduce the professor's mode of thought properly, we have to note that his article is presented as a staunch polemic against "the Communist argument." He says that we should not merely "dismiss it as Communist propaganda, which, in its major inspiration, it undoubtedly is." He shows his scholarly training by the qualification "major." The Times copy-reader, no professor he, called it "the Communist argument" pointblank. This shows the great difference between the academician and the journalist. The academician hedges on deceit just as he hedges on everything else.

The fact is: the view that U. S. prosperity is dependent on the cold wer and its war economy has been put forward, or mentioned with favorable tendency, by so many bourgeois ideologists that it is entitled to be considered a school of bourgeois thought today. Galbraith ought to be aware of at least one, his colleague at Harvard, Professor Slichter, who is no more liberal than Galbraith himself.

The latest (see the AP dispatch quoted in LABOR ACTION June 23) were the "top government economists" who stated that one-third of U.S. business activity "now. springs from the defense build-up" and that "It's now perfectly obvious that, without the defense program, we would be in a recession at the present time. The only thing holding the economy together at the present level is defense."

These men "asked not to be quoted by name"-LABOR ACTION added; "as if there was something subversive in the information." Our comment was naive, it seems: we learn from Galbraith that to have their opinion is to follow Communist propaganda. Other economic scientists had better make sure that their researches into the question come up with the right answer as established by the American party line, with Galbraith as its Lysenko.

.

Professor Galbraith begins very correctly by distinguishing between two questions. These are: (1) Is America's economic need for rearmament the motivating force of its cold-war policies? (2) Whether it is or isn't,

can we have prosperity without war?-Unlike some others, he does not use an easy answer to the first to pretend that the second has been dealt with too.

What he does not do is distinguish further between the two different questions confused under point 1. For question (1) should be subdivided into: (a) Is it true that "rearmament and military aid are really inspired by the need to prop up the American economy"? (b) Even if this had no decisive role in the original motivation of the program, is it-and to what degree-a force contributing to keeping it going, now that the connection has become more and more evident to more and more people, as Galbraith himself laments?

Galbraith's argument on this point is directed solely to part (a). We are not interested in denying it. Marxists do not believe in the devil-theory of war or the plottheory of social causation, according to which all our evils are due to despicable capitalists plotting their dastardly deeds in secret conference.

But part (b) is more difficult to answer and not the same thing. It does not necessarily even imply conscious motivation. As Stone says quite truly: "Anxieties, lines of least resistance, unconscious convictions too fearful to be faced in the full daylight of the mind, affect the conduct of nations as well as men."*

But we forbear further discussion on this point because we do not want to propose an answer to the question of conscious motivation-by whom or how manyand because it is the second section of the problem which is the vital one.

A Few Factors

Can the American economy maintain its prosperity without the cold-war?

Galbraith divides this discussion into two parts also. The approaches taken in the two parts are entirely different, as we shall see. The first deals with the danger of "a short-run or temporary slump" and the second with "the factors shaping the long-run strength of our economy.'

For the first, the "short-run" danger, he relies on listing new factors added to the economy since the crisis of the '30s. These are:

(1) "By contrast [with the period 1929-1932], farmers are now exceedingly solvent."-But if the problem is the possibility of a descent into crisis from the present level of prosperity, the contrast with 1929-32 is irrelevant. That was after the crisis had already broken out, and it did not break out because of insolvency among farmers. This bears also on Galbraith's reference to the role of "government support prices" in checking "any drop in farm prices and farm incomes." More important, this aim was also that of the New Deal depression palliatives set up by the AAA; the big over-all fact about which Galbraith says nothing is that none of the New Deal measures, from plowing-under to funny-money, ever succeeded in lifting the country out of the crisis. This was not accomplished until World War II began to transform the economy. [For a documented summary, see "From the New Deal to the War Deal" in LABOR ACTION of May 5 last.]

(2) "the unions would now be able, as they were not 20 years ago, to prevent competitive wage cuts."-Presumably because they are stronger? And what will the capitalists be doing meanwhile: cheerfully maintaining prosperity wages while their business falls off? A prediction of fiercer class struggle would be legitimate but this is the last thing in Galbraith's mind. A capitalist class which has put over the Taft-Hartley Act on these stronger unions (which got the Wagner Act when they were "weaker"), and which is now seriously talking of outlawing nation-wide collective bargaining, hardly fits the professor's roseate picture.-More fundamentally, however, maintenance of high wages is no cure for capitalist crisis, except for those who accept the "under-consumptionist" fallacy in its crudest form. The crisis is a crisis of PROFITABILITY for the capitalists, who will not produce otherwise. Maintenance of high wages reduces profitability as much, from one direction, as does a fall in people's purchasing power from the other direction. This is precisely the classic contradiction of the private-profit system. The period leading up to 1929 was a period of relatively high wages, remember!

(3) A series of other factors thrown in by Galbraith are legacies of the New Deal measures, which did not in their time check the ravages of the crisis then and could be only palliatives in case of a peace-inspired crisis now. They are such things as unemployment compensation, deposit insurance, broader income taxes, housing and public works programs, etc. On the tax angle Galbraith is-I am sure. quite unintentionally-humorous. The significance of the broader income taxes is that, as incomes fall in a slump, tax liability would fall also,

* But we must mention one case in which this is faced in the full daylight of the mind. This is in the recent statement put out by the leaders of the British Trade Union Congress to justify the rearmament program: "We cannot ignore the industrial and financial difficulties involved in a sharp curtailment of armament production. Widespread unemployment is held at bay today mainly by the rising labor demands of the engineering trades [heavy industry]." If the British tradeunion leaders can permit themselves this statement in a public document, what have we a right to think of our unreconstructed American capitalists? The former are right-wing Laborites, to be sure, and above all enemies of "Bevanism," but the latter are right-wing antilaborites.

"thus releasing income for private spending." Further to release income: "In the event of a sharp cutback in military spending, it would require no very sophisticated economic advice to persuade Congress to enact a whacking reduction in taxes." At this point he might be suspected of drollery if not for the context. In any case what he certainly seems to be unaware of is the contradiction he is getting himself into: on the one hand, he points to the beneficent effects of tax reduction, and on the other he proposes programs which would keep government expenditures up, even if for peaceful projects rather than war. His very course of argumentation acts out the inherent contradiction of capitalism.

A Few Exhortations

But to do Galbraith justice, after this listing of factors we find that not even he claims that he has presented reason to answer Yes to the question, "Can the U. S. continue to find a peaceable outlet, year after year and decade after decade, for its very considerable productive energies?" We find out more concretely that all he was doing, n his own view, was discussing "the IMMEDIATE consequences" (our emphasis) of a shift from war production. For this, indeed, his "factors" would have meaning. But one particularly claims that a crash must inevitably follow hot on the heels of a cutback in war production. Such factors as he cites could have something to say on the tempo and forms of a slide into depression. But this is not what he set out to prove. And above all this is not what justifies his categorical assurance that "there is no chance of another disaster like that of 1929"!

Therefore, for his last section Galbraith girds his loins and finally undertakes The Question itself.

At this pont everything changes; the whole method of the preceding sections gets unceremoniously dumped. What is it that gets dumped? Why, economics! Galbraith is nothing if not forthright in the confession:

"Here the answer depends less on economics and more on a broad assessment of social needs."

In point of fact, we find that the answer has nothing to do with economics or any other subject on which Galbraith is a professorial authority. The article becomes purely hortatory-which is a good academic way of saying that he proceeds to soap-box agitation as a substitute for any scientific analysis of why capitalism can be expected to do today what it couldn't do a couple of decades ago.

In brief, the professor proceeds to point out that there are all kinds of very worthwhile social projects which could absorb the moneys now spent on the cold. war, thus performing the same economic role; and to express his positive assurance, backed by his own word as a gentleman and a scholar, that they will be carried out-anything else is unthinkable. Don't the American people need housing? schools? roads? hospitals? dams? and-reclaiming? Who can deny this? Not only that: the peoples of the underdeveloped countries will still need our millions. The moral case is strong; still stronger N is the need to avoid crisis through this philanthropic outlet. . . .

What Professor Galbraith, in his overflowing kindness, is envisioning is nothing less than the conversion of American capitalism into a great big eleemosynary institution at home and a CARE organization abroad. Profit be damned; can we even mention such a mercenary subject n the presence of such a vision? Can we ask him to point to a little morsel of evidence that the rulers of this society, who have to be re-educated by their "internationalists" even to see the necessity of sacrificing a bit just to defend their necks from the Russian imperialist rival, are capable of shelling out similar billions for Galbraith's socially necessary projects?

In any case, we have already made the point that the crux is not any debate over the possibility of winning pover the NAM to the Buchmanites or the Salvation Army, or whether such a mass transmogrification would be easier or harder than recruiting them to the Independent Socialist League. In his "hard-headed" sentences Galbraith seems to be saying that, morality apart, the capitalists will have to go along because the alternative is the disaster of depression. But depression is a disaster for them precisely because it cuts deep into their profits. It is hardly more appealing, from their point of view, to give up the same millions voluntarily. Besides, capitalist crisis is not an equally disastrous occurrence for all capitalists, nor is it quite as black-looking economically when another alternative is the intensified exploitation of the masses made possible by fascism. . . .

Being totally unconcerned with such questions, Galbraith polemizes in this section against what must be the real difficulty-the theory, which he lambastes, that the American people already have everything anyone wants anyway. Here he becomes powerful, overwhelming all opposition by the cogency of his argument; nothing stands before the sweep of his pen as he lays low the mighty objection:

"Families with a present income of \$6600-or twice the average-have not the slightest difficulty in spending their money. So easily acquired is the amiable art of spending money that the same is true, though with some increase in saving, of those with three or four times as much."

Nobody's going to give him that argument again! Thus Professor Galbraith's proof of the possibility of peace-with-prosperity under capitalism.

N. Y.; 239 pages, \$3.

By WALTER BARRON ed-conservative" author.

the whole thing. NO ONE'S IMPRESSED

tile NAM officials.

chewing gum. Inside and outside the corpora-

'Temptation,' by John Pen

By HAROLD WEST

Kun's abortive Soviet regime. The exploitation of the peasantry by the fascist-minded nobility and landed gentry, the almost unbelievable poverty of the Budapest proletariat, the Social-Democratic struggle against the bid for complete power by Admiral Horthy and the fascist groups-all of these historical and political aspects form the background for the dramatic sweep of the narrative, but so intricately interwoven is plot, characterization, and historical framework that the action and dialogue provide the necessary pegs without the need of digres-

GRIM SCHOOL

'Is Anybody Listening?' by the Editors of Fortune **BOOKS and Ideas** The Dehumanization of the Capitalists

IS ANYBODY LISTENING? By William H. Whyte Jr. and the Editors of Fortune.-Simon & Schuster,

In this book the assistant managing editor of Fortune has put together a series of articles which ran in that magazine for several months. (One of the series, on "corporation wives," was summarized and discussed in LABOR ACTION for January 28.) The work is an inquiry into how business leaders try to get their purposes advertised inside and outside their organization, the limitations of the typical methods, and recommendations for directing these efforts by the "sophisticat-

Yet, with all the Luce-style breeziness and "cute" cartoons. the tone is one of hardly repressed anxiety. A leading journalistic spokesman for top American businessmen is clearly worried over

Here's why: The National Association of Manufacturers spends a huge budget for propaganda, but no one seems impressed by what they put out. The audience remains cold, and many of the company officials who foot the bill are tired of the self-advertised importance of the apparently fu-

"Scientific" devices, methodically designed to make such communication more effective, produce only more simplistic sugar-coating, becoming identified with the latest publicity for clorophyll - tinted

mass communication do not produce any widespread kinship-feeling with the program of American business. The populace may not be "radical." It may be sold cigarettes by celebrity endorsement. But it remains skeptical about the self-iustifications of corporate finance and industry.

The apparent logical solution for this dilemma is for business to be worthy of respect. rather than merely to clamor for it. "Participation" is the desired slogan, the approach toward "democracy" in industry. People are to be made to feel that they are part of the efforts of big industry by showing them that they are actually actively involved.

EYES ON 1984

All this adds up to the recently popular "human relations" school made academically respectable by the "industrial sociology" of Elton Mayo and the Harvard Business School. The thesis of this group, tested in several experiments, is that morale and production increase when workers are treated as human beings instead of as replaceable machine parts with a fixed price.

Whyte is mostly concerned with doing the same for the various rungs of the managerial hierarchy, some of whom appear even more insecure, dominated, and alienated than the factory proletarians. Let them be consulted in decisions, let their ideas play a role in company policy, let them count as creative individuals and they will become members of the hoped-for close-knit office family. This idea is widespread among many interested in "humanizing" the structural relations among

personnel in the mammoth organizations of American economic

tion, the expensive techniques of life. Work within American industry and business by invited visitors from abroad is suggested as an efficacious substitute for the "Voice of America" in selling the "American way." But after the first part of the book advertises the sensational successes to he gained from "human relations" methods, the second nart, though not always explicitly, remains troubled over just how much can be done, and indirectly implies that little may change.

> For, with his eyes constantly on the fearful image of Orwell's "1984," Whyte repeatedly points to the dangers in the shift from open structures toward conformity and manipulated agreement (particularly as found in the middle rungs of corporate business society). He may regularly exclaim that the human relations approach he advocates really means "democratic participation" and not the simulation thereof, designed only to get more subtle adherence to the string-pullers. But his disclaimers sound hollow to both readers and writer.

BIG BROTHERS

The dangers from "social engineering" that cause Whyte's pages of fretfulness stem from the program of Elton Mayo's disciples, and Whyte's attempt to separate the two is half-hearted. One gets the impression that, if top businessmen are going to be heard, they will have to be benevolent but ever present "Big Brothers," and Whyte is not quite sure that he likes it that way either.

The discussion of "company wives" is a powerful revelation of what the authoritarian structure of the corporate setup can mean. As in Orwell's phantasmagoria, those who are near the top are mate authority, even through le- of us.

actually more dominated than the workers, from whom, despite all the paternalistic gimmicks, only labor time most efficiently utilized is demanded. But top corporation officials have to control that most personal and intimate of human roles, mating, according to a detailed prescriptions of Do's and Dont's

One of the chapters discussing the detailed attention given to the proper behavior of corporation wives is appropriately titled: "Is Big Brother Watching You?" For that ultimately becomes the ma jor theme. In the supposed leaders of economic society, the predominant urge is toward building conforming mediocrities.

MOOD-PIECE

The concluding chapter has another appropriate Orwellism as title, "Group Think." Flippantly, if apologetically, Whyte fits into his own brand of contemporary conformism by blaming much of this trend on the educational philosophy of John Dewey, the radical democratic philosopher, who is more typically attacked as the exponent of "irresponsible individualism." On the other hand, there is nothing about authoritarian and traditionalist philosophies, and actually, practically no mention of cold-war-inspired political conformity. But this would be more important if he were writing a scholarly discourse, instead of what turns out to be a moodpiece.

And that mood becomes particularly pervasive when he expresses his chagrin over the theme of Herman Wouk's Pulitzer Prize Novel, The Caine Mutiny. For the thesis of that war story is the agreement by all concerned that it is wrong to oppose legiti-

gal means, at the extreme point when the alternative means accepting the probably disastrous directives of a cowardly and paranoiac ship's captain. The proud. morally rugged individual of American tradition becomes replaced by the compulsive rulefollowing, uninspiring and unaspiring bureaucrat.

GOOD FOR THEM TOO

This trend has often enough been observed by social scientists. But what makes Whyte's plaintive wail particularly significant is that he is a spokesman for big business. writing about big business, for big businessmen. His writing, therefore, becomes a mirror of the notoften-enough expressed notion that bureaucratic forms of living are more common in the ruling private economic sectors than in any other part of contemporary American society.

Yes, even more than in government, the men who staff the large corporations tend to become interchangeable bits of functional humanity, closely gearing their activities, public and private, in line with careful and fearful attention to their status within their organizations. As in 'Orwell's bleak world, the "party members" are more dehumanized than the "proles." One all but hopes for Cornelius Vanderbilts and John D. Rockefellers, whom one can at least hate. The activities of contemporary corporation executives are obviously condemnable; but as people, they are (as the old tear-jerkers put it) possibly more to be pitied than censured. Or better yet, one can suggest, with only slight whimsy, that the abolition of their eco nomic structure might be almost as good for them as for the rest

After the Defeat of the Hungarian Soviet

TEMPTATION, by John Pen. Translated from the Hungarian by Ralph Manheim and Barbara Tolnai.—An Avon Books pocket book, originally published by Creative Age Press.

Seldom does one find a novel that combines historical cocial realism and plausible character delineation so vividly as in this moving novel of Hungarian life in the counterrevolutionary epoch following the defeat of Bela

sion or extended exposition. The novel opens in a rural setting as seen through the eyes of Bela, illegitimate son of a peasant girl. The boyhood of Bela, as indeed the entire narrative, is presented in the first person in a retrospective series, but the reader is always in the present.

The life of young Bela at the home for the "bastard poor," run his reaction to the mores, laws, activities.

and values of his world. His character is forged in a grim school: desperate poverty, inferior social status, and a perspective of unremitting toil. Even before ado lescence he becomes the unregenerate rebel. He hates the rich of town and feudal domain (although his hatred is not unmixed with envy); he scorns the mother who abandoned him as an infant even as he pities her own fate as miserable washerwoman in Budapest; he identifies himself from his first period of social awareness with the rural and urban poor.

Only one person in his native village is able to exert any considerable degree of positive influence on young Bela-his radical, anarchistic schoolmaster. It is the schoolmaster who induces in him both a love of learning and the determination to use his knowledge to enlighten and organize the proletariat and peasantry.

MAELSTROM

It is in Budapest (the setting for most of the novel) that Bela enters the threshold of the broader world he has dreamed of, and it is in that metropolitan hell of nearstarvation and disease, in contrast with pockets of conspicuous wealth and extravagance, that Bela passes his early manhood and where he first encounters the illuminating ideas of Marxism and the movement associated with it. From the isolated village, Bela goes to live with his mother, and from the moment he takes the job of errand boy and bellboy in an exclusive hotel he is swept into the maelstrom of the class struggle, fascist by a greedy ex-prostitute, shapes intrigue, and radical underground

and a second second second

At the hotel, where drunken nobles and aspiring politicians engage in fascist conspiracies and sex orgies, where an alcoholic countess discards her servant-boy lovers with a callousness compounded of class considerations and nymphomania. Bela meets the people who are largely to determine his future. Here he meets the Prussian Junker-style major and his aide, the fascist politician, Catchem. These are the persons who expect to fashion Bela in the ideological-military mold of the Levente, the Hungarian fascist youth movement.

HORTHY FASCISTS

These are two of the key conspirators in the plot to smash the unions, peasants' organizations, the socialist underground, and transform the temporary stalemate between the contending class forces into a victory of the totalitarian wing of the feudalcapitalist coalition. Hitler's government is their model and they hope to dwarf his "achievements' when they assume full power in Hungary.

Bela is introduced to the ideas of Karl Marx by Elemer, the quiet, unassuming but miraculously patient, persevering underground leader who uses his bellboy job at the hotel as a listening post. Elemer, himself a youth, through his proletarian and socialist background has inured himself to the calculated risks and dangers inherent in his duties.

It is not clear whether Elemer is a left-wing Social-Democrat or a Communist party militant. Bela thinks he is a Social-Democrat. The major and his advisors consida er "Elemer a "communist" under-

ground agent operating in the Social-Democratic party. At this historical conjunction. Stalinism had not yet shown its full hand in the effort to convert the various Communist Parties into robot bodies at the Kremlin's command. The rot of Stalinism and the consequent metamorphosis of the national CPs were not yet evident. The difference between left-wing Social-Democrats and Communists was not too great.

Elemer is to become not only the Marxist teacher of the rebel lad from the village but also his conscience in the midst of the trials of his fidelity to his own idealstrials represented by the lure of wealth, prestige and sexual gratification if he sells out to the fascist leaders, backed by threats of punishment, blacklisting, jail and torture if he fails to carry out what "a good Levente member should do.

IN HEROIC MOLD

It is in part a drama of temptation. "Leave me be with your society of the future!" Bela cries out to Elemer. "... What about this society? What about my troubles, wise guy?" But he gains the victory over himself when he refuses to expose Elemer to the fascists under the threat of torture

It is Elemer who is cast in the heroic mold. Under torture himself, he protects Bela by telling them that the youth is really sympathetic to fascism. So the plot unfolds as Bela falls in with the stratagem.

While the novel does not bring out directly the analyses of Marx and Trotsky, the central ideas which explain the fascist phenom-

ena are clearly implied. Bela recognizes fascism as a class enemy, as an attempt to restore the old social order on a new totalitarian basis, leaving no pretensions of even limited bourgeois democracy or human decencies, but still organized economically (and thus socially in class relations) on a capitalist basis.

The novel's ending is the historical one: fascism triumphed over Hungary and the socialdemocratic movement, and with it the left-socialist militants were crushed. Bela takes the only way out for himself at the height of the crisis. With his comrades dead, imprisoned and tortured, he is no longer useful to the movement. His own role discovered by the fascists, a marked man, he tells himself he is justified in fleeing the country. In the last section of the novel. Bela makes his escape at night on an Austrian Danube steamer.





with our democratic ideals. Conferring powers like that upon the as well as to our alien residents. Once fully informed of such vast discretionary powers vested in the attorney general, Americans now would and should be just as alarmed as Americans were in 1798 over less drastic powers

The denunciatory language in this section applies with double force to Truman's own directives under which the attorney general's "subversive list" and the government's purge programs have been carried out. The only difference does not speak for Truman; where the new McCarran Act hits at aliens—and that is bad enough— Truman's administrative steps "to punish undefined 'activities'" and to put "vast discretionary powers" in the hands of the attorney general eral are directed at citizens.

Two major blows were thus dealt a week ago in the "capital of the world"-one against economic democracy at home, one against political democracy in the field of international relations.

The blows were dealt in a bipartisan gangup of a majority of Southern Democrats and Republicans, who rushed through the last session of the 81st Congress to go to their separate conventions-to maintain the two-

and it alone, which makes these decisions. The UN commander in the field is appointed by the removed by it at will. The only limitations on American action are those decided on by the American government itself, with or without regard to the views of its allies, as the case may be. Acheson's statement to the members of Parliament made it clear case it had been felt desirable to inform the British of the plan

Reports to the American press on the British reaction to the Yals bombings have sought to emphasize the idea that the British people are almost completely ignorant about what is going on in Korea, and that their reaction can be attributed to this ignor-

We are in no position to comment on the adequacy of the British press in informing the people of that country on what has been going on in Korea. But it is quite clear that whether they be well informed or not, their political reactions are far more sensitive and sophisticated than those of the American people. In this country the chief public reaction seems to be one of quiet satisfaction at the idea that the American air force has "turned the heat" on the Stalinist negotiators irritated bewilderment at the reaction of the British people to reacted. Rather than listening to them, the American labor movement would do far better to inform itself on why their brothers