

WHAT IS MAU MAU? British Imperialism in Kenya

, . . page 3

War and Civil Liberty in the Election . . . page 6

Gideonse of Brooklyn College Pays a Political Debt ... STUDENT SOCIALIST, page 8

Demagogy on Korea and the Witchhunt Features Last Roundup by Dems and GOP

'Me Too,' Says Stevenson on Purge; **McCarthy Throws His Mud-Bomb**

By GORDON HASKELL

Why has the issue of Stalinism, both abroad and at home, assumed the particular kind of role it is playing in the election campaign? Why have the Republicans, from McCarthy to Eisenhower, been able to take the offensive on the Stalinist issue, while the Democrats desperately try to defend themselves with a "me too" line on the question of who has been most effective in "stemming the tide" of domestic Stalinism?

Or to put the question the way in which it is usually asked by liberals and socialists both in this country and abroad: Why is McCarthyism, in all its varieties, a successful method of winning votes in America?

Perhaps an examination of McCarthy's own methods will give a clue to the answer. And we need go no further to study them than his currently infamous speech of last Monday "exposing" Stevenson's "tie-up" with Stalinism.

McCarthy's speech fell roughly into three sections. The first attributed the continuing international successes of Stalinism to a deliberate policy on the part of the Democratic administration. McCarthy referred to "those who are in charge of our deliberate, planned retreat from victory," and to "the suicidal, Kremlin-directed policies of the administration." He ended this section with the statement that the issue in the campaign is "Will Communism win, or will America win?"

M-BOMB

The second part of the speech was devoted to "proving" that venson has surrounded self with persons who are in some way tainted with Stalinist associations or sympathies. And the third was given over to "proof" that Stevenson had advocated world government, and had made the well-known deposition in the Hiss case.

It was in the second part of his speech that McCarthy scaled the heights of demagoguery and falsification for which he has become so justly famous. Wilson Wyatt is "disloyal" because Americans for Democratic Action. of which he is a former officer. has criticized aspects of the loyalty program and the Smith Act. De Voto is suspect because three years ago he wrote that he would not give information to the FBI. Arthur Schlesinger Jr. is a menace because he once wrote that he believed Communists should be permitted to teach in universities. James Wechsler, editor of the N. Y. Post, has admitted that he once belonged to the Young Communist League. Archibald Mac-Leish was at one time associated with Stalinist front organizations. (Continued on page 2)

Brooklyn College Bans Speech By Candidate George S. Counts!

to do so, or if no opposing speaker can be obtained, the first had not been mentioned again.

The rule's main point of interest body on this campus—including many faculty members who have

In addition as far as investigations thus far have been able to ascertain, even if such a rule was ever mysteriously enacted by administrative decree, with due contempt for the formerly democratic channel of student government (a procedure not unusual on this campus), THE RULE HAS NEVER BEFORE BEEN PUT

Some such rule was one among many-including outright abolition of all college political organizations - which were proposed for discussion by the administration of President Gideonse at a faculty-student open meeting

At this meeting, the hostile reaction on the part of many liberal faculty members to this attempt

If the latter group does not wish cratic political activity on campus was so strong that the proposals

But whether the regulation really is on the books or not, a gueslies in the fact that practically no- tion persists: Why did Gideonse decide to make this move now, against Counts and the Young Libbeen questioned about it-has erals, and not previously, against other speakers—such as Rudolph Halley, successful Liberal Porty candidate for president of the City Council, when he appeared on compus last year?

> Elsewhere in this issue is an account of yet another campus maneuver by Gideonse which is not likely to get him any medals for political cleanliness.

> Can it be that this banning of Dr. Counts is a further instance of a political debt being paid by Gideonse to his pal, Brooklyn Borough President John Cashmore, who, just as a matter of coincidence, happens to be the Democratic Party's candidate for senator and opposed by Counts.

Can it possibly be that the financial appropriations for the new Brooklyn College buildingwhose enactment in the New York City Board of Estimate was pushed by Cashmore-is persuading Gideonse to dispense with what little moral integrity one might presume he had left?

Fage Two

November 3, 1952

McCarthy Throws Mud-Bomb-

(Continued from page 1)

All this is brought out, with distortions and falsifications which are transparent only to the informed listener, to insinuate the idea that Stevenson has surrounded himself with men who are part of the conspiratorial machine of the Stalinist party, or at the very least who regard the Stalinists with a good deal of favor.

Thus the picture drawn by Mc-Carthy is: The Democratic administration has been engaged in a Kremlin-directed, planned capitulation to Stalinism, both at home and abroad. "Alger . . . I

mean Adlai," as the demagogue put it, has surrounded himself with people who are determined to thwart the effort of the FBI, open the door to Stalinists in government and in the schools, as well as others who are just as good as members of the Young Communist League or other Stalinist outfits. Further, he would have this country subordinated to some international organization like the United Nations-twelve employees of which have just refused to answer questions on whether they are or have been Stalinists-from which we are to conclude that the UN is pretty close to being a Stalinist front organization itself. And finally, Stevenson had been present or at least two international conferences at which Hiss had also been on the government staff.

SCAPEGOAT METHOD

"Ridiculous," one may say. Yes, it is ridiculous. But it is no more ridiculous than Hitler's contention that because there were Jews both in the Communist Party of Germany and of Russia and among the capitalists of his own and other countries, this was "proof" that the Jews were in an international conspiracy to destroy Germany by the dual means of undermining its social system from below and throttling it financially from above.

It is ridiculous, but it had a social appeal. It gave the most frustrated and embittered Germans a SCAPEGOAT on whom they could blame the economic plight of the country. It was vicious, but it worked.

And it worked because the German people were offered no positive, aggressive policy with which to attack the real source of their frustration, because the other maor parties in Germany confined themselves to defending policies which were obviously bankrupt, or adopting policies which were selfdefeating.

The success of McCarthyism in America today is based on the same formula. Find a scapegoat on which frustrated people can lay the blame for the failure of American foreign policy to seize the political initiative from world Stalinism. The domestic scapegoat is the American Stalinist movement. Then, identify the Democratic Party and its administration with that scapegoat. In so doing, identify liberalism, revulsion against the procedures of the FBI, the defense of the civil liberties of Stalinists, internationalist idealism, in short, anything but 100-per-cent chauvinism, with pro-Stalinism or with Stalinism itself.

FERTILE SOIL

The Stalinists are not an "innocent" scapegoat, as the Jews were in Germany. It is no problem to prove that there are Stalinists who engage in espionage, and that the politics of the CP is subservient to the Kremlin. The point is that there is almost no relationship between the magnitude of the actual internal Stalinst "menace" and the measures used or proposed to crush it. The point is that these measures are designed not chiefly for the purpose of crushing Stalinism, but rather of intimidating the whole American people and depriving them of their civil liberties.

The scapegoat method is a tried and true formula, and McCarthy is evidently a man uniquely endowed with a natural aptitude to practise it. But even a man with his gifts would be doomed to obscurity if the country lacked a fertile psychological soil in which they could flourish.

The psychological soil is prepared by the fact that Stalinism remains on the political offensive as a world movement. America has spent uncounted billions of dollars on aid to foreign countries since World War II, both economic and military. But the regimes it has bolstered with this aid have not been brought to economic health by it

In countries where the socialist movement is not powerful an aggressive Stalinism is either an actual or an obvious potential social threat. It has spread through China and Eastern Europe, it is knocking at the gates in Indo-China, it burns steadily in the guerrilla war in Malaya, and it has the United States gripped in a bloody military deadlock in Korea.

DEMS COMMITTED

To the American people this means continued high taxes to subsidize a decaying capitalism abroad and to build up a military machine for an eventual war. There is no end in sight of the rising cost of living, of the international tension, of the bloodletting in Korea. Someone must be responsible for this mess. Someone must have betrayed us, or else how could U. S. victory in the last war have led only to this?

McCarthy has his demagogic, reactionary answer, and it finds a response. But what answer have the Democrats?

They cannot avoid responsibility for the policies which have failed to defeat the Stalinist political offensive. They can only advocate a continuation of these policies, and point out, quite correctly, that

what the Republicans offer is either nothing or worse.

They are committed to support existing anti-Stalinist governments everywhere, however reactionary, financially and militarily. They are thus committed to supporting reactionary social and conomic systems which can meet the threat of Stalinists only by suppressing the Stalinist movements, but which cannot stamp out the social discontent on which Stalinism thrives.

Thus the Democrats are committed to a policy which must perpetuate and intensify the feelings of frustration on which Stalinism thrives abroad, and Mc-Carthyism battens at home. And it is quite typical that their specific reaction to the latter is to seek to draw its fangs by adopting a "me too" attitude.

STEVENSON'S SPEECH

"Me tooism" is never the same thing as the genuine article. When Dewey conducted his "me too" campaign in 1948 he did not become a Truman Fair-Dealer. And when Stevenson adopts a "me too" attitude he does not become a Mc-Carthy. But it is quite significant that the Democrats rebroadcast Stevenson's Detroit speech on how to fight Stalinism immediately following McCarthy's effort on the same station over which the Wisconsin windbag had done his

This was the speech in which Stevenson recounted the record of Democratic administration in the fight against American Stalinism. He endorsed measures which have been condemned by liberals and the labor movement. He lauded the Smith Act, the conviction of the Stalinist leadership under it, the whole government "loyalty" program including the subversive list. He praised the FBI as a fine instrument of professional Stalinist hunters, and referred to J. Edgar Hoover as an "excellent, experienced, devoted and trust-

worthy" man in his job. In short, he committed himself to continue the legal and administrative mean ures which have been most effective in spreading fear and creating the atmosphere of witchhunt in which McCarthyism can thrive.

He did not have a word of criticism for the policies which have extended the definition of "subversion" to include organizations and ideas which cannot conceivably he related to Stalinist espionage or secret penetration of policy-making governmental offices. He did not mention his own veto of the Illinois "anti-subversive" Broyles bill the act to which all liberals point when they see to justify their support of Stevenson on the ground that he can be counted on to defend our civil liberties-nor did he mention the rash of loyalty oaths being demanded of teachers, and even tenants of public housing projects. .Is this the way in which Mc-Carthyism is to be defeated in the United States? Is a more restrained pursuit of the scapegoat going to appease the feelings of political frustration which make scapegoatism profitable? If every Stalinist in the country were "placed behind bars," to use Stevenson's phrase, would that end the effectiveness of the world Stalinist movement, which is the real source of the problem of Stalinism?

The answer is clear. As long as we do not have a foreign policy which can successfully defeat Stalinism politically on a world scale, the basis for reactionary, even fascist mods will grow in this country.

The Democratic Party has demonstrated that it cannot develop such a foreign policy, and that hence it tends to yield to these moods, where it does not inflame them, in its effort to retain power. The labor movement, the liberals, and the "socialists" who are supporting Stevenson may well ponder how a continuation of this tendency will ultimately affect

Double Talk on Korea Issue (Continued from page 1)

they would then be expected to deliver on their "promises." They can then blame their failure on the Democrats who preceded them and in any event, the important thing is not what hap- and to justify it on the pens after November 4th. only what happens on that date. It is guite a sight to aggressive military policy watch the "liberal" Republicans squirming around with can only be settled as part the idea that a solution to of the struggle for the world. the war in Korea can be country.

COUNTER-PUNCHING

The Democrats are not in the same favorable position to capitalize on the genuine war-weariness which is noticeable throughout the country. Truman has attempted to relieve his administration of the charge that it invited the Stalinist attack by withdrawing American troops from Korea before the war, by pointing out that this was done on the advice of the military, headed by one D. D. Eisenhower.

This is strictly counterpunching, and has only limited defensive effect. No administration can relieve itself of political responsibiltary appointees for giving it bad advice.

Democratic spokesmen have been using is to set the Korean war in its context as part of the world-wide struggle against Stalinism, ground that they cannot be blamed for resisting Stalin's in Korea. The war in Korea

The trouble with this anhower visit to that unhappy realistic, if one-sided, appraisal of the nature of the Korean war, it offers no hope of ending the bloodshed there.

> As neither Eisenhower nor his hired brains have been able to think up any half-way plausible-sounding plan for ending the war in Korea, they have hit on the idea of winning votes by proposing that Koreans, or at least Asians, do all of the dying in the war. For the Democrats to agree to this "attractive" proposal would be to deal almost irreparable damage to their whole policy of recruiting allies for the Third World War.

is already strong enough in inists would win, and that "solution" lies in strengthity by blaming its own mili- Europe and Asia. But it the fighting spirit of the ening the whole world would be increased a thou- South Korean units at the against Stalinism they are

Stevenson and the other can government is willing to regime against Stalinism, fight only as long as foreigners do the fighting.

With the war taken over from the South and North Koreans and entirely dependent for both its military and diplomatic progress on Russian and Chinese governments on one side and the American government on the other, it is clear that no Korean solution is possible. This situation was not creathoped for through an Eisen- swer is that although it is a ed when the war started in 1950 . . . it was created when **Russia and the United States** carved up Korea in 1945. It was rendered decisive when the Americans propped up the reactionary Rhee landlord regime and thus gave Stalinism the basis of its social appeal in South Korea.

that the collapse of the South Korean army at the first brush with the Stalinist and of the population which aggressors was at least in part due to the large-scale morale is a political factor, guerrilla forces inside South specially in the context of Korea which had grown up the social-ideological strugchiefly as a reaction to gle with Stalinism. Rhee's police brutality.

To this day most informed observers maintain that if a tion" to the war in Korea free election were possible in they are understating the Resistance to rearmament the whole of Korea, the Stal- case. When they say that the sandfold if the Stalinists front is not due to an impas- simply admitting that the

The positive answer which could prove that the Ameri- sioned defense of the Rhee but rather to the fact that the only place where a Korean can get a square meal these days is in the army.

SOLUTION: BIG WAR?

In short, the weakness of the American government's position in Korea is the weakness of its foreign policy in general. Although there is no doubt that it can arm other nations more effectively than it armed the South Koreans and thus make purely military aggression against them less attractive for the Stalinists, it cannot solve the political problem of undermining Stalinism in Asia . . . or in Europe for that matter.

Even generals know that It should not be forgotten an army, however well equipped, is only as strong as the morale of its soldiers has to back it up. But this

> When the Democrats say that there is "no easy solu-

American soldiers and the whole Korean people, whose country has been destroyed in the war, are expendable my in the struggle for the world.

them.

But are they a worthwhile expenditure? Will a continuation of the slaughter there weaken Stalinism as a world force, and strengthen the forces of democracy in the rest of the world? There is no evidence for it, and none can be produced. The Korean war remains as the world lesson, in miniature, of the only possible "end" to the cold-war conflict of Stalinist and American imperialism on the basis of current policies.

When the Democrats say that its solution lies in the more vigorous prosecution of the cold war, they are saying, in effect, that the war in Korea will end only when it is liquidated in the war for the world.

Subscribers — Attention! Check your NAME-ADDRESS - CITY - ZONE - STATE ap-pearing on the wrapper. If there are any mistakes or if nything is left out of the ad-dress, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

16-44 If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue. **RENEW NOW!**

tribe in East Africa. NATIONAL STRUGGLE

East Africa from European domination. There are about 18 million Africans to a half million Europeans in "British East Africa." Since the influence and culture of the imperialists is in good part propagated by missionaries, their efforts are also concentrated against Christian missionaries, as well as Kikuyu Christians.

They are said to have a certain amount of influence in the Kenya African Union, an organization of 100,000 members, the only coherent African group in the reg10n The Mau Mau is prepared to

lence, to eject the British from their country. This is one reason why the imperialists are particularly worried. Socialists, of course, do not ap-

terrorism and assassination, but

+

London Letter — WHAT IS MAU MAU? Britain Tries the Iron Fist in Kenya Colony

By DAVE ALEXANDER

LONDON, Oct. 22-It must have been about three weeks ago that the British press suddenly discovered the Mau Mau, which it describes simply as a secret terrorist organization of Kenya natives seeking to drive the white Europeans out of Africa. The press publicized its unknown activities and made it the villain of the piece.

Suddenly, yesterday, a triumphant Mr. Lyttleton, the commonwealth minister in the Conservative government, announced the arrest of nearly 100 alleged members of this organization. The cruiser Kenya was on Hs way to Mombasa, and the Lancashire Fusiliers were

flown to Nairobi. Before going any further, let us explain what Mau Mau is. It is an illegal, and therefore secret, organization of the Kikuyu tribe of Kenya. It is concentrated in an area of a few hundred square miler, but undoubtedly has influence among the Kikuyu, who are the most educated and "advanced"

Their main and practically only political aim is the freeing of

use any methods, including vio-

prove of methods of individual

As we go to press, U. S. newspapers report that the British are stepping up their line of repression. On Sunday, Oct. 26, "Police smashed an illegal tribal meeting on the outskirts of Nairobi today after firing directly at the main speaker," who was wounded and later captured when he sought medical aid. The same Reuters dispatch, published by the N. Y. Times, states that there were 40 Africans at this meeting, which was such a danger to the state that the speaker had to be killed on the spot, and that 22 of these were arrested.

Troops and police were also used to arrest "49 suspected Mau Mau agents" in a raid on the Kiambu reserve. And "Reports from outlying provinces said almost all the young men of the Kikuyu tribe from which Mau Mau draws its members, had vanished from the reserves."

In time-honored fashion of an occupying power, the British marched the sailors of the cruiser Kenva through the streets of Mombasa to display their iron fist.

it is more important for Europeans and Americans to understand the economic and political forces and conditions which gave rise to the Mau Mau. The mass of the African people want to struggle for their freedom with all methods necessary, and with their aims and aspirations socialists are entirely in sympathy.

By the same token, the British imperialists, who have traditionally used the methods of violence. terrorism and intimidation to keep the Africans suppressed, can ask for no sympathy now that their subjects are fighting ever more aggressively for their selfrule

BLP's RECORD

It all started about two years ago, when the then Labor government became interested in the unification of the territories of Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda and Rhodesia into British Central Africa. The Africans argued that the Afrikaaner influence from the South (the element which is behind Malan's South African regime) would mean a spread of racial segregation. The South Af-

Labor Action FORUM New York

> Thursday, Nov. 6 at 8:30 p.m. An Open Forum Discussion on

What Do the **Election Results** Mean?

The discussion will be led off with brief remarks by HAL DRAPER, GORDON HASKELL and BEN HALL LABOR ACTION HALL 114 West 14 Street, New York City



November 1 at 9 p.m.

Refreshments, liquid and solid . . . Hallowe'en Hi-jinks

Contrib.: 50 cents . . . Students 25 cents LABOR ACTION HALL 114. West 14 Street, New York City

rican (Afrikaaner) brand of white-supremacy doctrine is even more virulent than the British brand under which many of the objectors were living and which many of them were prepared to tolerate temporarily.

So suspicious of the lack of security afforded by such a unification were the Africans that they began organizing nationally in an attempt to avert it. But the Labor government; to its shame, declared itself ready if necessary to impose its solution. Needless to say, the present Tory government was only too well pleased to support such a policy.

Added to the political motives for African organization were the economic ones. The cost of living has recently taken a sharp rise, while the mineral companies have been making enormous profits

Not a single Labor voice has been raised to oppose the arrest of 100 Africans suspected of associating with Mau Mau. The Labor opposition has been too much compromised to be able to do so.

Still, there were some awkward questions: "Were all these people known to be members of Mau Mau?" "If so, how long had the government known their names and activities?" "Why had it not arrested them before?"

Lyttleton had to bat on a sticky wicket in Parliament. He admitted that not all of them were known to be members of the secret organization; many of them were just suspects. The arrests had been made "because it is considered necessary to exercise control over them for the purpose of maintaining public order," he mumbled vaguely.

THE BRITISH FIST

There were other questions: "Why had Jomo Kenyatta, the president of the Kenya African Union, been arrested?" "Did we not want the support of 'responsible' elements among the Africans against Mau Mau's terrorism?"-Lyttleton replied that he was not casting aspersions on the bonae fides of the Kenya African

Union: it was only incidental that Kenyatta was its president. he was also believed to be connected with Mau Mau: etc.

Page Three

The Kenya African Union has invited two Labor MPs, Leslie Hale and Fenner Brockway, to visit the country to see the situation for themselves. Next week, Lyttleton will'fly over for a look around.

Meanwhile the Emergency Regulations are in force. Through them, habeas corpus is suspended, and many Africans are held "at the governor's pleasure." It is illegal for more than ten Africans to congregate without police permission On top of this, 30,000 miners are out on strike in the Copper Belt of North Rhodesia. The Manchester Guardian correspondent in Nairobi admits that Africans were arrested on the streets and taken away for "screening."

It is thus hardly surprising that the Britsh government is becoming a little sensitive to Arab-Asian attempts within the UN to "interfere" in colonial administrations.

Don't Let Them Deport Refugees Back to Franco and Stalinland!

While the United States government insists on the right of North Korean prisoners of war to choose whether or not they want to be returned to Stalinist territory, another branch of the vernment is forcibly deporting totalitarian countries people who have fled to escape their regimes

While the U. S.-UN negotiators have stewed in Panmunjom over this stumbling-block to the truce negotiations, the administration's Immigration Service has been doing exactly what it refuses on principle to do in Korea.

A report by the Workers Defense League describes the lengths to which the McCarranized Immigration Service has gone. The WDL, which has undertaken to fight these cases, describes the situation in the following release, entitled "Whose Side Is U. S. Immigration On-Democracy or Dictatorship?"

STOP THE CRIME

The United States Immigration and Naturalization Service is ignoring the pleas of refugees from dictatorships and is sending men back to probable imprisonment or death.

deported to a country where the attorney general determines that he would be subjected to physical persecution."

Spain has a totalitarian regime, that totalitarian dictatorships physically persecute those who are opposed to them.

The Commissioner of Immigration, acting for the attorney general, demands absolute proof that a man will be physically persecuted if he is returned to a totalitarian country. He does not con-

sider this adequate proof: • Certification by the International Refugee Organization (IRO)

• Certification by the Republic of France. · Certification by the National

Catholic Welfare Conference. • A record of three years in a

Soviet forced labor camp, two years in General Anders anti-Communist Polish Army, refusal to be repatriated after the war, seven years in a Mexican refugee camp, and attempted suicide rather than be forcibly returned to Communist Poland.

months without trial in Spain on court, in a 11 page decision by "suspicion" of distributing anti- Judge Samuel H. Kaufman, said Franco literature.

In other cases, the United States Immigration Service has deported anti-Communist Chinese to China without a hearing, anti-Titoists to Yugoslavia, anti-Communists to Pond and Czechoslovakia, and anti-Fascists to Spain.

Prompt action in the courts by the Workers Defense League has saved *temporarily* a few of these refugees from deportation, has possibly saved their lives.

Wladyslaw Michalski attempted suicide at Idlewild Airport on June 17, 1952, rather than be flown back to Communist Poland. When the Workers Defense League obtained a writ of Habeas Corpus in federal court for him, citing his record of Soviet imprisonment, serice in Anders army, and flight to the Catholic refugee camp in Mexico, Immigration attorneys claimed that the attorney general could disregard this evidence if he chose. Judge Thomas E. Murphy, in upholding the writ, pointed out that Michalski had not even been allowed counsel at his hearing.

A new hearing has been grant-The law says: "No alien shall ed him on Judge Murphy's order. WDL has supplied him with rep resentation and produced expert testimony to convince Immigration that Poland has a totali-But the Immigration Service tarian, Communist regime. We will not concede that Poland or are not yet sure that Immigration will not again try to send him back to Poland.

WDL FIGHTS

Francisco Pau Molina, youthful Basque nationalist, was held in Franco's jails for several months without trial on "suspicion" of distributing anti-Fascist literature. Conditionally released, he stowedaway on a ship to Italy, where he was certified by the International **Refugee Organization as eligible** for resettlement assistance under international agreements. Reaching France, he was again certified, after careful examination by the French State Department, as a Spanish refugee. Yet U. S. Immigration Service refused to give any credit to these recognized international documents and tried to ship him back to the waiting arms of Franco.

Once again, the Workers Defense League went into federal court and secured a writ of Ha-

• A record of imprisonment for beas Corpus. Once again, the that Immigration could not dismiss lightly a claim of persecution by a totalitarian regime.

> Most recently, Immigration cancelled on October 3, 1952, a stay of deportation of Jose Del Rio Cumbrera to Spain and ordered his deportation the following day. Workers Defense League attornevs and staff, working far into the night, were forced again to secure a writ to protect this man's ights.

The president of the United States, recognizing that the new Immigration law (the McCarran Act) will exclude from the United States thousands of desirable immigrants and will subject to the threat of deportation thousands of anti-totalitarian refugees who are already legally here, has appointed a special commission to study our Immigration policy and to make proposals for its administration and revision.

The McCarran Act goes into effect December 24. The Immigration Service acts as though it were already in operation. These aliens desperately need our help now ond, long before there can be adequate changes in the law, hundreds will need our assistance in fighting the arbitrary decisions of Immigration service. They will need our help to save their lives.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library, publishers of Signet and Mentor pocket books, published Oct. 29:

Two Adolescents, by Alberto Moravia. Signet, 160 pages, 25¢. Only the Dead Know Brooklyn. by Thomas Wolfe. Short stories,

Signet, 160 pages, 25¢. No Star Is Lost, by James T. Farrell. Signet Double Volume, 512 pages, 50¢.

Death Is a Round Black Ball, by Mike Roscoe. Signet, 144 pages,

Back Street, by Fannie Hurst. Signet Giant, 336 pages, 35¢.

Fighting Ramrod, by Charles. Heckelmann. Signet, 144 pages, The Caravan Passes, by George

Tabori. Signet, 192 pages. 25¢. The Face of Innocence, by William Sansom. Signet, 144 pages,

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.

Stakinism, 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 Stallnism 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 tegether 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

NTERESTED?
Get Acquainted ——
ndependent Socialist League 14 West 14 Street Jew York 11, New York
I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
] I want to join the ISL.
AME
DDRESS
ITY ZONE
TATE TEL
HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE
LABOR ACTION 114 West 14 Street New York 11, New York
lease enter my subscription: Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00
] NEW [] RENEWAL] Bill me. [] Payment enclosed.
j bin me. 📋 i gyment enclosed.
IAME
4. 4., 50 S. E
۲E '

STATE

ZONE

YOU and SICIENCE

How a Town Fought a Technological Death Sentence

By CARL DARTON

Several days ago a news release of the Association of American Railroads stated that diesel locomotives have now replaced about 70 per cent of the steam engines used in hauling freight and passengers in the U.S. This was hailed as the most rapid changeover in the type of motive power in the history of transportation.

This item recalled an article we came across while thumbing through a recent issue (June 1951) of the American Sociological Review. This is a case study by W. F. Cottrell of a community's reaction to technological change under the strikingly alliterative title "Death by Dieselization."

Stories of one-industry communities' relegation to the dump-heap are not new to American history. Ghost towns are an accepted part of Western folklore. What is new is the changing pattern of the workers' and people's reaction to technological obsolescence. Cottrell's study indicates that now, when technology hits them, people no longer just slump away but tend to give their struggle political content.

The locale of this study is a railroad town in the Southwestern desert section of the United States which is given the name of "Caliente."

Caliente rose as a division point in the earlier days of the steam engine where the rolling stock could be serviced and the crews changed. At that time the distance which a ocomotive could travel before servicing was about a hundred miles for freight and 150 miles for passenger trains. Following World War II the higher tensile steels developed for artillery and armor were used for locomotives, permitting the use of steam at higher temperatures and pressures, with resulting greater speed, power and efficiency. Thus greater distance between service intervals were possible.

Towns located at one hundred miles from a terminal became obsolescent, those at two hundred miles became assenger stops.

Community Turns to Group Struggle

The advent of the diesel engine within the past several years again called for a reshuffle. Diesels operate at about 35 per cent efficiency compared with 4 per cent for the am engine and require much less frequent stops for servng. As a result every third and sometimes second divinal point on this Southwestern railroad became technogically obsolescent.

Caliente was one of these divisional towns which sudnly suffered "death by dieselization."

From the long-range viewpoint the abandonment of liente by the railroad could be charged off to the march "progress" but since such phrases, no matter how highunding, fail to pay off on a day-to-day basis, its citizens mediately asked "Who gained and who lost in the transtion?"

The railroad whose modernization caused the demise as well able to assess the cost, and though it owned threearters of the town the increased profits from lower mainnance costs made the move worthwhile. It was the good izens of Caliente with their families, without means of lihood, who obviously were to pay.

What did the community endeavor to do for its selfeservation? The Chamber of Commerce made an effort to arch for a new industry. But the conditions which led the ilroad to abandon the town made it impossible.

Appeals to the company for reconsideration of its deion to move, in the interest of loyalty to its employees,



good citizenship and the community, were of no avail. It soon was apparent that when there was a conflict between the professed American ideals of healthy community living and the profit motive, the latter ruled without question.

LABOR ACTION

As Cottrell points out, "the social system which they (the good citizens) have been taught to revere now offers them a stone instead of bread." It is further concluded by Cottrell that those who gained by the move were the absentee owners of the railroad and the vague "consuming" public, while the stable citizens and workers who had cooperated to build the railroad system lost heavily.

Cottrell asks, "How can a healthy society accept such contradictions and inequities in rewards?" Why should changes which might be beneficial to "society as a whole" be so harmful to the people? Since there are no ready answers to these questions in society today the people of Caliente sought a way out by new avenues of thought and

Since individual appeals were unavailing, the community adopted the policy of group struggle and turned to the labor movement as a whole for aid. The nation-wide demands of the "Big Four" unions for retention of existing rules and the imposition of new ones, such as requiring the presence of a third man in the diesel cab, became community slogans. Normally such demands would be stigmatized as featherbedding but in Caliente they were accepted by all citizen groups as the only way to keep the town alive.

'Who Benefits—At Whose Expense?'

As similar demands by the railroad unions throughout the country added to the threat of a nation-wide rail strike government seizure was at first hailed by Caliente with the expectation that justice finally would be done. Thus it is seen that attitudes which were formerly considered to be freight points, while those at three hundreds miles were of forbidden "class" origin were accepted by the commu nity as a whole as necessary for its existence.

What the people of Caliente did not realize at first was that the federal government is so controlled by big business. including the railroads, that their hopes and expectations for help from Washington were doomed to failure. The important thing to note, however, is that the community, under the pressure of technological change and economic necessity, forgot its old habits of thought and belief and looked to fundamental changes and political means for securing justice.

Cottrell in his analysis does not consider the reaction the people of Caliente at all unusual today. Though expressed in academic terms Cottrell's study contains much of value to the workers today.

We quote from his article:

"We should expect that where there are other groups similarly affected by technological change, there will be similar efforts to change the operations of our institutions. The case cited is not unique. Not only is it duplicated in hundreds of railroad division points but also in other towns abandoned by management for similar reasons. Changes in the location of markets or in the method of calculating transportation costs, changes in technology making necessary the use of new materials, changes due to the exhaustion of old sources of materials, changes to avoid labor costs such as the shift of the textile industry from New England to the South, changes to expedite decentralization to avoid the consequences of bombing, or those of congested living, all give rise to the question, 'Who benefits, and at whose expense?' ...

"It is clear that while traditional morality provides a means of protecting some groups from the consequences of technological change, or some method of meliprating the effects of change upon them, other large segments of the population are left unprotected. . . . A good proportion of these inventions increasingly call for the intervention of the state. To call such arrangements immoral, unpatriotic, socialistic, or to hurl other epithets at them is not to deal effectively with them."

Readers of LABOR ACTION realize that these conclusions are not new to the corporations and rulers of American industry. The capitalists call upon the state for intervention as the needs arise. Talk of the liberal state and free enterprise are merely hogwash to confuse people.

The speedup of technological change makes it even more. important that the socialist solution be followed. This means that the workers must interevne and put forth their own rules whereby technical improvements are accepted as a social responsibility with the risks and dangers, as well as the benefits, being borne collectively rather than being a one way ride to individual death. Technological developments stress that our political and social institutions are obsolete.

Youth League.

elopment toward the right.



By JUAN REY pone the problem.

of operation But the workers, in spite of the fact that they support the government and support nationalization, fear this state-capitalist reform, because they understand that the state will be more dangerous than the old employers. Therefore the workers' demand is for nationalization under workers' control and workers' admin-

OPEN LETTER

istration.

gotten to that point.

The Central Obrera Boliviana (the trade-union federation); has now published its Open Letter to President Paz Estenssoro on the



uge For

Jammed Meeting Hears Shachtman On Election Issues at L.A. Hall

NEW YORK, Oct. 25-Labor Action Hall was filled to overflowing last night when Max Shachtman, rational chairman of the Independent Socialist League, presented "A Socialist View of the Elections" to a meeting jointly sponsored by the ISL and the Socialist

Shachtman began by giving a comprehensive analysis of the programs and campaigns of the two major parties. After showing that the differences between them. on all major issues, were either unessential or invented for campaign purposes, he declared that on both sides the campaign was a fraud. Analyzing Stevenson's public speeches and actions, he showed that, contrary to the impressions created by the liberal press, the Democratic candidate does not represent an advance over Truman and the past Democratic administration, but actually is symbolic of a political de-

Shachtman castigated Stevenson for giving lip service to civil rights while appealing in the South to the same reactionary and racist sentiments as Eisenhower in the search for Southern

votes. He quoted Stevenson to the effect that he not only approved government's loyalty and subversive drives but that he anti would extend and expand them, even as would the Republican candidates.

With respect to the Taft-Hartley Law, Stevenson was described as deliberately evading the question of what should replace the law, particularly its provisions on industry-wide bargaining and the use of the injunction.

On foreign policy, the two parties were described as having no essential differences whatever. finding it necessary to invent them in order to create the impression of controversy. The realnew element in the election. Shachtman declared, was provided by the role of the labor movement. He showed how the old-line city machines, the political power behind Stevenson in the Democratic Party, were in the process of decline; that in many instances they were to be found in basic conflict with the toher major "machine" in the Democratic Party, that of the labor movement. The George S. Counts campaign in New York, by the Liber-Party, was described as the

outcome of one such conflict be tween labor elements and the machine bosses.

Shachtman declared that this development was the result of labor's increasing involvement in political action, but that its progressive character was nullified by the policy of the labor leadership in seeking to gain control of the ruling capitalist party. Contrary to all of their professed desires to remain powerless, the labor leaders really do and must seek to influence political decisions on which the well-being and even existence of their movements depend. But they are wrong in believing that they can, by "capturing" the Democratic Party, compel it to serve their ends. Labor would have to follow. Shachtman declared, the path advocated by socialists here and abroad, break with the Fair Deal and set forth its aims independently.

It was in order to express the sentiment for such a course that the ISL advocates a socialist protest vote in this election. The speaker then went on to explain why it advocated a specific endorsement of the Socialist Party candidates, among the socialist groups.



To the Editor:

The Manchester Guardian Weekly has just written up the 'American Left," in an article by D. W. Brogan in its October 16 issue; and no doubt you'll be intrigued by his description of the ISL. The first part of Brogan's article is devoted to the Progressive Party and its ALP affiliate. and most of the rest to the Socialist Party and the Independent Socialist League. It closes with a reference to the IWW and Socialist Labor Party.

Here's how Brogan sees the SP and vourselves:

. . There is, for instance, the Socialist Party, the party of Eugene Debs and Norman Thomas. But there's the rub. Is it now the party of Norman Thomas? For that handsome, eloquent, public -spirited leader is not the candidate this year and he sits very loosely indeed to the party platform. Under Mr. Thomas the Socialist Party ceased to be the chief instrument of protest. He never had anything like the following won by Debs, and the natural clientele of the party was taken away by the New Deal, by the munists, by the American Labor Party, till, today, its faithful recall dwindling sects like the Irvingites more than an effective organ of protest. The British Liberal Party is positively Gladstonian in its vigor compared with the American Socialist Party. It is as certain as such things can be that its candidate, Mr. Darlington Hoopes, will not get a tenth of the votes cast in 1920 for the imprisoned Debs, possibly not even a half of the votes cast

for Mr. Thomas. There may be a place for a live Socialist party or league, but it is unlikely that the phoenix will be reborn from the ashes of Mr. Hoopes's veterans.

"That this is so does not surprise the Independent Socialist League. It is pure in doctrine and uncompromising in policy. It is Marxist, revolutionary, hostile to 'Stalinoids' and to modern orthodox Trotskyites. It is for peace (but not Picasso's peace). It deals with religious pacifists kindly but firmly. It keeps a vigilant and hostile eye on Belgrade as well as Moscow, and hopes for the rise of an American version of Bevanism in the American trade-union movement. For the present leadership is no good; it has sold out to capitalism, to the cold war, to reformism (and not too much of that). It is nearly but not quite as bad as the Stalinoids of the Progressive Party. This, for those who enjoy fine, fierce controversial politics, is the stuff to give them, but it is not at the moment, a force, even a marginal force, in practical politics. Its role is to be like the old Independent Labor Farty in Britain. No Fabian caution is to be tolerated. Here is the enlightened minority, but it is a small minority indeed! . .

You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of LA. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of vi Reep them to 500 words. views.



Bolivia: Coup by MNR's Labor Henchmen in the COB

SANTIAGO, Oct. 24-The next few days should see the publication of the Bolivian government's bill for the nationalization of the mines. The pressure for nationalization is so great that the Nationalist government cannot post-

The commission appointed to study the question has presented its report, and now the people are waiting for the draft of the law.

The government plans to nationalize the mines without making any great changes in the structural organization of the industry, which will become state property as the basis for a new state bureaucracy. The Bolivian mines have hitherto been centralized under the ownership of three great companies, and it is relatively easy to transform this private monopoly into state monopoly. The Nationalist government of the MNR looks upon nationalization as a state-capitalist method

This slogan is the result of "leftist" agitation over a long period of time, and the workers think that they can prevent the creation of a new powerful bureaucracy by controlling the mine administration themselves. Of course, under capitalism workers' control cannot prevent the growth of totalitarianism, because the nationalization of the mines even under "workers' control" is a very ambiguous slogan: only the socialization of the mines under a workers' government can forestall capitalism by destroying it. But the Bolivian workers have not yet mine-nationalization issue, calling for nationalization without compensation and under workers' control and administration. It was a very good letter, written with socialist spirit, like the document "The Ideological Position of the Bolivian Working Class" discussed in our last articles.

The government was scared by this Open Letter, precisely because its "socialist spirit," and ordered its "labor ministers," Lechin and Butron, to attempt a kind of coup d'état within the Central Obrera. A session of the Central was thereupon organized with a strong turnout by the Nationalists (who ordinarily do not participate in the sessions); and at this meeting they revoked and condemned the position on nationalization. which had just been published in La Nacion, the official government organ. They then formed a new commission to draw up a new Open Letter to the president, with Nationalist majority on It.

Today the press published the new document. It accepts the basic idea of workers' control and workers' participation in the adion of the mines. torts this idea in a vulgar "yellow," totalitarian, Peronist way.

In the first draft by the Central Obrera, the workers are the masters of the mines, of production and administration; in the new vellow draft, the workers are reduced to watchmen and doorkeepers of the state administration. The bureaucracy is all, the workers are nothing. The new draft was passed by the Nationalist majority which had been mobilized, after an extensive discussion directed against Lechin and Butrón.

None of the workers' delegates would sign the new Open Letter, and so it was published over the signatures of Lechin and Butrón themselves. The paper published by Lechin and Butrón has been reactionary and disgraceful in its response, defending the government's position on state-capitalist methods and distorting the earlier draft's views on workers' control and administration.

BREACH DUE

The government does not dare to fight the idea of workers' control, and so it "accepts" the letter of the demand but distorts its spirit and its socialist content. The conflict between the workingclass masses and the government is inherent and latent, though not yet entirely open. Some mines have adopted resolutions backing the position of the Left in the Central Obrera.

In this way, the government, with the help of Lechin, has administered a setback to the POR fraction in the Central Obrera. But the publication of the draft law on nationalization and its applicaion in the m sharpen the conflict between the mine workers and the new state bureaucracy. Then we can expect an open breach between the two. But the workers are very strong and armed, and the government party is very weak and divided.

The issue of the nationalization of the mines contains within itself the problem of the struggle for political power, because the workers and the government understand the whole question in different ways. It also raises the problem of a new insurrection, a purely workers' insurrection.

Price 50 Cents

Rosa Luxemburg

REFORM OR REVOLUTION

This historic pamphlet, long out of print in this country,

is now available in an edition published in India

Order from

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 W. 14 St., New York 11, N. Y.

F.O.R. Meeting on South Africa

'To the Editor

Readers of LABOR ACTION may be interested in a recent meeting of FOR (Fellowship of Reconciliation, a pacifist group) at which Bayard Rustin spoke on the "The Revolt in Africa."

Rustin, possibly because he is an American Negro, had some difficulty in getting to Africa. He was first given a passport good only for France and England. On his arrival in England he applied have it extended to include to Africa and with the help of Quakers there and in the United States he was successful.

He was never able to get a visa for the Union of South Africa. Kenya, or Rhodesia but visited several other countries, and spoke to leaders of the countries from which he was excluded.

He spoke very movingly of the conditions which are causing the revolt in Africa. In Kenya for example 50,000 Europeans own twothirds of the land while five and cne-half million Africans own one-third. A few Africans were offered the choice of starving in the hills with the rest or staving on the European land as sharecroppers. They live in conditions which make our own South seem like heaven.

A comparatively minor example of conditions in South Africa is the lack of malaria control. During the last war Negro GIs stationed there dug miles of drainage ditches in their free time in a successful fight against malaria. The government has since allowed the ditches to fill in.

Seven thousand men are in prison in South Africa as a result of a civil-disobedience campaign against Malan's racist laws but the United States continues to bolster the Malan regime. Rustin believes that the real struggle in Africa and Asia is not between "democracy" , and "communism' but a revolt by men who are hungry, in many cases physically hungry and in all cases hungry for human dignity and freedom. These hungry men in Tunisia, in Indo-China, in South Africa

receive no help from the United States because the latter's de-

pendence on military might leads it to support French colonial power and Malan in South Africa. Though the African leaders are not Communists, they now threaten to accept Communist aid and may do so if the West continues its present policies.

Rustin concluded by saying that the struggle in Africa is not only a struggle for bread and freedom but, if it continues in the use of passive resistance, it is also a revolution against dependence on violence. The members of FOR. he said, have an obligation to support the struggle financially so that the families of the men who are in jail because of their resistance will not suffer, to end Jim Crow in America, and not to withdraw support of the African revolt even if violence breaks out.

Even violent resistance, he said, is better than a cowardly acceptance of servility. This last statement, which was not questioned by the audience of pacifists, will be approved by non-pacifist socialists who have always regarded non-violent resistance as a means of struggle, in some cases perhaps the most effective means of struggle, but believe that revolutionary movements against tyranny and exploitation should not and cannot make a fetish of it.

It is interesting that a sincere pacifist, one who has served time on a Southern chain-gang for his beliefs, feels after witnessing a revolutionary situation that it may be necessary to support violent resistance.

Rebecca REED



LABOR ACTION

HOW YALE'S ANTI-WAR CLUB SEES War and Civil Liberties in the Election

"In Korea we took a large step toward building a security system in Asia. . . . What ever unscrupulous politicians may say to exploit grief, tragedy, and discontent for votes, history will never record that Korea was a useless war, unless today's heroism is watered with tomorrow's cowardice."-Stevenson, speaking in Portland, Sept. 8.

In speech after speech, Stevenson has revealed his relation to the permanent war economy by his statements on the necessities of national defense. Always the accent is on "at least this many arms and maybe more."

Stevenson and others have in fact developed a whole new terminology for discussing the permanent war economy. The present period of furious arms race is the buildup. Buildup to what? To a "defense plateau." This plateau is more of a mirage than a real landmark, since it is always two or three years in the future. A delay in its arrival is known as a "defense stretchout." The quite hypothetical process of arriving at the "plateau of strength" is sometimes known as "getting over the hump.'

Consider Stevenson's contribution to this literature, from his Springfield speech of September 15:

"... I have said previously that obviously once the defense effort has fulfilled its objectives, that very substantial reductions in the budget will ensue automatically. My guess is that those will come, or begin to be apparent, or be conspicuous, in fiscal 1955."

From a basis such as this there follow certain consequences. America must continue to stockpile atom bombs, must develop and test the hydrogen bomb, must conduct research in bacteriological warfare. America must build air and naval bases all over the world, continue the peacetime draft, maintain a large and most unwilling conscript army. She must force rearmament on Germany and Japan, construct a network of military alliances such as NATO, and compel the European economies to join the armaments

This is the content of the foreign policy of Acheson and Truman on the Democratic side, and of Dulles and Dewey for the Republicans Eisenhower has certified himself to be a continuator of this policy. Can anyone doubt that Stevenson will continue this program, in the face of his repeated assertion that the Democrats and not the Republicans are its real inventors and proper stewards?

Indeed, we need not speculate on Stevenson's war-like fintentions. He has announced them clearly to the discerning voter.

In Asia, for example, he has promised to "protect" Formosa, and its leading citizen, with the American fleet -an act which can only be regarded as hostile by the Chinese goernment. He has pledged continued military assistance to the British and French in their colonial wars against the people of Malay and Indo-China.

Thus the best that Stevenson offers is limited war and unlimited rearmament for ten years, followed by powder-keg truce and garrison existence for a century. In reality, he will deliver far less than this; his policy can only mean arms as long as arms are enough to prevent collapse of the economy, and nuclear suicide as soon as this disastrous "remedy" begins to fail.

Stevenson and Civil Liberties

"The problem of fighting Communist penetration in government is a job for security agencies and a job that never ends . . . the close screening of government employees and the quiet professional work of the FBI is the best way to turn over every stone in this country and face what Hes beneath."-Stevenson, Sept. 30, Springfield,

Focal Point has always been greatly concerned with the onslaught upon political freedom generated by the cold war. It is not simply a question of taking steps to prevent overt acts of espionage in a few security-sensitive government posts. Our government has unleashed a witchhunt which casts a pall of fear over all areas of intellectual life. The whole society has become permeated with an atmosphere inimical to free thought and to the unfettered expression of political opinion.

Under these circumstances, a militant defense of the civil liberties of Stalinists is a decisive need for the future of American democracy. We must defend the rights of Stalinists not for the sake of their totalitarian ideology, but for the sake of our own elementary freedoms.

Because the future of democracy is literally at stake, we regard civil liberties as a decisive political issue one upon which our support or rejection of a candidate must stand or fall. Many Stevenson supporters would agree. In fact, a serious concern for civil liberties has led many to support Stevenson: "Has not Eisenhower surrendered to McCarthy? Isn't Stevenson a champion of democracy, and a fighter against McCarthyism? Would not Stevenson in the White House prevent further witchhunts?"

The man's own words loudly answer, no!

First, there is the record of the Truman administration in this area. In his Detroit speech of October 7. Stevenson vigorously defends this record.

He cites the administration's prosecution of the Communists under the Smith Act, the creation of the "official" Attorney-General's subversive list, and the loyalty investigations of all federal employees as evidence of the administration's good faith in suppressing Communism. He further points out, and quite correctly, that all these measures were taken long before 1950, when the junior



senator from Wisconsin first appeared on the national

scene. Stevenson summarizes the effective work of the Truman administration in "combating Communism" as fol-

lows: "Democratic leadership has built an elaborate internal security system to protect this nation against Communist subversion-a system which has put the leaders of the Communist Party in this country where they belonghehind bars.'

Stevenson then promises to continue the "purge" (his very word) if elected:

"Does the general really want to purge Communists from the government, . . . or is he only interested in scaring the American people to get votes? . . . For my own part, I will tell you straight out, I believe the FBI has been doing a superb job. I think J. Edgar Hoover and Gen. Bedell Smith are excellent, experienced, devoted and trustworthy men . . . I would back them to the hilt.

"And let me say one more thing, so there will be no shadow of a doubt. If I find in Washington any disloyal government servant, I will throw him out ruthlessly, regardless of place, position or party."

Does Stevenson restrict the scope of the "purge" to government employees? Not at all. In his American Legion speech he states: 'There is no justification for indiscriminate attacks

on our schools. . . . If there are any Communist teachers, of course they should be excluded, but the task is not one for self-appointed thought-police, or ill-informed censors.

This says nothing if it does not promise thought-police -not self-appointed, but presidentially appointed; and censors, not ill-informed, but well-informed. To whom but the well-informed and discreet agents of the FBI is the task of "excluding" Communists from the schools to be entrusted?

Champion of Democracy?

Does Stevenson restrict the scope of the witchhunt to Communists only? Not in the least. We have already mentioned his reference to the "official" atorney-general's list, which includes a half-dozen radical organizations of the anti-Stalinist left, and scores of "fellowtraveler" organizations. But we need not argue by indirection.

In one of his most sinister campaign utterances, during his Detroit speech of October 7, Stevenson states:

"The major enemy of our freedom is Stalinism. We shall fight that enemy at its every outpost. But we shall fight, too, the minor enemies who snipe at our tested institutions."

Who are these "minor enemies" but such groups as Focal Point, which Stevenson also promises to purge, if we should have the temerity to snipe at America's "tested institutions"?

At one point in this speech, after outlining his own program for purging "Communists," Stevenson asks in all innocence: "I have often wondered what the Republicans think they would do to improve the situation if they were elected." It is truly a cause for wonder!

In the face of the clear evidence of Stevenson's own words, illusions about his calling off or even slowing down he witchhunt must be discarded

What is really at issue between Stevenson and Mc-Carthy? In his speech on Oct. 7, Stevenson rejects Mc-Carthyism because it is ineffective:

"For all his bragging and fear-mongering, the junior senator from Wisconsin has yet to produce evidence leading to the conviction of one single Communist agent, either in or out of government.

"The reason for this is clear. Catching real Communist agents, like killing poisonous snakes or tigers, is not a job for amateurs or children, especially noisy ones. It is a job for professionals who know their business and their adversaries. The professionals of the Federal Bureau of Investigation make up a magnificent instrument for the protection of our government."

The difference between Stevenson and McCarthy is one of method only. McCarthy wishes to proceed politically, relying on exposure tactics and on an aroused reactionary "citizenry": the American Legion, local "Americanism" committees, and other indigenous arms of reactionary politics.

In the type of witchhunt proposed by Stevenson and the Democrats, such public action is superfluous. Democracy can better be put to death discreetly. They see their means not in American Legions, but in Loyalty Review Boards, attorney general's subversive lists, lie-detectors, and above all, in the extension of the discreet and reliable power of the FBI.

Many liberals have been coasting along on the easy assumption that because Stevenson is against McCarthy, he must be for civil liberties. To such liberals, Stevenson's actual utterances on the subject must come as something of a shock.

It is neither shocking nor surprising, however, once we relate this data to a larger political frame of reference. We do not impugn Stevenson's democratic intentions -rather we see his "purge" psychology as a reflection

of the dilemma of the social system which he represents. Every thinking person has become concerned with the steady disappearance of the once obvious rights which are the indispensable basis of American and every other democracy. Few, however, have thought through the connection between the witchhunt and the government's foreign policy. This relationship becomes clear if we consider the American government's image of Stalinism, both et home and abroad.

Our government views the phenomenon of world Staltnism, wherever it may be manifest, as essentially a conspiracy. It therefore counters with police measures, appropriate to suppressing "conspiracies," of which the current "police action" in Korea is but one example.

This approach is based on a complete misunderstanding of the nature of the Stalinist movement. A worker in Italy, or a peasant in Viet-Nam, does not join the Communist Party in order to participate in a conspiracy. He joins a political movement, which offers him a program addressed to the solution of his immediate needs, especially his vital and unrelenting economic needs.

Stalinism is a dynamic, growing political movement capable of evoking the voluntary loyalty of millions throughout the world. It cannot be fought successfully by attempting to "police" it, but only by a political program which is more dynamic, and more appealing to the peoples of the world.

It is because our government persists in viewing Stalinism as something which merely requires policing that it is losing the struggle for the minds of men.

Here in America, our political leaders make exactly the same mistake. They approach Stalinism as if it were devoid of political or ideological content.

In his Detroit speech of Oct. 7 Stevenson argues that, once we emerged from the depression, "Communism was finished as a political threat; it has survived as an instrument of subversion and espionage." (Our emphasis.)

Nothing could be farther from the truth. Even today a student who joins a Stalinist campus group, a worker who votes for a Stalinist-dominated union, or a Negro who joins the CP in order to fight Jim Crow, is not joining a conspiracy, but a political movement, which must be dealt with on a political level.

Because Stevenson chooses to ignore the political aspect of American Stalinism and acknowledges only its conspiratorial aspect, he can only think in terms of policing it. Again from his speech of October 7: "As far as I am concerned, this fight will be con-

tinued until the Communist conspiracy in our land is smashed beyond repair." He sees no threat to political liberty in this repressive

police procedure, because in his view there are no political ideas involved. It is a simple matter of defending the state against "conspiracy."

American capitalism's answer to the threat of Stalinism is based on force and repression, because it cannot confront Stalinism successfully on the political level. It cannot win the masses of the world because it has no solution to the problem of poverty. Lacking a political alternative, it meets Russian Stalinism with the H-bomb, and the domestic variety with Smith Act jail sentences and Mac-Carran Act concentration camps.

•

The GOP and Fascism

Many liberals, even though they may agree that evenson's program is one of permanent war economy, and though they may see the disastrous consequences which follow from this program, will contend: "Isn't Stevenson still the lesser evil, in the face of the dangerous tendency represented by Taft and the old-guard Republicans?

I. F. Stone, in an article in the Compass announcing his switch from the Progressive Party to Stev went so far as to equate a Republican victory with the rise of fascism. Drawing an analogy with the German experience, he called upon all liberals to submerge their differences (over the nature of Stalinism) and unite to defeat American fascism.

This hysteria is worthy of its source. It is somewhat alarming, however, to hear otherwise responsible liberals employ this argument, under the stress of election emotions. The party of Nixon and McCarthy, they assert, must be defeated at all costs-by electing the party of MacCarran and Sparkman.

Now we have no intention of debacing which member of the Wisconsin-Nevada Axis is the greater enemy of democracy. In order to assess the fascist potential of the Republican Party, we will deal not with flamboyant personalities, but with underlying social forces.

A main strategy of the Democratic campaign has been portray Eisenhower as a "captive" of Taft. We must first establish clearly who is a captive of whom in the Republican Party.

That wing of the Republican Party for which Eisenhower is a front is based squarely on the economic and political power of big business. The Taft wing on the other hand, has its social roots among big farmers and small businessmen. Between these factions a struggle for power has raged for many years, and there can be no doubt as to its outcome. Since the victory of Wendell Wilkie over Taft in 1940, and through the successive nomi-nations of Dewey and Eisenhower, big business has been boss in the Republican Party.

It is a mistake to contend that these power relations have been reversed since the convention. What has hap-(Continued on page 7)

By MARIE SETON

That such attempts at thought-control make the pursuit Subsequently, the state legislature passed the Levering of truth impossible was clear to a number of California faculty members even among those who signed the oath. Act, which declares all state employees to be civil-defense Many of them, immediately after signing, let it be known workers and requires of all civil-defense workers a new oath. The California state constitution has had for 102 years a that they were available for other appointments and left simple oath for all holders of public office and public trust. California at the first opportunity. Many teachers at other universities refused to accept lucrative positions at the Uni-It reads: versity of California after the oath controversy. At least one "I swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constituscientific society advised its entire membership to refuse tion of the United States and the constitution of the state of appointments at California.

California, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of according to the best of my

ability." If the Regents and the state legislature were concerned The constitution specifically declares that "no other oath, with the welfare of the student body they would realize that their action in provoking such a boycott did far more harm declaration, or test shall be required." The Levering Act requires another oath which begins similarly but continues: than the possible presence of a few underground Stalinists.

Though it may be unrealistic to expect such concern "And I do further swear (or affirm) that I do not advofrom the Regents or the evidently hysterical state legislacate, nor am I a member of any party or organization, poture, the people of California will have an opportunity next litical or otherwise, that now advocates the overthrow of month to vote to protect not only academic freedom but the government of the United States or of the state of Califreedom of opinion for all state employees. Two amendfornia by force or violence or other unlawful means; that ments to the constitution will be offered for their approval within the five years immediately preceding the taking of or disapproval. this oath (or affirmation) I have not been a member of any One would forbid "subversive persons or groups" from party or organization, political or otherwise, that advoholding any office or employment in the state, "including cated the overthrow of the government of the United States but not limited to the University of California, or with any or of the state of California by force or violence or other county, city, etc. . . ." or from receiving any tax exemption unlawful means except as follows (if no affiliations, write in the state. The amendment proposed does not name any in the words "No Exceptions") : and that during such time such subversive groups but provides that the legislature as I hold the office of.....I will not advocate shall enact such laws as are necessary to enforce the amendnor become a member of any party or organization, political ment. Presumably, then, the legislature would define the or otherwise, that advocates the overthrow of the governgroups affected. ment of the United States or of the state of California by The other amendment would make the requirement of force or violence or other unlawful means."

Thought-Control in California

A number of organizations, including the state central The state Supreme Court recently ruled that the specommittee of the Democratic Party, the American Civil cial Regents' oath was unconstitutional on the grounds that Liberties Union, the League of Women Voters, the state the "loyalty of state employees is a subject requiring uni-CIO, the California Federation of Labor, and the California form treatment." On the same day, by a vote of 6-1, it Federation of Teachers, have gone on record against one or upheld the constitutionality of the Levering Act despite the both. It is to be hoped that the California voters will follow apparently clear constitutional provision that no other their example in November. ogth than the one contained within it shall be required.

The court ordered the university to reinstate the faculty members who had refused to sign the special oath provided they signed the Levering Act oath. The professors have refused to commit themselves on the Levering Act oath until they know whether the Regents intend to appeal the special oath decision. One of them said, "The decision augurs well and happily for an end to the controversy which so sorely tried the university we love.'

The decision on the special oath is a victory but the professors might have gained a greater victory if they had sued for reinstatement not only on the grounds that no special oaths should be required of teachers but also on the grounds that the constitution forbids any other oath for any state employee than the simple, positive one it contains. The struggle for academic freedom is only a part of the larger struggle for freedom of opinion for everyone.

There is a great deal of confusion even among liberals on the question of academic freedom. The confusion is usually based on the theory that Communists, fascists and "others" are subject to exterior control of their ideas in the fields of art, science, and philosophy. There is some truth in this, and the "others" (who are never named) should include members of some institutional religious groups, etc. Liberals such as George Counts, organizations such as the **SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE** American Federation of Teachers, conclude by saving that persons subject to such control have forfeited their right to academic freedom. If the right to teach in the public schools is to be denied to Communists on the basis of this theory it must equally be denied to believing Catholics, for example, whose opinions on a host of questions from birth control to the very right of the state to maintain public schools are laid down by exterior authority, which expects the faithful to comply.

But, as was pointed out in last week's Student Socialist article on Thought Control for Teachers, though this is the basis for liberal support of the current attack on academic

November 3, 1952



Oath Fight at Univ. of Calif. Wins a Point But Loses in Attack on the Levering Act

The struggle for academic freedom in California made a small gain this month, and also lost a point. It will be remembered that 18 faculty members of the University of California were fired two years ago for refusing to sign a special loyalty oath required by the Regents of the university. They filed suit for reinstatment on the ground that the oath was unconstitutional since it applied only to teachers and not to all state employees.

freedom there has been no attempt by the authorities to show that, in their actual teaching activities, any of the victims have shown unacademic bias or distortion. This is true in the California case as well as in New York.

It should be clear even to liberals that the current witchhunt is not based on a concern by the authorities to protect the minds of students from biased teaching but a desire to control the unofficial thoughts and activities of teachers.

Vote Up on Amendments

the Levering Act oath part of the state constitution. Both proposed amendments specifically mention the faculty of the University of California as subject to their provisions.



114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the Socialist Youth League. I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

		1 1 2	
NAME			
en e			
ADDRESS			
CITY	Z0	NESTATE	
		S	
SCHOOL (IF STUDENT)			••••••••••••••••••••••••
		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	the second secon

War and Civil Liberty ---

(Continued from page 6) pened is rather a matter of campaign rhetoric.

Sophisticated conservatives in both the Republican and Democratic Parties understand that they must achieve mass support at the polls to win an election. Each finds its mass electoral base among different segments of the population. The Republicans depend on the small-town voter, who is more likely than not a Taft supporter. The Democrats depend on the urban industrial vote, and especially on organized labor.

Each group, in the course of its campaign, inevitably makes a rhetorical turn in the direction of its mass base.

Each tells its potential voters what they want to hear. This is why, in spite of the fact that their programs are essentially the same, Stevenson sometimes sounds like Walter Reuther in his speeches, while Eisenhower sometimes sounds like Colonel McCormick. In neither case is this rhetorical turn to be mistaken for their real program.

Big business and the sophisticated conservatives who guide its destinies are firmly in the saddle of the Republican Party. It is their weight which is decisive in evaluating its fascist potential.

At present the fascist elements in the party are a minority within a minority, operating on the lunatic fringe of the Taft camp. They cannot grow unless the Taft forces grow. The Taft forces in turn cannot grow unless they get the nod from big business. But at present, big business is committed to a perspective of permanent war economy. That is precisely why they fought Taft so bitterly at the Republican convention, and insisted upon a candidate who would not destroy the edifice which the **Democrats have so carefully erect**ed. . . .

INTERCHANGEABLE

Not only is Taftism a minority tendency in the Republican Party, it is a weak and hopelessly de-feated tendency. Old Guard Republicanism is a thing of the past, because its ideology is wholly incompatible with the requirements of a permanent war econ-

In desperation the Taftites engage in all sorts of adventurism, from support of MacArthur to linter parties of the right. This adventurism on the part of its minority tendency, however, is not to be mistaken for the program of the Republican Party in power. On the contrary, it is a reflection of the fact that the Republicans have had no responsibility for governing in 20 vears.

The effect of a Republican victory has been grossly exaggerated by most liberals. If the Republicans should be elected, the permanent war economy would simply be continued under new management.

Eisenhower would undoubtedly continue to undermine our civil liberties through the quiet professional services of the FBI. Senator MacCarran, of the Democratic opposition, might well assume the role currently performed by Senator McCarthy-calling loudly for stepped-up purges from the Eisenhower administration!

We are not arguing that there are literally no differences between the major parties. We do maintain that on the crucial issues of war and civil liberties. these parties are interchangeable.

