

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

May 14, 1951

FIVE CENTS

Another 'Disappointment' for Reuther

... page 2

Labor Back on Boards—and on Spot

... page 3

Supreme Court Blows Both Ways

... page 2

SP: Another Step Toward Oblivion

... page 5

MacArthur-Truman Fight Boils Down to This: Who's Got a Program to End War in Korea?



NEXT WEEK —

What do the people of the Russian Ukraine, who hate the Moscow regime, think of American propaganda in the Voice of America?

Read about an exceptionally interesting document from the Ukrainian Resistance movement!

Anti-Sex League For Russians?

An amusing account of the approved form of hetero-sexual love in Stalinist countries, was reported in the British magazine, *East Europe and the Soviet Union*, last month. The new idealized concept of love being fostered by the Stalinist governments in satellite countries (long familiar to beleaguered Russians) is a strange combination of Victorian ethics and Stalinist industrial dynamics.

A commentator on the Budapest radio spoke extensively on the subject. After a long description of the evils of capitalist love—"romance on the conveyor belt"—he went on to describe love in a socialist society which he characterized as "sincere, beautiful and pure."

The commentator then quoted one chapter from Maltsov's novel, "With One's Heart." "This described the skiing visit of a young man and a young girl to a collective farm. Enthralled by the examination of agricultural machinery, they forget the time, and in the dark they miss the way and wind up in a fox-breeding farm, among the sheds." "But," writes Maltsov, "beyond trying to warm her frozen hands, breathing hotly down her neck and trying to kiss her, at which she burst into tears, the hero makes no further advances. To ensure further meetings, however, he lends the girl his gloves, and they part filled with glowing happiness."

By SAM ADAMS and PHILIP COBEN

The slugfest of charge and counter-charge between General MacArthur on the one hand and President Truman and Marshall on the other has appeared to put a choice of two programs before the American people. The outstanding fact that emerges from the melee is that both—the line of MacArthur and the line of the administration—are futile, or worse.

Out of the welter of problems that have been chewed over before the Senate committee hearings, one overshadows all others: *How to bring this war in Korea to a conclusion.*

If the administration could hold out any real possibility of ending it by decisive U. S. military victory, the question would not be debated before the country in its present form. The more fundamental question would then be uppermost: Would a U. S. military victory in Korea stop Stalinist expansion in any real sense? Would such a victory really be a victory for democracy in the world, or would it merely serve to establish U. S. power in the world?

But the administration cannot even speak in terms of military victory through its own strategy (as opposed to MacArthur's), and we have made clear before this that the military impasse of U. S. power in the Korean corner of the globe is closely connected with its political inability to rally the peoples of the world against Russian imperialism.

In this situation, MacArthur has rushed in with his "solution." It boils down to the following proposition: *End the war in Korea—by spreading it to China! and perhaps by spreading it to the whole world!*

If this warmongering bugle call of his has any popular appeal, it is only because the alternative perspective on how to end the war

which is presented by Truman and his cohorts has no appeal at all for the people. It is primarily represented by Operation Killer (alias Operation Slaughterhouse, alias Operation Meatgrinder . . .), the perspective of wearing down the Chinese Stalinists to an acceptable compromise by wearing down their forces militarily—that is, by an indefinite continuation of the carnage and casualties which, at its promised but unseeable end, will have the result only of setting the stage for a temporary deal with the Kremlin's power.

"Struggle Without End"?

Who in the country, of whatever political complexion, can get enthusiastic about this "global strategy"?

This is actually the administration's alternative to MacArthurism. In his speech of May 7, President Truman—unable to present this baldly and frankly as it should be if he were to be entirely honest about it—asserted: "We are not engaged in a struggle without end." What was behind this brave claim?

He was able even to speak the words only because he wound up by generally pointing the finger to growing "internal tension and unrest behind the Iron Curtain" and by holding up, in effect, the inner collapse of Stalinist imperialism as the "solution" to the cold-war-in-permanence. The inability of the U. S. to give any such solution flesh and blood will be dealt with at large in next week's LABOR ACTION. It is sufficient to note right now that the vague terms in which Truman raised this hope are incapable of countering the MacArthur appeal.

One solution to the immediate slaughter of the futile Korean war did not come before the people from either MacArthur or Truman or Marshall. It is: *End the useless killing now going on in the peninsula by withdrawing all U. S. forces, getting out of there!*

(Turn to last page)

Socialist Youth Win Free-Speech Fight, Beat 'Riot' Frameup at Los Angeles CC

By PAUL STEBBINS

LOS ANGELES, April 27 — Vigorously fighting back against a reactionary attack on free speech by the witch-hunting administration of Los Angeles City College (LACC), united socialist action has scored a spectacular victory which has resounded through the press headlines of the city.

The Korean war and MacArthur were temporarily pushed out of the top spot by the screaming front-page banner headlines in the Los Angeles newspapers — like "Police Break Up Socialist Rally!" in the *L. A. Times*—when the story broke.

It was the would-be witchhunters who inflated the event to this phenomenal size—but they are regretting it now!

Without their frenzied attack on free speech, the socialist youth street rally held near LACC on Thursday, April 26 would have been just another meeting. When they provocatively tried to turn it into a "riot" and red-scare, the attempt boomeranged. In particular, the Socialist Youth League of the city has succeeded in winning widespread public attention and sympathy as a militant socialist (and anti-Stalinist) organization fighting for civil liberties and free speech.

First: why the April 26 socialist youth rally was held—

As LABOR ACTION announced some issues ago, three socialist youth groups had scheduled a state-wide united conference, to take place in Los Angeles on April 25-26. This was the second conference of its kind, the first having been held in Berkeley last November, jointly sponsored and organized by the state branches of the Socialist Youth League, the Young People's Socialist League and the Libertarian Socialist League.

First RALLY DISRUPTED

Two weeks before the conference, on April 12, the SYL had tried to hold an orderly street meeting near the LACC campus, with Ted Yudkoff of the SYL as speaker. Unexpectedly, obviously organized rowdiness by elements in the audience succeeded in disrupting the meeting. Observers reported that this incitement to riot was whipped up by an official of the college administration who was in the crowd, somewhat at

the cost of his academic dignity!

In response to this fomented mob action against free speech, the socialists decided to return to the place on the 26th, when the state-wide socialist youth conference would be meeting, with the support of the three youth groups involved.

This joint public meeting near the campus was intended as a small demonstration of the solidarity of three democratic socialist organizations against the authoritarian suppression of basic civil liberties in the city's educational institutions.

CAMPUS AUTOCRATS

The administration of Los Angeles City College is, in fact, worse even than that at Brooklyn College in New York under President Harry Gideonse. It is more brutal, more repressive, quicker to suspend and expel students, and more dishonest in its own defense. In the past period this reactionary administration once arbitrarily suspended all student government!

The LACC administration has grown increasingly bold and openly arrogant in this course, since it has up to now met no challenge from liberal or democratic forces and has been emboldened by the chauvinistic atmosphere exuded by the Korean

war situation and accompanying government policy, by McCarthyism and by the Truman administration's loyalty-oath purges.

The repressions at LACC were considered by all liberals as a black stain on democracy in Southern California. But it was the extreme arrogance (and stupidity) of the academic bureaucrats who control the college that made possible the socialists' victory over them.

STUDENTS SYMPATHETIC

It was the second (return) meeting on the 26th that exploded in the headlines, in spite of the fact that the meeting itself was as peacefully conducted and uneventful as its organizers had hoped to make it. The tipoff on what happened is that the police riot squad arrived on the scene, in fact, as the meeting was quietly coming to an end!

At the meeting itself, the speakers easily won the sympathy of the assembled students precisely because they effectively demonstrated the anti-totalitarian and anti-Stalinist socialist character of the sponsoring groups. They explained their socialist conviction that they were defending the rights of all political groups and parties and all students to exercise the democratic right of free

(Continued on page 6)

Dems Hand Reuther, UAW Another 'Disappointment'

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, April 30—The public statement of Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers (CIO), that he was disappointed in the appointment of Blair Moody as U. S. senator by Governor G. Mennen Williams of Michigan was a significant reflection of the blind alley into which UAW-PAC policies has brought the Reuther leadership.

For in the most important decision relating to the 1952 elections, as well as the internal dispute within the Democratic Party in Michigan, Governor Williams has clearly shown the UAW leaders that he has declared his independence from their advice and influence.

And the sum-total result of the Reuther strategy in Michigan of building up the Democratic Party via UAW activists and funds has been to create a machine which took the first chance it had to break away from CIO ties.

Governor Williams refused to appoint George Edwards, one-time UAW organizer and recently a labor-backed candidate for mayor of Detroit. Sensitive to the frequent assertions in the daily press that he is a captive of the CIO and fearful of a CIO label in the 1952 elections, Governor Williams chose the opportunity created by the death of Senator Vandenberg to break away from close association with the CIO.

Edwards was backed by Michigan CIO leaders as well as the top UAW leadership. Instead, a man who became a Democratic Party member when he was appointed senator obtained this key political post, which, among other things, controls federal patronage in Michigan.

WITHOUT RECOURSE

Moody was well known in Michigan not merely as a newspaperman in Washington but as Republican Senator Vandenberg's ghost writer. His political past indicates he was a New Deal fellow-traveler, although he also always voted for Vandenberg.

Moody never joined the American

can Newspaper Guild, to which he was eligible, and this was pointed out by some of the UAW secondary leaders who are as disappointed as Reuther in the appointment.

Now the combination of Williams and Moody presents the UAW with the situation that the main figures in the Democratic Party (which was a minor force in Michigan until resurrected by the UAW in recent years) are clearly independent from them, and, given the present policies of the UAW leaders, the union movement is without any recourse except to pretend it is adjusted to this new turn of events. That is why Reuther had a kind personal word to say about Moody, after the announcement of his new position.

Within the UAW, the reaction to the appointment of Moody went along the following lines: Those secondary leaders who are pressing in their own confused and muddled way for a third party via capturing the Democratic Party organization in Michigan were quite critical of Williams' appointment. However, a goodly section of secondary leaders, who are convinced that the only future for the UAW is to work along with the Democratic Party, are very pleased with the appointment of Moody. They recognize that it strengthens their hand within the UAW.

The vetoing of George Edwards because he would be subject to attacks as a CIO man dooms the UAW to the policy of merely endorsing regular Democrats, and to a strictly second-class citizenship in state politics.

LOOKING BOTH WAYS

And this is where the second Supreme Court decision comes in to direct focus. The court has issued an order which casts doubts upon the legality of the subversive list itself. A lower court has been ordered to review the "subversiveness" of three Stalinist-front organizations now on the list. In other words, then, no organization can be legally considered subversive UNTIL it has had a court hearing. Thus, in effect, these three groups (the

Wayne County CIO convention will be held. It will be interesting to watch the discussion on political action at these conventions. The Wayne County convention will have a special problem, the mayoralty election in Detroit this fall. Judging by all present indications, the UAW leaders find themselves in a complete blind alley as to what course they should follow. Both Moody and Williams, as well as their conservative supporters in the UAW, will urge that a "regular" Democrat be the candidate, and that labor take a back seat all the way around.

Any talk that George Edwards might try again for mayor is considered political lunacy among the UAW leaders who have never recovered from Edwards' defeat in 1948.

At the moment, the UAW finds itself in the ironical position of having adopted a resolution on political action at its recent convention which claimed it would be "independent" from either major party. In practice, the Democrats like Williams whom the UAW put into political life and office are declaring their independence from the labor movement. More precisely, they are swinging to a more conservative path in keeping with the times.

The most effective argument used by Williams' supporters on the Moody appointment has been: If Williams appointed Edwards he would only defeat himself as well as Edwards; Edwards can't win because of the CIO label; this way, Moody can win in 1952, and Williams can be re-elected governor, or maybe even make vice-president on the Democratic Party ticket.

That such an argument should be effective, that Reuther and Michigan CIO President Gus Scholle, have been put in the position where the man they helped elect informs them the CIO may be a liability, speaks volumes, not so much about Williams as about the dead-end road of the present UAW policy of "supporting friends of labor."

Bay Area, Seattle, Reed College Hear Shachtman on Coast Tour

OAKLAND, Calif., April 22—Max Shachtman, national chairman of the ISL, here on a tour of the West Coast, was the speaker at a meeting held April 18 under the auspices of the Socialist Youth League at the YMCA Stiles Hall, near the campus of the University of California. Speaking on "The Significance of the Barcelona General Strike," he pointed out in specific detail to the audience of 65 students the tremendous revolutionary potential that exists in Spain today and the positive effect that it must and will have upon the international working-class movement.

This meeting had originally been scheduled as a debate between Shachtman and the Spanish (Franco) consul-general in San Francisco, who was due to maintain that the regime he represents is democratic. At the last minute this "democrat" had his secretary inform the SYL that he felt it unwise for him to appear because the public might feel that he is a prejudiced speaker for his government.

On April 19, Shachtman went to Oregon and spoke before student audiences at Portland's Reed College and Oregon State College at Corvallis. Seldom do the students at these colleges have the opportunity to hear the independent socialist viewpoint. High response manifested itself particularly at Reed, where the audience numbered over 90 students—almost a fifth of the entire student body.

On his return to the Bay Area, Shachtman spent Friday and Saturday speaking individually to workers and friends of the ISL and SYL and ended his visit here at a public meeting at Finnish Brotherhood Hall in Berkeley, where he spoke on the Truman-MacArthur fiasco, using this event to clarify the split that exists in big business and therefore government circles as to how the Korean War and cold-war crisis is to be handled.

The interest and attendance (over 65 people) at this meeting, and at the party that followed, reflects an increase of interest in the ISL that has occurred here since the start of the Korean war.

SEATTLE, April 17—This afternoon a symposium was presented by the YMCA-YWCA at Eagleston Hall on the subject "Will the UN Policy Bring Peace in the Far East?" Participants were Dr. Frank Williston of the University of Washington (Far East Department) and Max Shachtman of the Independent Socialist League, with Dr. Hugh Bone of the Political Science Department as moderator.

Dr. Williston spoke in favor of the UN program, asserting the UN had pressed hard for land reforms and the establishment of a democratic government. Even after the outbreak of war the UN went on record to continue these plans as well as contribute to the rebuilding of Korea once peace became a reality.

Shachtman hit at the intervention of the UN in Korea, terming the UN a "myth"—the only potent forces in reality being the two rival imperialist powers, Russia and the U. S.

Korea was simply being pillaged from head to foot in the path toward a greater war between these two nations. The necessary solution, he said, is the complete withdrawal from Korea. The U. S. clearly has no perspective in Korea or the Far East. The defeat of Stalinism can be accomplished only with the aid of allies. The establishment of a genuinely democratic government at home, representing the interests of the people rather than the interests of big business, will bring the respect of the Far Eastern peoples and make it possible to work with them to defeat Stalinism.

The symposium concluded with an extended period of discussion between Dr. Williston and Shachtman, and by the audience. On Sunday, April 15, Shachtman spoke before some 75 friends at the Forum of the Church of the People, on the British Labor government.

The question and discussion period showed how much interest in the subject and the speaker was maintained in the audience when the period ran overtime; only with the apologetic insistence of the director of the Forum, Fred Shorter, was the meeting brought to a close.

Remember What They Said About the Mobilization Setup? Labor's Back on Boards — and On the Spot

By GORDON HASKELL

The leaders of the American labor movement have returned to the war-mobilization agencies in Washington. Their return was accomplished very quietly, with little fanfare. This was in sharp contrast to the dramatic, electrifying effect of their mass departure from the government bodies just about two months ago.

This contrast was not due to a failure in publicity techniques. The militant, challenging action of the labor leaders in leaving the mobilization setup and appealing to the labor movement and the whole country to support their stand was recognized by everyone as a step which could lead to a new political alignment in America.

The indictment which they brought against the government's mobilization program was so sweeping that it could have been the basis for a new Declaration of Independence, the independence of the labor movement from the politics of the two old parties.

The basis was laid, both in words and in action. But the declaration did not follow. And, as LABOR ACTION pointed out at the time, unless the labor leaders accepted the political logic of their own indictment, they would be forced, sooner or later, to return to the mobilization agencies they had denounced so thoroughly.

The charges the labor leaders brought against the government fall under two general headings.

TWO CHARGES

They charged that the defense setup was dominated from top to bottom by representatives of big business, with labor and consumer representatives in a "window dressing" role only. They pointed out that in every section of the mobilization machinery men from the particular businesses which would be most drastically affected by the operations of that section had controlling positions. To remedy this, they demanded that labor be given equal representation at all policy-making and administrative levels.

The second general charge was that the policies already adopted by Congress and proposed by the administration are calculated to put the burden of the mobilization on the shoulders of the workers and other low-income groups. They denounced the price-control program as a sham, the tax program as one devised to soak the poor, the rent-control program as a fraud and the wage freeze as the most vicious piece of class legislation since the Taft Hartley Act.

They demanded that all these programs be turned upside down on all three levels: administrative, legislative and executive. They insisted that until this takes place "equality of sacrifice" is a mockery, and they swore that they would fight until equality of sacrifice becomes a reality.

As a matter of fact, now, just two months after the big storm, it is difficult to remember the vio-

lence of the language they used in denouncing the whole setup and all its works.

DID THEY WIN?

Yet even while their campaign was in full swing, one "omission" in the indictment was very prominent. They denounced Charles Wilson and the reactionary coalition in Congress Hill the welkin rang. But about the chief actor in the whole show, they said not a word. President Truman, who bears primary responsibility for the mobilization setup, was not mentioned by the top labor leaders as a partner in the plot to "give the country to Wall Street."

Have the labor leaders returned to the mobilization setup empty-handed, or have they won a smashing victory as they claim? It would be wrong to answer that question in simple black-and-white terms. Judging the outcome solely on the basis of the objectives which they set for themselves, and which are concurred in by almost the whole leadership of the labor movement on all levels, it is correct to say that they won a considerable victory for one of their major objectives, and suffered a defeat on the other. It would be even more accurate to say that they simply abandoned one of their objectives, for the time being at least.

EQUAL POWER?

It appears that the labor leaders will now be substantially represented on all levels of the defense setup. The president's new National Advisory Board on Mobilization Policy can very well become the top policy-making body for the mobilization. Labor leaders are being appointed to all the subordinate agencies. The stubborn, arrogant attitude of Wilson toward the labor leaders has presumably been replaced by more reasonable behavior. The labor leaders will now share responsibility for the administration of the mobilization.

That was one of the things they set out to get, and they have it. But it is doubtful whether even the most optimistic labor leader now really believes that "equal representation" in the mobilization setup means "equal power."

Whatever powers they may have must now be used to organize and mobilize the workers and the country within the general framework of the laws laid down by Congress, and even more important, within the general framework of an economy which is based on inequality of income, of privileges, of rights, and hence of sacrifices.

NOT LEADING FIGHT

For the labor leaders the most important single agency is the Wage Stabilization Board, and it was in this field that their militant stand won their greatest victory. The new board will have certain limited powers over disputes between labor and capital vitally affecting "defense."

The old board was empowered only to lay down and maintain a rigid wage formula. It gave the

labor movement no elbow room whatever to adjust inequities or sub-standard wages and to win improvements on the basis of "fringe" demands in contracts. There can be little doubt that the new board will seek to find ways and means to keep the wage freeze flexible enough to prevent major strikes from breaking out.

But in winning these concessions, the labor leaders gave up the effective struggle over the major issues in economic policy. The very victory they have won will hamper them in the struggle over the issues of price control, taxes, rent control, housing and the rest.

When the labor leaders broke from the mobilization agencies, they appealed to the whole country for support. They stated, and correctly, that their demands were not made solely in the interest of the wage earners in the unions. They said that all the common people, the farmers, the old folks and disabled veterans living on pensions, the people with little businesses—all need redress against rising prices, the inequitable tax program, the gutted rent-control measures. And they proposed to lead all these people in the struggle for equality of sacrifice against the clique of big-businessmen and politicians who are riding roughshod over the basic needs, the standard of living, of the great majority of the nation.

Of course, the labor leaders will continue to advocate more liberal programs in all these fields. They will make speeches from time to time, and the labor press will write editorials. But they are not leading a political crusade on behalf of the common people.

ISL FUND DRIVE

Push Puts Drive Near Top

By ALBERT GATES, Fund Drive Director

As we indicated in our last column, several branches had requested an extension of the Fund Drive to permit them to complete their plans in the campaign. The Drive Committee agreed to this request and the drive has been officially extended to May 12. This extension should permit every city to go over the top, as this week's reports show.

Seven cities are now over 100 per cent, and several others so close to it that an additional payment will put them there too. The Socialist Youth League, with its Chicago unit leading the way, still holds to the lead by a big margin. It now stands at 172 per cent with a contribution of \$861.95, of which sum the Chicago unit contributed \$364.50! Take a bow, SYL.

Streator is still in second place with 136 per cent. That's still okay. Our friends in Oregon came through too and are in third place, followed by Boston, "General" with \$1168.50, and Buffalo and Reading, each with 100 per cent.

The biggest jump in the standings, however, was made by New York City, which had a banner ten days. The branches there contributed \$1020.50 to land right behind the 100 per centers with 90.5. Ben Hall, New York organizer, feels pretty cocky now and is certain that in another week New York will join the select circle.

This week finds Chicago and Detroit running neck and neck with 88.8 and 88.6, respectively. The Motor City boys and girls are sure they can pass the Windy City.

These aren't the only places that are close to the win column. Seattle, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Newark and Oakland can make it

As a matter of fact, their victory in getting into all the mobilization agencies will tie their hands with regard to the political struggle. For now they have assumed responsibility for administering the programs which are based on reactionary, inequitable legislation. And that legislation and the legislation to come cannot be changed by anything but a political movement.

THE LESSON STICKS

Nevertheless, the dramatic demonstration made by the labor leaders two months ago remains a step forward in history which has not been and cannot be taken back.

First of all, the United Labor Policy Committee still exists. It was formed in the heat of the fight, and now the whole labor movement realizes that it can act together for major political objectives. We will no longer have to refute the argument that as long as labor is divided organizationally it cannot unite politically.

Secondly, and much more important, everyone recognizes that it was labor's united, independent, militant action which forced the business-government clique to yield to the demand of the labor leaders for a reorganization of the mobilization setup. It is true that the clique could yield to this demand without endangering its commanding position in any way. Yet the arrogant Wilson and the group he represents had to eat crow publicly under the pressure of the labor movement.

NO PEACE AHEAD

It will be very difficult to erase the memory of this event from the minds of the labor leaders and,

more important, from those of the organized workers. The latter were never called into real action in the fight. They were asked to form the roofing section in the bleachers—to pass resolutions and write letters to their congressmen and the president.

But nothing which is being done now can conceal the fact that the moment the labor movement disentangled itself from its alliance with the administration and stood on its own feet, it acquired a political punch which it has never had before.

And try as the labor bureaucrats may to lie down peacefully with the wolves of big business in the mobilization agencies, they will not find an easy resting place.

The price rises, the pressure of taxes, the rent increases, the lowering of the standard of living of the workers as profits pile up in the corporation coffers, will give them no peace. The ranks are bound to resist the basic inequality of sacrifices of the armament drive. They will grow more restless and rebellious as the burdens press harder upon them.

And if the labor leaders in the mobilization agencies try to quiet them, or even to enforce their burdens upon them, the cry is bound to rise: Get off the mobilization boards! Free your hands to fight politically against the business-government gang which is operating against the poor in the interest of the rich! We have seen what labor can do when it acts independently: let us form an independent political movement—a labor party—which will really struggle for equality of sacrifice!

As we indicated in our last column, several branches had requested an extension of the Fund Drive to permit them to complete their plans in the campaign. The Drive Committee agreed to this request and the drive has been officially extended to May 12. This extension should permit every city to go over the top, as this week's reports show.

too. Our friends in Oakland have written that their rummage sale, to be held at the time of this writing, will give them a big boost.

Between the last published report and this one, contributions totaled \$2196.50 to raise the national fund to \$11,130.35, or 89 per cent of the goal. We now need \$1369.65 to go over the top, or another 11 per cent.

All the branches are aiming for this amount in the next week to ten days. The last haul is always the toughest, but we are so close now to making the goal that we're pretty positive of hitting 100 per cent.

Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Per Cent
TOTAL	\$12,500	\$11,130.35	89
Soc. Youth League..	500	861.95	172
Chicago 364.50, New York 227.95, Detroit 95.00, Berkeley 95.50, St. Louis 31.00, Buffalo 25.00, Oberlin 8.00, General 15.00			
Streator	25	34.00	136
Oregon	50	60.00	120
General	975	1168.50	119
Boston	50	55.00	110
Buffalo	850	850.00	100
Reading	100	100.00	100
New York City	4200	3802.00	90.5
Chicago	1800	1600.00	88.8
Detroit	800	709.00	88.6
Youngstown	100	85.00	85
Seattle	300	250.00	83.3
Newark	300	225.50	75
Los Angeles	550	407.25	74
Oakland	650	478.00	73.5
Cleveland	300	206.50	68.8
Pittsburgh	150	92.00	61.3
St. Louis	50	30.00	60
Philadelphia	450	193.00	43
Indiana	100	25.00	25
Akron	100	0	0
Baltimore	50	0	0
Connecticut	50	0	0
Minnesota	10	0	0

Court Hits 'Subversive List' but OKs Purge

By RICHARD TROY

The Government loyalty program, now in its fourth year of operation, has run into another crisis in its development. Last week the Supreme Court handed down two decisions which, theoretically at least, have the effect of throwing into further legal confusion a process which has never been noted for its clarity.

One of the decisions, in a test case, approved of the means by which an employee was examined and dismissed; the other one held that the subversive list, upon the basis of which the test-case employee was presumably dismissed, was unconstitutional unless listed groups received a legal hearing.

In the same week, as if to further complicate matters, President Truman issued an order which, in a sense, contradicts the matter of these orders which, in another of fact, contradicts the first! Precisely what repercussions these new orders will have is not easy to ascertain.

Dorothy Bailey, a government official who was discharged two years ago because of alleged association with allegedly subversive organizations, had appealed to the court for reinstatement. On what basis? Because, she said, she had been fired without "due process," i.e., she had not been permitted to know the exact nature of the accusations against her nor the accusers, nor was she allowed to

face her accusers and question them.

The court, by a tied 4-4 vote, failed to reverse the lower court decision, thus in effect upholding the constitutionality of this procedure. In other words, an individual may be discharged without a full and open hearing. If the Review Board thinks that an employee has associated with subversive organizations (whatever that means) and thus constitutes a "risk," it is constitutionally within its bounds in firing that employee.

This is important, because, as is freely admitted, the chief and often the only basis upon which the "purification" of the government is being achieved is the attorney general's notorious list of "subversive" organizations. Miss Bailey was discharged because it was alleged by FBI sources that she had associated with a subversive organization.

LOOKING BOTH WAYS

And this is where the second Supreme Court decision comes in to direct focus. The court has issued an order which casts doubts upon the legality of the subversive list itself. A lower court has been ordered to review the "subversiveness" of three Stalinist-front organizations now on the list. In other words, then, no organization can be legally considered subversive UNTIL it has had a court hearing. Thus, in effect, these three groups (the

Council of American-Soviet Friendship, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, the International Workers Order) have been stricken from the list of the two hundred groups selected by the attorney general, pending further action by the lower courts.

There can be no doubt that this second decision is a real blow against the whole concept of the administration's subversive list system, which is based precisely on its inviolability from court proceedings, proof, evidence, hearings, and the other inconveniences of democratic procedure.

But it is a blow only against the "concept," that is, on the theoretical plane. For it appears that any practical effect it could have on the Truman witchhunt system is negated by the first decision in the Bailey case. Even if the entire subversive list were formally thrown out of the window, as long as a loyalty board does not have to account to anybody for its decisions it can go right on using that list in practice as if nothing had happened.

At any rate, a blow has been struck at the assumed right of the attorney general to arbitrarily name groups for the list without a hearing, without establishing to a court's satisfaction the "subversiveness" of the groups involved. The court did not, it must be emphasized, suggest that the list itself was unconstitutional,

al, but it did quite specifically state that the present list, as an instrument of public policy, was illegal until a hearing was given and subversiveness proven.

"BOTTOM-SIDE UP"

This leaves, of course, much up in the air for further debate. The officials of the loyalty program have stated that, until further clarifying action, they will be forced to continue to employ the present subversive list as the basic guide to their activities. And no doubt the nature of the Bailey decision, a vindication of justice or necessity of the loyalty witchhunt itself.

No one has questioned the premise of Tom Clark that association with a "subversive" group is satisfactory grounds for dismissal from any government post. The psychology of the hunt still generally prevails, and the purge will continue, with Congress leading the pack. The confusion that now reigns is mainly over how to legalize the means by which the cleansing shall be conducted.

Some groups are more concerned over the legal scruples involved; others want to intensify the loyalty check. The court has simply said that the subversive list must be more carefully and legally compiled. They do not condemn the subversive list itself, nor do they condemn the loyalty board trials which dump the most elementary processes of Anglo-Saxon legal traditions,

LABOR ACTION apologizes to the comrades of the Detroit Socialist Youth League for omitting the signature of the SYL in the May Day greeting published April 30, The Detroit greeting was jointly from the Detroit ISL and SYL. Same for the Los Angeles SYL.

The Standard Biographical Work—
"KARL MARX"
by Franz Mehring
British edition, cloth-bound—\$3.00—while they last
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

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 world-wide 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!

INTERESTED?
Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

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

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name
Address
City Zone
State Tel.

Youth Student Corner

A "RESERVE FBI TRAINING COURSE"?

By SCOTT BYER

SAN FRANCISCO, May 2—Next September the Catholic-controlled University of San Francisco will institute what is believed to be the first compulsory course on the Communist Party ever set up in an American university. The course, "Soviet Communism in America," will be mandatory for all students in the senior year; at a later date the university plans to transfer it to the junior year to permit further study before graduation in an advanced elective course entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of Modern War."

In addition to the lectures, reading, and study that the students in this compulsory course must do, they will be required to submit reports and term papers based on personal investigation of CP activity in San Francisco. They will be required to examine the workings of the party line, university officials said, in labor, social, and cultural organizations that subscribe to or are dominated by CP principles.

The teacher of this course, Professor A. Bouscarren, who is described as a "long-time student of Communism in America," said that as the opportunity offers, the students will observe or participate in meetings of such groups as the Marine Cooks and Stewards Union, Harry Bridges' Longshoremen's Union, the California Labor School, and others.

In his statement to the press the professor assures everyone that "there will be no FBI aspects involved; some will join these organizations as summer workers and students and the others will attend open meetings whenever possible." Former members of the Communist Party will be interviewed; transcripts of trials involving the CP will be studied; and "all other avenues" will be explored to give the students an understanding of CP methods.

The professor added that the university has been studying the manifestations of "Soviet Communism" in the U. S. for some time and was impelled to start the compulsory course at this time because of the Korean War and the apparent inability of returning armed-forces personnel—including graduates of the university—to understand its underlying causes. For that matter, he said, "Leaders in the government, labor, science and education strongly committed to the American way of life, have been constantly outwitted by a failure to understand the true nature and tactics of Communism."

They Can't Teach the Truth

As much as this writer dislikes making absolute statements, it is safe to say that this 18-karat supporter of American imperialism, the University of San Francisco, will fail miserably to give any real understanding of the nature and tactics of Stalinism. It will be a cold day when they are able or willing to point out the truth—that it is the failure of capitalism as a viable system and the failure of the working class to replace it with democratic socialism that has made possible the successes of Stalinism; and that the "secret" of Stalinism's widespread appeal is its opposition to capitalism. They will be able to tell much of the truth about Russia's totalitarian system and about U. S. Stalinism's bureaucracy and line-changing, but they will not be able to explain why this totalitarian monstrosity is able to feed on the evils and crimes of capitalism.

It is possible that this "democratic-educational" institution may achieve success of a different kind with these compulsory classes: success in using an academic institution and its students as an auxiliary to the FBI and the state national "Un-American Activities" commissions which have been so active since the beginning of the cold war. That the organizations into which the students must infiltrate as a part of their homework are Stalinist-dominated is a well-known fact; that socialists and class-conscious workers oppose the leadership of these unions is well-known; but this opposition must be carried on inside the labor movement.

Those students who have found compulsory ROTC an imposition on their rights will find this equivalent of compulsory reserve FBI training just as offensive.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

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.

NAME.....
ADDRESS.....
CITY..... ZONE..... STATE.....
SCHOOL (IF STUDENT).....



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 20 May 14, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Reading from Left to Right

FURTHER ENSLAVEMENT OF THE SOVIET VILLAGES, by A. Sergeev.—The Challenge, April.

This is the fourth number of a magazine that deserves acquaintance. Published in New York by the Association of Former Political Prisoners of Soviet Labor Camps, it devotes itself to personal reports from ex-concentratees. Naturally, the general character of its material would be perfectly familiar to those who have read books like *Tell the West*, but to those more closely interested in the phenomenon of the Russian slave-labor system, it offers a multitude of interesting sidelights. (Politically, the approach of its editors is crudely pro-Western, but its value lies in its presentation of actual experiences.)

The article by Sergeev is untypical in that it discusses the Kremlin's turn toward giant "super-kolkhozes" rather than the slave camps. His interpretation is not new but is made cogently. The turn, he says, is not decisively motivated by purely economic considerations but by military and political (totalitarian) ones:

"It will be easier for the Soviet government to pump bread and agricultural raw materials from a smaller number of enlarged kolkhozes than it would be from a multitude of small kolkhozes situated far from the district kolkhoz centers. The new policy will make it possible for the government to concentrate in its hands all the products of the village. . . ."

The peasant's conditions in the giant kolkhoz become identical with that of the worker in the giant factory: "until quite recently he was still allowed a small plot for his private truck-garden, he owned several hens and sometimes a cow or some small farm animals. All this made it possible for him to supplement to some extent his meager kolkhoz ration and to sell some of the products of his garden in the market for money with which he was able to buy some clothing and household necessities. The peasant still retained a certain small measure of independence from the government, which bred in him a devotion to 'his own,' made him less 'obedient'

to orders from above. Now, in transforming the peasant into a slave laborer, the government seeks to concentrate in its hands vast reserves of obedient manpower which will be easily transferred from place to place, from one branch of the economy to another: to road-building, military works, canal-digging, lumbering, and so on. It is more difficult to tear the peasant away from his own hut, his own plot of land, which require daily care, than it is to move him from the settlement to which he is bound only by a servitude he hates.

"The new organization of agriculture is also expected to do away with the insufficiency of controls over the rural population which became apparent in the last war, when the peasants used every possible dodge to evade mobilization for fortification work, sabotaged evacuation orders, and scattered to the woods whenever police units appeared in the villages.

"Until recently, the control over the peasants was not as close as that under which the city population lives. The party and Young Communist League organizations in the villages were small and weak. The distance of many of the villages from district centers made it impossible for the MVD to maintain surveillance over each peasant household. But now, in the amalgamated kolkhozes, MVD divisions and party organizations are increased in size and effectiveness. Having at their disposal new cadres of Communists especially trained for ruling the villages, they will be able to tighten controls over the peasants, both economically and politically. Living in a barrack, the peasant will no longer be able to freely express his thoughts even to his own family, and will have no opportunity to freely associate with people of similar opinions. Moreover, the strict controls will force him to give all his energies to work for the government, leaving him no time or strength for cultivating his own garden, even if he is temporarily allowed a patch of land for himself."

The other side of the picture: the tremendous new reservoirs of hatred and revolt which the regime thus builds up against itself.

WORLD POLITICS

WILL BEVAN GROUP ORGANIZE ITS SUPPORTERS INSIDE BLP?

By HENRY JUDD

LONDON, April—The dramatic resignation of Aneurau Bevan and his associates from the Labor government signifies the beginning of a new phase in the history of the Labor Party and its government elected in 1945. Not only has it brought into the open a fact which has been clear for some time—that the American government is slowly but surely strangling Britain's Labor government by its withholding of raw materials and its price maneuvering—but every issue involving the Labor government in England itself is now posed.

In this respect, Bevan and his comrades—now the recognized leaders of a broad left-wing of the Labor Party—have taken the only possible and correct step. By their action they have reaffirmed their faith in the possibility and necessity of steering a socialist course of action independent of both Russian Stalinism and American capitalism, and defending those enormous gains already achieved by six years of Labor's rule. The resignation speech of Aneurau Bevan, a powerful and effective speech, has shaken England to its depths, stirred the ranks of the Labor Party out of its apathy and opened the possibility of the construction of a serious and mass left wing within the party.

The resignation of Bevan has been inevitable for some time. Since Labor's shaky victory in 1950, the leadership of the party, frightened by the darkening international situation and losing confidence in its own perspective, has reacted in a steadily capitulatory and "rightist" fashion to all events. Without the insistence of Bevan in the cabinet, it is doubtful if nationalization of iron and steel would have been completed; there has been an increasing dependence on American policy (although it would be wrong to state that British policy has been entirely subordinate to America); and in Parliament the party leadership has witted steadily under the blows of Churchill and his Tories.

WHAT'S NEXT FOR BEVAN?

All this reached its low point, of course, with presentation of the annual budget by the clever bright-boy Gaitskill, who seemed particularly proud of the commendations he won from Churchill and the opposition. Bevan has clearly stated his reasons for opposing the budget, which symbolizes for him the end of the forward march of socialist reconstruction in England and the beginning of a liquidation of all achievements, particularly those of the social-reform program. At stake was the issue: Who shall pay for the rearmament program? But the much deeper and significant question: Is this rearmament program the way in which we shall save England from Russian Stalinism? was

also involved and will be debated in the coming months.

Now that all the issues have been exposed, what will come next?

The tactic of Bevan and his friends is not to precipitate the next elections, and to keep Labor in power until such a time as elections become unavoidable. They refuse to accept the trap offered them by both the Tories and the right-wing leadership of their party to bear the onus for elections at a time when Labor would most probably lose. Their response to charges of "splitting the party" and "endangering the government" is that it is not they but the rightist leadership, whose capitulatory policy becomes clearer every day, which bears the responsibility.

IT'S NECESSARY TO PREPARE

This tactic seems correct to us, and the only possible one under the circumstances, provided the Bevan group and their supporters now take the viewpoint to the Labor Party ranks and the trade-union movement. For otherwise, they must now systematically organize, educate their supporters, develop a positive program, prove they have a perspective of their own.

The annual congress of the Labor Party is not far off; will Bevan and the Tribune group prepare for this? We cannot know this, but it is to be expected that Bevan understands the long-range problem and has a perspective in mind which reaches beyond the issues of today.

In any case, his move has gone a long way in clearing the atmosphere and raising the real issues. Rejecting both Stalinism and capitalist solutions, he is today the potential leader of the most powerful independent socialist group in the world—the ranks of his own party and the 6-million strong British trade-union movement. Bevan is not a figure to be taken in hand by infiltrating Stalinist fellow-traveller elements (now fairly numerous in the Labor Party) or by self-styled Trotskyist cliques.

If he and his group continue what they have begun, they will be the rallying center for all serious socialists within the party and the whole future of the party (whether or not it remains in power) can be transformed from its present gloomy character into its precise opposite. The Bevan movement, then, must be welcomed by socialists everywhere as an expression of what is meant by the great potentiality of an independent socialist perspective in the world.

Close Referendum Vote Okays New Line on Elections —

SP: Another Step Toward Oblivion

A brief item in the *Socialist Call* for April 27 announces that "the referendum on electoral policy, introduced by eleven members of the National Executive Committee has been carried by the Socialist Party membership by a majority of nearly two to one."

As readers of LABOR ACTION know, this referendum has the effect of reversing an action of the last convention of the SP. At that time, a group led by Norman Thomas was defeated on a proposal to permit SP members to support the more progressive candidates of the two capitalist parties in places where the SP was not running candidates of its own. This referendum adds a proviso that such support can be given only where locals of the party in the area do not prohibit it.

It is reported that the total vote cast and counted on this question was less than seven hundred. Due to a technicality on dues payment, the votes of members of the rela-

tively large local in Reading, Pa., were not counted. The Reading local had taken a strong stand against the referendum, but SP spokesmen state that the result would not have been altered had the votes of the Reading members been included. With Reading counted in, however, the vote would have been much closer.

The result of the referendum cannot fail to have a serious effect on the already shaky structure of the Socialist Party. It is a sad fact that electoral activity has been one of the very few remaining reasons for the SP to exist as a separate political organization. Aside from its general formal commitment to the ideal of socialism, the policies of the SP are almost indistinguishable from those advocated by the liberal Americans for Democratic Action.

This is particularly true with respect to foreign policy. Both the ADA and the SP support the war in Korea, the North Atlantic

Pact, and the whole structure of the administration's cold-war strategy, and both make the same criticisms of specific details on how this strategy is carried out.

TOWARD LIQUIDATION

Now that members of the SP will be supporting the same political candidates in most key areas, there will be even less reason than before for right-wing SPers to devote themselves to the party rather than to the ADA-Democratic setup.

This situation confronts left-wing elements in the SP with an extremely difficult problem. For some time there has been a growing recognition among these comrades that their party is swinging slowly but surely into the capitalist camp in the cold war. The NEC's declaration in support of Truman's Korean adventure came as a shock to many of them. Yet they have clung to the hope that in due course they would be able to win a majority in the party

for their anti-war Third Camp position.

But the action of the NEC in pushing over this referendum so soon after a party convention had "decided" the policy on electoral activity shows that this leadership is bound to have its way regardless of the formalities of party democracy. Even more important, it shows that a decisive section of the leadership is marching steadily toward a coalition with the Fair Deal wing of the Democratic Party. Given the relationship of forces, it is obvious that such a "coalition" can only mean the eventual liquidation of what remains of the SP as an independent political entity.

Yet it must be clear to these left-wing comrades that a socialist political organization with an independent anti-Stalinist and anti-capitalist position is needed today more than ever. The Independent Socialist League is that organization. We invite these comrades to study its program, structure, and activities.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

A DISCUSSION OF UNITED-FRONT POLICY TOWARD STALINIST PARTY AND THE SWP

To the Editor:

I am not sure that I understand Albert Gates' article "Another Experience and Its Lessons" [April 16]. Does Gates mean that the ISL should not or will not make united fronts on immediate issues (e. g., anti-Franco) unless the whole question of democracy versus totalitarianism is dragged in and unless a clear differentiation from the Stalinists is established? Of course, any anti-Stalinist organization that does not do so when it has the opportunity is showing a lack of both common good sense and political intelligence. However, I fail to see why it should be a barrier to united action.

Secondly, does Gates believe that united fronts with Stalinists and Stalinoids (liberals, Zionists) are entirely excluded? If so, when has the ISL adopted that position and why? I agree that the Stalinist organizations are not part of the working class movement but agents of an "alien" class. However, united fronts are not limited to working-class movements. Above all, while the Stalinist organization is not an integral part of the working class it unfortunately does have in its ranks many sincere advanced militants. If the Stalinist totalitarian leaders were by a freak miracle to permit them to be exposed in action together with our people we certainly would be foolish not to take advantage of the situation.

AI FINDLEY

The trouble with Comrade Findley's criticism of my article dealing with the experiences of the ISL in its united front with the Cannonite SWP is that it doesn't quite deal with the subject of that article but raises other and more general questions of united-front tactics with relation to the Stalinists and the SWP. To get rid of the simpler of the two questions he raises, I take up the question of the Stalinists first.

It isn't at all a question of whether I "believe that united fronts with Stalinists and Stalinoids (liberals, Zionists) are entirely excluded." It is rather a question of what is the principled attitude of the ISL toward formal and official united fronts with the Kremlin's representatives in this or any other country.

On that, the position of the ISL is quite clear. In general, we do not propose and we do not make united fronts directly and officially with the Communist Party and

its satellite and fellow-traveler organizations for a whole series of principled reasons; on the contrary we are and remain intransigent opponents of Stalinism in all of its manifestations.

Our 1946 convention adopted a position on this question which reads in part as follows, after a discussion of several aspects of Stalinism and our attitude toward it:

"For the same reason, as well as for the practical reason of its utter impracticability, the party does not make proposals to the Stalinist party leadership for united-front activities, even though it favors participating in genuine united fronts of the working class and its organizations in which the Stalinists may be a part. However, this attitude toward the Stalinist party cannot simply be duplicated in contact and relations in which we enter, and must enter, with rank-and-file Stalinist workers. . . . The resolution then proceeds to expand the last thought in some detail.

ON STALINISM

Much more than this can and must be said on this question, but the above is sufficient to indicate, at least, what the thoughts of our movement have been on it. If anything, our views on Stalinism today are much stronger, particularly on the question of united fronts with this enemy of the working class.

That does not mean, as the resolution indicated, that we would refuse to participate in broad class movements of struggle in which the Stalinists might participate, movements of a concrete social, political, or economic nature, for then our point of departure would be the mass or independent character of the movement, the concrete issue of the moment, or the non-Stalinist nature of the whole movement.

It should be added, however, that this would not be the case with any Stalinist-inspired or organized movement, which would inevitably be tarred with the basic anti-working-class and pro-Russian policies of the native Stalinists, irrespective of the nature of the struggle. The possibilities of the Stalinists participating in such movements becomes less and less real in our world of today, for there is hardly an activity of Stalinism which does not originate in or flow from the world interests of the Kremlin.

This is not to deny that it is

possible to make a common front with Stalinist or Stalinist-influenced workers on concrete, immediate or local issues affecting the working class in a particular area, union or movement which is not and cannot be dominated by Stalinism. Some road must be found to break away workers who do follow Stalinism, not on the premises set by the Stalinist party but in the course of the general and independent struggle of the working class.

ON THE SWP

We pass over to another field, however, in the case of the SWP. Our differences with that organization are deep and many, particularly on the question of Stalinism. As our readers know, it is our view that the SWP never understood the most obvious meanings of Trotsky's writings on Stalinism; that they are hung up by their conception of Russia as a degenerated workers' state, of Stalinism as an "integral part of the working class movement." Despite the fact that the SWP is led into the most ludicrous contradictions on the war question, in general, the Korean war, Yugoslavia, the nature of the Iron Curtain countries, and that it is difficult at times to distinguish its views on this or that question from the Stalinists, it is not a Stalinist organization, but one of its opponents, feeble and weak though it be, an opponent nevertheless.

We are for united fronts with the SWP where the issue and conditions make it possible, and even take the initiative as we did when we proposed an anti-Franco united front to the Socialist Party and the SWP simultaneously. Even here, however, our interests are not primarily the united-front organization and the action of and by itself, but the action related to its purpose, the compelling reasons which brought into existence the united-front movement in the first place.

One has to be concrete in order to discuss the question. We could have united fronts with the SWP and many others on questions of racial discrimination, conditions of the working class, high prices, etc., without any differences or conflicts occurring. When united fronts, however, occur around political questions of great international importance, the arena of action broadens and the arena of conflict increases. In the specific case of the anti-Franco picket line in New York, we were confronted with two problems, bearing in

mind that the Socialist Party refused to join in the action because the SWP had already agreed to participate. Firstly, in the pre-conference negotiations with the SWP, its representatives refused to adopt any broad slogans against totalitarianism or slogans which would distinguish the demonstration from any common-garden variety of Stalinism (despite the fact that this would not violate their stated views). Secondly, at the broader conference, under the pressure of participating organizations and the ISL, the SWP finally yielded and compromised (!) on the slogan: "Against Totalitarianism Everywhere." Imagine, they yielded and compromised in a situation where all participating organizations wanted a clarifying slogan!

The article which I wrote stated simply that it was a mistake not to have made this question a breaking issue. Given the world situation, the kind of clarity we asked for was, in our opinion, indispensable for a correct fight in behalf of the Barcelona strikers separate and apart from—distinguished from—the Stalinists. We have already reported what happened in Chicago. There the Cannonites made it a breaking point because the conference would not formally and officially invite the Stalinists. In Oakland, too, they could not participate in the united-front movement, because the conference there would not agree to invite the Stalinist unions with their Stockholm Peace propaganda.

We would have lost nothing had a break taken place since our forces, the ISL, SYL and the participating organizations, made up two-thirds of the demonstration. A demonstration clearly anti-fascist, anti-totalitarian, and anti-Stalinist would have been a more effective, democratic, and for us, genuinely socialist protest. Most important for us is not the united front with the Cannonites. There is nothing sacred about that. Most important for us was to be clear in our principles and politics and to avoid being muddled up by the confusion and semi-Stalinist politics of the SWP.

Albert GATES

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 W. 14 Street, N. Y. C. specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

Socialist Youth Win Fight — —

(Continued from page 1)
speech, peaceable assembly and orderly discussion.
Bob Martinson, of the Berkeley Socialist Youth League, acted as chairman, answered all questions from the audience and also read a message from Chuck Doehrer, West Coast representative of the Libertarian Socialist League, stating that organization's solidarity with the purpose of the meeting.

BLASTS MILHAM

Vern Davidson, organizer of the Los Angeles Young People's Socialist League, chairman of the Westwood Socialist Club at the University of California at Los Angeles, and secretary of the Socialist Party of Los Angeles, was the second speaker. He presented his agreement with the purpose of the meeting and made a speech urging students to join the Wilshire Socialist Club.

Ted Yudkoff spoke for the Socialist Youth League, and as the victim of the rowdiness which accompanied the April 12 meeting. He exposed the role of the administration and Vice-President C. R. Milham, whom he held responsible for an anti-democratic demonstration against a peaceful assembly of students. The audience listened attentively and sympathetically to his defense of free speech.

DEMOCRACY FOR ALL

Yudkoff emphasized that although he was a socialist, he also spoke in defense of the rights of young Democrats and Republicans to free speech. He said:

"The reactionaries have denied to all students their democratic rights, in order to prevent the socialists from exercising their legal right to free speech. You, the students of this college, in helping the socialists to conduct a peaceful political meeting, as you are doing today, are helping also to defend your own rights to think for yourselves and form your own opinions! We do not demand that you agree with the aims of democratic socialism. We say that you have a sacred right to listen, to think, and form your own opinions. We say that disruption organized by a university official is an attack on the rights of all students, all minorities, and upon free student government. As socialists, we are in the forefront of the struggle against war and 'thought control'! But we willingly offer our help to all democratic students in this battle for

their right and our right to speak peacefully and freely."
These speeches and the careful organization of the meeting itself, including the large placards which emphasized the struggle against totalitarianism of every kind (the same signs which were used on the picket line before Franco's consulate on April 14 to support the Barcelona general strike), plus Bob Martinson's able answers to the questions of the students—this won support from a majority of the students and insured the peaceful nature of the meeting.

WHERE'S THE RIOT?

The meeting had already lasted for an hour, had concluded with a question-and-answer period, and the car from which the speakers had addressed the crowd was already a half block from the scene when the cops arrived. They had been summoned, as is reported by all observers, by LACC Vice-President C. R. Milham.

When the ten police cars came up, plus the squads of motorcycle cops and panting patrolmen on foot, the speakers' car was stopped—after an "exciting chase" of 200 feet. At the meeting place itself there was only a small group of about 40 students who were still discussing the meeting in a most orderly manner. (The only other note visible to the naked eye was provided, about 300 feet away from this knot, by two student opponents of the socialist speakers; they were shouting each other around on the lawn because one of them was an anti-Semitic reactionary who insisted on labeling all the speakers as "dirty Jews," while the other anti-socialist was a Jewish student.)

MILHAM ON THE SPOT

Why then did this completely peaceful meeting cause front-page top-spot banner headlines in almost every city newspaper? Why was it, in fact, given greater prominence than Truman's announcement on price control or MacArthur's Chicago trip?

As far as the press was concerned, it undoubtedly smelled the possibility of a local "red scare." As far as the LACC witchhunters were concerned, they undoubtedly believed that they could manufacture a riot, to suit, at any time they chose. Acting on this assumption, they placed the call for the riot squad, before there was the slightest indication of the remotest possibility of any "riot"! But even when the police ar-

rived, sirens screaming, they were unable to provoke anything. The police were "puzzled." Milham behaved as if this was his last chance to deliver the promised "riot"; but in the presence of the police, all provocation was ably stopped by the SYL sponsors of the meeting who asked the crowd to cooperate with the police in clearing the street. Of course, in the meantime, the police had drawn a bigger crowd than the socialist meeting; their sirens stopped all classes!

At this turn of events, Milham played his last card. He urged the police to make an arrest, any kind of arrest, but to do so in the name of the police and not in his, Milham's, name.

Ted Yudkoff of the SYL, turning upon Milham, thereupon denounced him as the cause of the melee and the real instigator of the so-called "violence." Publicly and loudly before the gathered students and police, he proclaimed that if Milham refused to press the issue through an arrest in his own or the college's name, then he would insist on Milham's arrest!

COLD FEET

The college vice-president, thus bearded before the assemblage, thereupon was forced to drop his attempt to remain the moving inciter in the background and, on his own responsibility, asked the police to arrest the SYL leaders. Three SYLers, Yudkoff, Martinson and Stan Weir—plus a "Jim Roberston, who is inclined to sympathize with the Socialist Youth League," according to the press—thereupon accompanied the police to the Hollywood police station, where they found an unexpectedly altered situation.

The police were in a state of obvious confusion. Vice-President Milham had reconsidered and now had cold feet. The police themselves were unwilling to take responsibility for an unprovoked arrest. Neither Milham nor the police were now willing to face the consequences of a faked and hopeless case against the socialist youth.

The SYLers utilized this new situation to win their case before the press—for reporters from all over the city were now gathered around, together with the cops. Before the newspapermen, police and Milham himself, they took the initiative in opening up with a highly justified denunciation of the LACC head and his role in the affair, of his black record on civil liberties for students, etc.

They explained that they had eyewitnesses to Milham's presence in the crowd, his incitement to violence, his confession that he had called the police while the meeting was entirely orderly with no sign of change. They said that "Milham's days as a paid servant of reaction and as a subverter of civil liberties are numbered!"

CHARGES DROPPED

The LACC head squirmed—and squirmed. And then he virtually substantiated the truth of the SYLers' charges by bolting from the gathering!

Reporters and police actually laughed outright as he fled, and both categories indicated that the socialists had won the field. The police announced that all charges were dropped, the interrogation was over, that the normal routine of their station was already utterly disrupted and that they would be pleased if the socialists would move off the premises and leave them alone.

The press headlines, photos, column-inches of text, and national publicity followed, however: interviews of the SYLers with the newspapers, flashing bulbs and lights of the press photographers, newsreel and television news broadcast, sympathetically presented to the public by the announcer, and all the participating three socialist youth groups were repeatedly mentioned in radio news broadcasts for two days.

BIG NOISE IN PRESS

In truth, as has been mentioned, the publicity that followed this victory was phenomenal and amazing. The headlines screamed "Riot at LACC"; headline: "Yudkoff Says He's a Socialist"; conflicting stories were printed on the size of the crowd, the number of policemen, the content of the socialists' speeches; the Hearst press invented the tidbit that the speakers had "slandered MacArthur" (whose name, as it happens, had not been mentioned at the meeting); the Chandler press deduced from this air that the meeting had been a May Day celebration—the ability of the capitalist press to slander, distort and lie had a field day for a while, but the facts were too clear even for them.

In sum, the socialist youth movement here has a right to be joyful at the real victory for civil liberties which it has won. The right of socialists to speak at LACC will

not be lightly challenged again.

Above all, the SYL is confirmed in its belief in joint activity of socialists based on an anti-war program, and in the special value of the anti-war conference, which can justly claim all the credit for the success of the meeting at City College. All the participating organizations have grown in membership, prestige, and influence as the result of their unity in action. The socialist anti-war conference distributed a joint press statement which revealed the true facts of the LACC meeting. The conference decided to hold another street meeting at City College in the near future, based on bigger forces, more widely sponsored by other anti-totalitarian, anti-imperialist, anti-Stalinist movements who agree with its program for the defense of democracy by militant, united action.

BUILDING SOLIDARITY

Already, as the result of this publicity, the anti-war socialists have been offered the free legal service of a number of lawyers as a preparation for the next meeting at LACC. Liberal friends of the socialist movement are already moving to force an investigation by the school authorities of the entire administration and its regime at Los Angeles City College.

A possibility exists that even the anti-socialist press will work to overthrow the rotten regime at City College, and to force Milham into a well-deserved, if somewhat premature, retirement. Several commercial photographers have also offered their services to secure the needed evidence of the role of inciters, disrupters and fascists who may believe that they can reverse their decisive defeat.

The united socialists, however, who sponsored this action, are convinced that the next meeting will be peaceful, completely orderly, unmarred by police sirens, and that even the reactionary administration will attempt to discourage further undesirable publicity for themselves.

As a socialist speaker at the anti-war conference said: "The struggle against war and for peace, against war and for civil rights, against war and for liberty and democracy—all these struggles are only one struggle—and the correct name for this struggle is the STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM!"

The facts of this episode at City College prove he is right.

HOW THEY TURN WORKERS' HOLIDAY INTO A MOCKERY —

Reactionaries Steal the Show on May Day

May day, as it was once known to workers all over the world, has been nearly snuffed out of the cold-war world. Reading the newspaper accounts of "May Day" celebrations staged all over the world, one had to recall the proud occasion it once was for millions of men who marched and sang to demonstrate their solidarity and their conviction that the day of emancipation was not far distant.

Today the totalitarians and potential totalitarians have stolen that holiday of the international working class. They are not satisfied with crushing the working class—they must remold its organizations and holidays.

Thus General MacArthur and Cardinal Spellman led a "Loyalty Parade" down New York's Fifth

Avenue, parading in front of a long line of veterans' organizations and superpatriotic groupings. No greater affront to the original spirit of May Day could possibly be imagined, unless it was the parades held behind the Iron Curtain.

In Moscow Stalin and his fellow butchers stood atop Lenin's tomb and reviewed—not free and powerful legions of the working class—but regimented and warlike rows of soldiers followed by thousands of Stalinist slaves shouting forced, mechanical cheers for their masters. Overhead flew the newest products of the Stalinist war machine—high-powered jets, new bombers, etc.

In Buenos Aires, Dictator Peron led a parade which was dedicated, in poster after poster, to the wonders of his rule. In Mex-

ico City President Aleman reviewed a monster demonstration the "keynote" of which was "a demonstration of loyalty to President Aleman and faith in his treatment of organized labor." The May Day parade in the capital of Venezuela, Caracas, was dispersed.

In countries where a relatively free labor movement exists conditions were not much more hopeful. In Tokyo, General Ridgway, MacArthur's successor, refused to permit the May Day rally to be held in the Imperial Plaza, the only arena large enough to hold the planned mass demonstration. It was held anyway and there was trouble.

In Teheran, 30,000 massed in a rally which terrified the reactionary rulers of Iran. But for

whom did they mass? For the Stalinist-led Tudeh party, which roused the assembled to the high-pitched enthusiasm for the cheers for Stalin and the Russian "workers' state"! Other Stalinist-organized demonstrations were staged in East Berlin, Rome, Milan, Vienna, where millions all cheered the enslaver of hundreds of millions of men.

WHERE, MR. BROWN?

There were a few bright spots and they should be mentioned. For one, a rally of 500,000 Berliners indicated a real spirit of hope and defiance.

In Germany, Irving Brown, chief AFL representative in Europe, inaugurating the newly-built (by contributions of U. S. capitalists) Free Europe Radio

Station, told thousands behind the Iron Curtain that May Day was not the property of the Stalinists but of the "free and independent trade unions." And though Brown spoke for the AFL and through channels provided for him by men such as General Clay and Henry Luce, he spoke words of great truth.

But one may ask Brown: If May Day is the property of "free trade unions," why did not the AFL and CIO march in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, all over the U. S.? Where were they on "their" day? Why were they silent?

BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library, publishers of Signet and Mentor pocket books, published April 28:

THE SUMMING UP, by W. Somerset Maugham. Mentor, 192 pages, 35 cents.

STAR MONEY, by Kathleen Winsor. Signet Double volume, 600 pages, 50 cents.

PYLON, by William Faulkner. Signet, 192 pages, 25 cents.

THE DOG STAR, by Donald Windham. Signet, 144 pages, 25 cents.

THEY SOUGHT FOR PARADISE, by Stuart Engstrand. Signet, 208 pages, 25 cents.

STRANGERS AND LOVERS, by Edwin Granberry. Signet, 160 pages, 25 cents.

COURAGE AND CONFIDENCE FROM THE BIBLE, by Walter L. Moore. Signet, 176 pages, 25 cents.

You're Invited

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

Readers Take the Floor . . .

McKinney Objects

To The Editor:

This is written to protest against the liberty which the editors of LABOR ACTION took with my "discussion article" published in LABOR ACTION for March 12. The general head on the article is "Pro and Con: Discussion. A Dissenting View on the War Question." The editors, for some strange reason, took the view that this was not enough for my article. They therefore concocted a head of their own to add to the above: "The Choice is Between U. S.-UN or Stalin." I say that this head is an interpretation of my article. Anyone has the right to write an interpretative piece; editors have the duty to do this but they do not have the right to put their editorial or personal opinions in the head which they supply to a contributor's article expressing his personal viewpoint, and for which he must take responsibility.

I was surprised to see this ancient twist used in LABOR ACTION. Not only is it dishonest but of low political and intellectual caliber. If LABOR ACTION readers are so naive and infantile that they cannot be trusted, even to read a "discussion article" without prompting from the editors, then I submit these readers are not worth much. And should you tell me that your head was actually taken from the

article, then I will ask you: since there is a general head on "discussion articles" why didn't you leave off your head and let the readers discover this themselves by reading the article?
I suggest that in the future this kind of journalism be left to Hearst and the Daily Worker.
E. R. MCKINNEY

LABOR ACTION has always used headlines on discussion articles, as on other articles, to indicate the article's main point. It seemed to us that Comrade McKinney had indicated his main point in his original article when he wrote that every country "will line up under a UN dominated by the U. S. or it will capitulate to Stalin . . . A million words . . . cannot say anything which adds anything significant to that one sentence." (Indeed, in his present rejoinder, he does in fact stress the same idea even more strongly.)
But Comrade McKinney insists that the head was a "distortion," and though this leaves us in the dark as to what he is trying to say, we can only be truly sorry that we did not succeed in heading his article in a manner objectionable to him.
We note with equal regret, also, that he insists on ascribing this to dishonesty and other nasty motives, not even omitting to mention Hearst and the Daily Worker.—Ed.

More General Strikes Bring Showdown in Spain Nearer

On the same day that Stanton Griffis, U. S. Ambassador to Spain, announced in Barcelona that the U. S. and Spain were entering into a "trade, friendship and navigation" agreement, new strikes broke out in Spain, the fourth great demonstration in the last two months.

This time the scene of the outbreak of resentment against the Franco regime was in the city of

Pamplona where 30,000 workers were out on a strike in protest against the rising cost of living and the flourishing black market from which only the rich and favored benefit.

Press reports indicate that most of the major businesses of the town have been paralyzed by the walkout, and it does not appear that the workers are going to heed the warning of the civil

governor to return to work or face immediate dismissal.

This demonstration had its origins in a parade of angry women who marched on the governor's palace last Monday protesting that the price of eggs was far above the official ceiling. The women demanded action against the ration officials and then began breaking eggs in the stores.

They were immediately dispersed, but on the following day "flying squads" of workers appeared in factory after factory all over the town calling upon their comrades to follow them into the streets in a general protest strike.

NOT INTIMIDATED

The flying squads met with complete success, and within a few hours the business of the entire city was immobilized. The civil governor then issued his threat to dismiss the demonstrating workers, as civil governors in Spain have done in vain in the other areas in which general strikes have been staged in recent months.

When the workers refused to take notice of the governor's words, the local militia was called out, and though they did not dare to try to force the workers into the plants, they did fire their tom-

my-guns into the air and showered blows upon the demonstrators with nightsticks.

It seems certain, however, that the strikers will not be intimidated and will, like their comrades in Barcelona, Bilbao, Azcoitia and elsewhere continue their protest for a full forty-eight hours. The government seems unable to employ the army to quell the uprisings. However, it is becoming ob-

vious that the Madrid government is being shaken by these general strikes as reports indicate that troops are being sent to Bilbao, scene of a huge walkout last month, "in preparation for possible disorders there."
A showdown on the Franco tyranny versus the Spanish people comes closer at every outburst despite Washington's moves to prop up El Caudillo.

NOT IN THE HEADLINES . . .

A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, minority groups, national and world politics—\$2 a year.

Next—A Labor Party!

by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty, Simple Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party
25 cents a copy

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

"THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV"

A Novel of Modern Russia

by VICTOR SERGE

\$3.00

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

MacArthur-Truman Battle — —

(Continued from page 1)

There is no purpose served in standing appalled before the realization that this would leave Korea a prey to Stalinism. Korea is a dead duck as far as that is concerned—because of the policies followed by U. S. and Russian imperialism up to now. The big problem of stopping Stalinism does not now revolve around the Korean peninsula, but around how to stop Russian totalitarianism in the rest of Asia and in Europe, all over the world.

The continuation of the U. S. adventurist intervention in Korea stands in the way of this objective, it does not aid it—not even if (some day!) it eventually leads to a sterile military "victory." Above all, it stands in the way of the solution which Truman himself shadowily pointed to: the mobilization of the peoples oppressed by the Kremlin against their own masters.

We emphasize: Whatever popular appeal MacArthurism has (and it has shown plenty) is due to the fact that he SEEMS, at least, to offer a visible way out of the war. As we said, it is by scattering the burning brands of war even farther! And this is why, indeed, in the not-so-long run, the MacArthur euphoria in the country is not and cannot be deep-rooted as far as the masses are concerned.

GOP Dons the War-Paint

For a few days, the GOP leaders were beside themselves with MacArthur frenzy. They had worked themselves into what would eventually have been an extremely unpopular position with the people of the country. In hailing General MacArthur's policy for broadening the scope of war in the Far East, they were earning the title of "war party" for the GOP.

Senator Taft, the "intellectual" (save the word!) leader of the party—a man noted for never having been right on a single forecast or important opinion in foreign affairs—endorsed MacArthur's program while at the same time he called for a reduction in the armed forces and the military budget. The isolationist-tinged Midwesterners like Capehart, Dirksen, Wherry and Wiley, suddenly became militant opponents of "appeasement" and the champions of a more active military policy.

WITH KID GLOVES

But these men did not really express their own views, assuming they had any really consistent ones. They were really megaphones for The Great Man's speeches which changed in content daily. What started out as a loud demand for extending the war to Chinese soil, boiled down to the quiet opinion that bombing should be employed together with a planned invasion by Chiang's Formosan army—without the use of American troops! This until

the semi-public hearings in the Senate sub-committees. Here MacArthur showed the stuff he was made of.

In the hearings, The General had to get down to facts and face a little questioning (we say a little, because the "statesmen" of the Senate could never forget that they were talking to a Great Man, a military man who had flouted the civilian authority to which he was subordinate and actually had become more popular than he had any right to be). He was treated delicately and with kid gloves even by administration supporters who could hardly follow the successive contradictions of the new spokesman for the Far Eastern warmongers and the China lobby.

SUDDENLY IGNORANT

In outlining a realistic political and military program, MacArthur suddenly became reticent, modest, unknowing, suspiciously coy, and transformed from a great "world leader" to a little man who was merely a "local theater commander" who could not be expected to know the global problems involved in the present-day political and military situation. He demonstrated that he was as provincial-minded as his ignorant supporters and blatherskites like Fulton Lewis



Jr., whose nightly ravings on air are calculated to incite mob reactions to all important and difficult problems of present-day society.

At one point in his testimony MacArthur proclaimed his course as the only one which could guarantee a victory in Korea, even if it should lose the allies of the United States. We can do it alone, he shouted. And not only in the Far East, but everywhere else, in Europe, on three or four fronts, if necessary. . . .

But aren't you for maintaining our allies, he was gently asked. Of course, it would be "tragic" if we lost them!

For the kind of war you want, isn't it necessary to be strong, fully armed and fully prepared? Of course! Well, then, general, what would you say about a prominent Senator who recently said in the Senate that he was for extending the war in the Far East but demanded the army be cut in size and the military budget reduced? I do not intervene in politics!

What do you think of the joint chiefs of staff, general? I think highly of them. Are they competent men? Highly competent. You have no doubt about their integrity? None at all! Their personal

integrity? Unquestionable. And General Bradley? Of, course, of course. Now, then, general, if you believe this country needs to be strong and prepared so that it could withstand any threat, and if you have such confidence in the joint chiefs, and if they said universal military training is a necessity would you support them? And here, the old fading-away-soldier-turned-politician-with-an-eye-on-the-Republican-presidential-nomination, replied that he could not answer such a question on its face, that he would have to study the facts!

General, you have stated that the people in Asia need food and shelter and security. What do you think of Point Four then [the anemic administration program for aid to the backward areas of the world]? I am not familiar with it and cannot express an opinion.

MARSHALL ATTACKS

On one important question after another, he disqualified himself for fourteen years, had no opportunity to study the larger political and military questions, and was not fully familiar with the world problems which American foreign policy had to contend with.

The testimony is altogether too long to allow further illustration of what is essentially a bankrupt position expounded by a military commander at odds with his higher command and frustrated because he cannot win a victory in a war which was untenable to begin with. It is an impotent rage which would call for an expansion of war that might bring a world conflict tomorrow and atomic warfare that could destroy so much of the world we know today.

It did not cost General Marshall, currently secretary of defense, too much effort to establish a telling case against MacArthur on one level.

Insofar as General MacArthur specifically is concerned, Marshall cited the series of conflicts between the Far Eastern commander and the administration and the joint chiefs, his violations of instructions with regard to taking his differences into the public arena and to political representatives in Congress, all leading to the creation of an untenable po-

sition for himself as a commander subordinate to the president and the joint chiefs.

But of greater importance in Marshall's testimony was the opinion that MacArthur's "proposals" for the war in Korea would not bring victory or an end to the war. He did, however, lend meaning to the phrase "Operation Meatgrinder" by stating that it was the aim of U. S. to inflict such losses on the Chinese armies as to produce a disintegration of Mao's troops and bring the war to a close by making its continuation untenable—and not necessarily by a direct military defeat inflicted on those armies in the field. In other words, the only way out that the administration can see is a drawn-out and wearing military struggle, confined to its present areas and avoiding in this manner the immediate outbreak of THE big Third World War.

WHERE'S LABOR?

It is saddening to note that the American labor movement does not understand the full force of the issues and that it does not inject itself into the new "great debate" with the full force of its millions to stand up against MacArthurism and all that he represents. Instead, and to avoid the real issue, they speak kindly and approvingly of General Ridgway, MacArthur's successor. What a lack of consciousness, perspicacity, courage!

But even more important than the above, the MacArthur controversy emphasizes the importance of American foreign policy and the need for a genuinely democratic foreign policy. Who can and who should initiate a progressive foreign policy that will stand up to Stalinism, halt whatever progress it makes and defeat it in the only way it can be defeated—politically and through the conscious intervention and action of the working classes of the world over—if not a progressive and militant labor movement with a progressive labor foreign policy?

That would indicate, wouldn't it, the need for the independent political organization of labor and its contest for power? Yes, it would and does. This is the crying need of our time and it was never more clearly indicated than today while the "great debate" rages in Washington.

What Is INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM?

For information and literature about the Independent Socialist League, write:

ISL, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Read About Socialism!

- THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISMpage \$1.00
by Max Shachtman cloth 2.00
- SOCIALISM: The Hops of Humanity 10¢
by Max Shachtman
- MARXISM IN THE U. S. 35¢
by Leon Trotsky
- PLENTY FOR ALL: The Meaning of Socialism 25¢
by Ernest Erber
- THE ROLE OF THE PARTY in the Fight for
Socialism (mimeo'd) 25¢
- THE ROLE OF THE TRADE UNIONS: Economic
Role under Capitalism (mimeo'd) 25¢
(Both mimeo'd pamphlets for 40¢)

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

The Handy Way To Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION

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

Please enter my subscription:
 NEW RENEWAL
 6 months at \$1.00
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME
(please print)

ADDRESS

ZONE APT.

CITY

STATE

Bill me.
 Payment enclosed.