

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 6, 1952

FIVE CENTS

UAW Reopens the 5-Year Contract
... page 2

The First Yiddish Daily in Israel
... page 6

New Disclosures on Trotsky's Assassination
... page 4

Russian 'Monroe Doctrine'?
... page 3

THE MOST AMAZING POLITICAL SPECTACLE IN DECADES —

The Candidates Turn Out Their Pockets . . .

By HAL DRAPER

This is the campaign that was going to be waged on a "high level," given such eminent gentlemen as Eisenhower and Stevenson at the head of the major tickets. Remember? It is a bit difficult to remember at the moment.

The campaign has bogged down—or flared up—into the dirtiest mess in decades. Most of the public's attention is concentrated on the efforts of each of the leading candidates to prove to a skeptical public that he is *not* a crook. This is not happening in some Latin American republic but in the most powerful nation in the world.

It is an amazing political spectacle, if you shift your attention from the details of what is happening. We have made the point before (in LABOR ACTION for April 14) that the corruption issue has reached what is virtually a new stage in the United States. The present opening of the muddy sluiceways serves again to underline the main thought.

This, to be sure, is not the first American presidential campaign in which charges of corruption were a leading issue. That was so in the campaign against Jackson and his spoils system in 1832, and against Van Buren in 1836. It was so in the Hayes-

Tilden contest in 1876, after the graft record of the Grant administration. It was so, most recently, in 1924 when the Democrats tried to capitalize on the exposures of the Harding grabfest. But in all of these cases it was the Out Party yelling, with perfect truth, about the sins of the In Party.

The pattern that we pointed to last April holds again this September in the current bout between the pot and the kettle. If ever there was an issue on which the Democratic Party and the Republican Party are indistinguishable Gold-Dust twins—Tweedledee and Tweedledum—it is this one. There never has been a time when the amount of well-publicized corruption has been so thoroughly bipartisan.

"Some politicians," writes Washington columnist Doris Fleeson in the N. Y. Post for September 29, "do not believe the issue can or should be kept alive during the campaign. Both parties, they think, have been hurt and should retire it."

Those are wise words of advice, but neither party can heed them. For neither side can "retire" the issue, just as it was neither party that brought up this question of kept congressmen.

Earlier this year the heat was on the record of the Truman administration. We

(Turn to last page)

Another Place for the Little Man
To Look for Big-Business Corruption



The ISL Urges: VOTE SOCIALIST!

The twin parties of capitalism, the Republican and the Democratic, are offering their presidential candidates to the people once again.

The working class appreciates the importance of this year's election. Its organized section, the trade unions, have almost unanimously decided to take an active part in the campaign. Faced by the strong possibility of a Republican victory, most of the unions in the country have hastened to endorse the Democratic Party or its candidates and to muster all their strength to assure their victory. Even the AFL has found itself impelled to abandon the traditional, conservative, obsolete Gompers policy of "no politics" and to adopt instead an endorsement of the Democratic candidates.

In one respect, we welcome these developments, especially the most recent action of the AFL convention, for a number of reasons. We have long advocated the long-overdue need for the labor movement to enter actively and resolutely upon the road of political action, so that it can realize its interests and make its power felt in the field which is, especially nowadays, the most important of all, the political field. We have long emphasized that the workers are a

distinct class with distinct class interests, and that just as they defend these interests by organizing on a class basis in the economic field, they must likewise organize on a class basis in the political field.

Labor in a Trap

The decision of the unions to enter the election campaign as labor unions, which means the political mobilization of the workers as a class, is an unexpressed acknowledgment of the truth that we socialists have always put forward. Finally, the desire to prevent the Republican Party from coming to power, not so much because of the individuals who compose it, but because of the reactionary, capitalist, anti-working-class program and tactics they represent,

Bevan Victory

As we go to press, news reports indicate a sweeping victory by the Bevan wing of the British Labor Party at the current party conference, in the elections to the National Executive among the constituency Labor Party branches. We plan to bring our readers the fullest accounts of this conference beginning with next week's issue.

shows a growing political consciousness in the labor movement and a determination to stop the advance of reaction in the country.

However, the fact that these progressive political developments have been enclosed within the framework of the Democratic Party means that labor's aspirations will continue to be thwarted, that labor still remains in a political trap which can only assure defeats and disasters. Proof of this is abundantly available in this election.

Scrap of Paper

The failure of the official labor movement to form an independent labor party of its own, and its commitment in advance to the Democratic Party and its candidates, is not only a tragic mistake in general, but in particular in the 1952 elections. This abject commitment made it possible for the Democratic Party bosses to take the support of the unions and their leaders for granted, and therefore to act in any way they pleased.

The party bosses saw to the adoption of a platform which is a scrap of paper only, and therefore a deception from beginning to end. The

(Continued on page 7)

UAW Reopens Five-Year Contracts on New Demands

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Sept. 28—The modest demands made by the top leadership of the United Auto Workers (CIO) on the major auto corporations, although contract reopening dates are better than two years away, reflect the deep dissatisfaction and pressures of the men in the shops.

As the rising cost of living cuts down standards in spite of the escalator clause and the so-called annual-improvement-factor raise, the gripes and tensions in the plants intensify. In recent months, this process has been given further impetus by two major factors: (1) the widespread unemployment for weeks at a time, first because of the steel strike and then model change-overs, and (2) the usual speedup drive of the auto companies as production on 1953 models begins.

Using the vague language in

the contracts regarding the annual improvement factor as their excuse, the corporations, General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler are trying to get more production per man, based on more sweat per man rather than technological advances. In fact, the companies use technological advances to speed up the individual.

RESENT SPEEDUP

Some of the new production rates proposed by the companies remind one of the pre-union days. Since the policy of the auto union is to settle these questions through grievance procedure, and the umpires use the contracts to make rulings that take away established rates of work, the speed-up becomes an inexorable process.

In this connection, the proposed change in the annual-improvement factor, from 4 to 5 cents per man per hour per year, has sig-

nificance only if the union obtains a clearer statement directed against the use of this clause for speedup.

How strongly the rank and file feel about this is shown in the number of cases where top seniority men fight for lower-priced classifications because the work is so much easier and off the assembly line.

What the reaction of the corporations to the new demands of the UAW-CIO will be remains a corporation secret. Besides the change in the annual improvement factor, the union is asking that a new ceiling on the base rate of pay—adding 21 cents out of the 26 cents of escalator-clauses raises to base pay rates—and increases in pension payments be given by the corporations to the union.

It may be recalled that in the fall of 1950 when the pressure in the Chrysler shops was great enough—wildcat strikes, etc.—the company scrapped a three-year contract and wrote a new one which included a 10-cent raise, an escalator clause and the improvement factor.

PROFITS BIG ENOUGH

Since the auto companies have made tremendous—in fact, fabulous—technological improvements, thereby greatly increasing productivity per man, the granting of the UAW-CIO demands would hardly be a financial burden.

The Ford Company, for example, has created one billion dollars worth of new plant equipment since the war, and yet has shown a great profit every year.

Chrysler Corporation made \$37,000,000 in the first six months of 1951 with the production of nearly 850,000 units. In the first six months of 1952 it made \$43,000,000, although it produced 200,000 fewer units! Labor-saving machines, etc. are being put into the plants daily, as auto workers are finding out when they are called back to work after the layoffs.

IN THE BAG?

In addition, the UAW is seeking to apply the escalator-clause principle to its pension plan, whereby GM would give a cost-of-living bonus to pensioners so as to restore their purchasing power as of the signing of the pension plan in 1950. At present there are some 7000-odd GM workers on pension receiving an average of \$38 a month from GM plus social security.

Finally a separate substantial wage increase is being sought for the skilled-trades workers firmly based upon the scarce labor market rather than on any "living document" contract reasoning.

It is difficult to see where the raising of these economic demands by the UAW is going to cause any difficulties with GM. "Exploratory talks" have already been held. Keeping in mind the

(Continued on page 6)

ASK NEW BASE

In 1950 the UAW accepted GM's figure of 2½ per cent as being the annual increase in workers' productivity, although the union claimed it to be much higher. At the average wage of \$4.60 per hour for the GM worker in 1950, this 2½ per cent was translated into 4 cents per hour to be added to the base rates. Today, the GM worker's average wage is \$1.95 an hour in that the escalator clause has risen from 3 cents to 26 cents and the base rates have increased 12 cents through three annual improvements. Using GM's figure of 2½ per cent, the UAW reasons that 2½ per cent of \$1.95 is 5 cents per hour instead of 4 cents and is demanding the additional penny.

Furthermore, the union points out that while the escalator clause has risen from 3 cents to 26 cents, GM workers conceivably could lose the entire 26 cents should the economy tailspin. Ironically, while the UAW's fight before the Wage Stabilization

Gordon Haskell's Tour

By the time this issue reaches you, the national ISL organization and speaking tour of Gordon Haskell, assistant editor of LABOR ACTION will have covered the West Coast.

At the time of this writing, Haskell is addressing a series of meetings in Seattle and the surrounding area. Upon completion of his activities there, he will continue on to the Middle West where, omitting his stop at Kansas City, he will begin with a stop in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Meetings for Haskell in the Middle West and East will concentrate on the presidential election campaign, at which time he will present the socialist viewpoint of the ISL, calling attention to the need for an independent labor party.

The remainder of the tour schedule follows below. While in Chicago, he will cover surrounding towns, including Streator, Ill. At Detroit, he will visit Ann Arbor and possibly Lansing, Michigan. Haskell will also cover Akron during his stay in Cleveland and then move on to complete his tour with three meetings in Pennsylvania.

Milwaukee	October 6-7
Chicago Area	October 10-15
Detroit Area	October 16-19
Cleveland Area	October 20-22
Pittsburgh	October 23-24
Philadelphia	October 25
Reading	October 26
Newark	(Date Open)

Successful Meetings Mark Haskell's Bay Area Visit

OAKLAND, Calif., Sept. 29—The democratic alternative to the course of the U. S. today. Although great numbers of students support the Democratic Party and Governor Stevenson, there was no real opposition to his measured criticism of the role played by this party in instituting the present drive against all radical and liberal thinking under the guise of fighting "communism." "Reactionary Stalinism is not the main domestic threat to our civil liberties," he insisted. "The government's 'loyalty' program, backed up by the growing pressure of McCarthyism, is in blatant contradiction to the alleged program of saving democracy all over the world. How can we save democracy abroad if we curtail and seriously undermine democracy at home?"

The reason for this contradiction in behavior was related to the actual foreign policy of the present administration, its inability to win allies, its fear of Stalinism, its support to reactionary regimes, its attempts to save and prop up capitalism all over the world. Haskell presented the case for a democratic foreign policy—a policy which could win allies abroad and stop the advance of Stalinism all over the world.

During his visit, Haskell spoke twice under the auspices of the Socialist Youth League of the University of California. His street meeting at the university's Sather Gate drew a crowd of over 100 students and faculty members of the university and was the kickoff for local political activity on the campus this year.

Haskell was introduced to the audience by Bob Martinson of the SYL, who explained the educational nature of socialist electoral activity in America, decried the ballyhoo which accompanies U. S. elections and asked for a critical and questioning attitude toward both parties and their candidates.

AT SATHER GATE

Although pressured by "loyalty oaths," administration maneuvers and attacks by the Berkeley City Council, the university community has resisted the attempts of last year to destroy Sather Gate as a free-speech area for the East Bay. The combined phalanx of paid city photographers, administration stool-pigeons and FBI agents that "livened up" every meeting last year was not so much in evidence. These forces have managed to intimidate the university but have failed to still student curiosity in the ideas of the anti-administration forces.

The fact that the UAW leadership has called for improvements in the present contracts between the companies and the union is a tacit admission that many features of the 5-year contracts can't stand waiting five years, from the standpoint of the men in the shops, for modification and change.

The demand for adding 21 of the 26 cents escalator-clause payments to base rates shows a concern over the possible accuracy of the CIO Economic Outlook prognosis that 1953 will see a recession. If that were to develop and auto workers took a 21-cent pay cut, the Reuther administration would face the crisis of its life, and it knows it.

Attempts to throttle fair and honest reporting by the student newspaper—the Daily Californian—were also frustrated last year. Regent John Francis Neylan, reactionary Republican and leader of the attack on the freedom of speech and thought long enjoyed at this state university, has so far been unsuccessful in silencing the critical voice of the student paper, although he managed to force upon the paper, last year, an "Advisory Board" whose exact functions are not clear but which stands as a constant threat to the integrity and independence of student journalism.

Given this atmosphere, the meeting was very successful. It was the first meeting of the new semester and the only meeting since Socialist Party candidate Darlington Hoopes spoke here during the summer. There was no heckling and a great deal of interest in Haskell's criticism of the present state of civil liberties and U. S. foreign policy and his statement of a

democratic alternative to the course of the U. S. today. Although great numbers of students support the Democratic Party and Governor Stevenson, there was no real opposition to his measured criticism of the role played by this party in instituting the present drive against all radical and liberal thinking under the guise of fighting "communism." "Reactionary Stalinism is not the main domestic threat to our civil liberties," he insisted. "The government's 'loyalty' program, backed up by the growing pressure of McCarthyism, is in blatant contradiction to the alleged program of saving democracy all over the world. How can we save democracy abroad if we curtail and seriously undermine democracy at home?"

The reason for this contradiction in behavior was related to the actual foreign policy of the present administration, its inability to win allies, its fear of Stalinism, its support to reactionary regimes, its attempts to save and prop up capitalism all over the world. Haskell presented the case for a democratic foreign policy—a policy which could win allies abroad and stop the advance of Stalinism all over the world.



—Photo courtesy of Daily Californian

LONDON LETTER

Charlie Chaplin Hailed Back by British; Ziliacus Is Back as Influence in BLP

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Sept. 24 — Charlie Chaplin's triumphant return to London is the great subject of discussion in the national press right now. His persecution by the witchhunters in the U. S. has given his visit to London a political significance. The fact that Attorney General James P. McGranery has ordered an inquiry to determine whether Chaplin shall be allowed back to the U. S. has, not unnaturally, provoked lively comment in the editorial and correspondence columns of the big newspapers.

The Laborite Daily Herald editorial for Tuesday, September 23, vigorously attacked the unwholesome record of the Committee on Un-American Activities. The Labor Party has thus taken a stand on a particularly dramatic case of the violation of human rights, a stand which has the backing of all sections of the labor movement and liberal opinion in the country.

Charlie Chaplin is the symbol of "the little man" to the British people, the little man who made fun of authority, who scoffed at police forces, at the big capitalists and the fascist dictator. His films, like "Shoulder Arms," "The Great Dictator," and "Monsieur Verdoux," had a lesson to teach, a moral to be drawn.

Charlie Chaplin's return to London takes us back two or three decades when "the little man" was completely at the mercy of an unmodified capitalism unable to cope with the millions of disabled at the end of the great war, unable to provide work for millions of unemployed men. In his portrayals the British "little people" see their own recent past and the reasons why they look to the Labor Party and a new Labor government to ensure against its return under the Tories.

IN-BETWEENER

Emanuel Shinwell has said it again. He has challenged the present secretary of state for war, Anthony Head, to deny the fact that a "giant" in the War Office had supported his demand for reduction in the term of military service to 12 months. An editorial in the New Statesman and Nation quite rightly points out that if Shinwell really intends to stand by his demand, he has placed himself to the left of even Aneurin Bevan.

The News Chronicle of September 20 is very concerned with Shinwell's adamant views on the subject because, as it points out, General Omar Bradley has rejected Shinwell's views on Britain's contribution to NATO.

It will be interesting to see if Shinwell intends to take the struggle to the coming Labor Party conference at Morecambe. His previous anti-Bevan stand will not, however, endear him with the left wing, and his present conversion to a kind of "Bevanism" will not help him in his relations with the official wing of the party and the trade unions.

HE'S BACK AGAIN

Kenneth Ziliacus is coming back into the political limelight again, after his readmission to the Labor Party a few months ago. Already a large number of constituency Labor Parties have asked him to stand as their parliamentary candidate. If he gets into the next House of Commons, he will play a very important role in shaping the Bevanites' foreign policy.

His support for Tito has earned him the bitter hatred of the Stalinists, and he is now one of the CP's biggest enemies. His most recent book, *Tito of Yugoslavia*, gives the reader a rough idea of his conception of foreign policy. Firmly tied to the idea of the "coexistence of capitalism and so-

cialism"—we presume that "totalitarian socialism" is his conception of Russia—he holds the view that the Yugoslav break offers a unique opportunity for proving to the Kremlin that the West can coexist with "socialism." His identification of the totalitarian regime in Yugoslavia with socialism is a most unfortunate one, although, to be fair, he does not hesitate to criticize one or two features of the Tito regime.

Ziliacus' plan seems to be: to establish the closest possible relations between the Yugoslav party and the Labor Party as a democratic socialist bridge between Russian totalitarianism and Western capitalism.

THE BIG ILLUSION

In Ziliacus' own words: "The Yugoslav Communists, by their courage, their faith in the people and their determination to include democracy, humanism and the freedom and rights of the individual in the socialism they are building, show that not only is the policy of force based on fear and hatred futile, but a policy of negotiation and compromise with Communism is perfectly possible. The Yugoslav example is proof that common interests can be discovered between Communist and non-Communist states on which we can make a peace that will endure, because it is animated by the common purpose to extend democracy from the political into

the economic field and to knit the people of the world together in a system of world government."

This statement of Ziliacus' views is particularly important as it makes it quite clear that to expect the left wing in the Labor Party to take certain a-priori forms of development at this early stage in its maturing is to expect something that simply will not happen. The left wing is amorphous, confused and contains views, opinions and tendencies ranging from Titoism to semi-Stalinism, from pacifism to neutralism.

It must be stated that the left wing is still wedded to the idea of the coexistence of the two world systems, with Britain acting as a bridge or mediator. The resolutions sent to the Labor Party conference on East-West trade, big-power conferences, etc., indicate not a conscious pro-Stalinism but a genuine (if naive) hope that somehow or other we can get back to the good old days when Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt could talk things over and settle the world's problems over a drink of vodka.

However, this is no reason for despondency. Only incurable sectarians here think that the left wing should be able to skip over these amorphous stages with the aid of obscure journals. Still, it points to the important tasks which consistent left-wingers face in trying to clarify the policy of the Bevan group.

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Sept. 24—On the 12th of September, 1952, the Ethiopian New Year, Haile Selassie ratified the treaty of federation between Eritrea and Ethiopia. The next day, large crowds collected in Asmera, the capital, to watch the Ethiopian flag being run up in place of the British flag.

But a very unpleasant incident marked the handing over of power from the British to the Ethiopians in Eritrea. For reasons which the British government has yet to explain, 75 modern buildings were destroyed, apparently wantonly. These included a customs house, warehouses, a hospital, a cement factory, a floating dock and other valuable equipment. At Otumlo 500 oil reservoirs were destroyed, while at Fatma Dari a potash factory was demolished; at Zulla 400 modern houses were demolished.

The British government will have to talk, and talk fast. Was this merely an administrative mistake of somewhat immense proportions—and if so, who was responsible? Or was it the last spiteful act of an imperialist?

BAD CONSCIENCE

Otherwise the transfer of power marked an event unique in modern history. During the 19th century there had been an imperialist scramble for Africa. Largely because of its then geographical inaccessibility, Ethiopia was the only country, besides

Liberia, which kept its self-government.

These two countries managed to avoid notice because they are distinguished neither for their mineral wealth nor their strategic position.

However, the rapacious Fascist government in Italy decided that Ethiopia would make the last "game." After provoking a number of border incidents in 1934, General de Bono crossed the frontier from Italian Eritrea on October 3, 1935. At the same time Graziani attacked from Somaliland. In seven months, by the use of tanks, bombs and poison gas, the gallantly fighting Ethiopians were defeated.

Within a few sordid months, Lord Halifax, the British foreign secretary, recognized the Italian conquest. Practically every major country, except the U. S., Russia, China, Mexico and New Zealand, accepted the rape of Ethiopia despite the previous resolution of the League of Nations (in 1932) "not to recognize any situation brought about by means contrary to the Covenant."

The hasty diplomatic about-face of the imperialist powers before the war left them with an extremely bad conscience after it. They began to talk of Haile Selassie and Ras Inerau as "the first victims of fascist aggression," despite the fact that their attitude of non-intervention had played into the hands of the aggressors just as in Spain.

UN TAKES OVER

On July 3, 1941, the last Italian forces surrendered to a force of Belgians. The British government immediately issued a statement defining its relations with the Ethiopian government and the reasons for its stay in the country.

The whole of the East African Italian empire — Italian Somaliland, Eritrea and Ethiopia—was now a power vacuum, which the British government was not slow to fill. However, these regions are so poor and backward that they decided to leave the fate of the Italian colonies in Africa to the United Nations.

Seeing that no great imperialist power had yet landed a heavy foot there, Haile Selassie became interested. Looking back in history, he reminded the Council of Foreign Ministers in London that the Ethiopian empire had been split by the Ottoman invasion of Eritrea in 1850. In 1881 General Gordon, the British imperialist, had gone to Ethiopia after the Egyptian forces had been defeated there, and accepted the suzerainty of the Ethiopians over Eritrea.

UNIQUE EVENT

There were also some very cogent economic reasons for the desirability of Ethiopian federation with Eritrea and Somaliland. The former country always had a financial deficit because of its lack of communication with foreign countries except through the latter. There were very many Eritreans in Ethiopia in high administrative positions. Fifty per cent of the population of Eritrea (about a half million out of a total of one million) are Coptic Christians, like the Ethiopians.

All these arguments were powerful enough to persuade the UN on December 2, 1950, that Eritrea should be federated with Ethiopia. The federation was to be one in which Eritrea would have autonomy in all local and domestic matters but would be under Ethiopian auspices internationally.

The historic importance of this decision is that it is probably unique in modern history for a colony to be handed over for federation with another of equal "international status." Kwame Nkruma, prime minister of the Gold Coast, is reported to have commented very favorably on the happy marriage and equal terms of the two Negro countries.

Britain Gives Up Eritrea With Last Spiteful Growl

Russian 'Monroe Doctrine'?

By GORDON HASKELL

The American press is speculating that one of the purposes of the forthcoming congress of the Russian Communist Party will be to proclaim a "Monroe Doctrine" for the whole area extending from Berlin to Canton. This speculation is based chiefly on a document which is purported to have been furnished the State Department six years ago by the Sino-Korean Peoples League, which is described in the press as an "anti-Communist underground party." It is a report of a speech made by a Russian official in Siberia in 1946 in which he predicted that a "Monroe Doctrine" for Eurasia would be proclaimed in 1952.

Of course the publication of this document has given a further boost to the American obsession with the idea that Stalin is operating on the basis of a "world plan," or even a "world timetable" of operations. For people who think that revolutions and other mass movements are "fomented" by small groups of "professional conspirators" it comes quite naturally to think that Stalin's world counter-revolution can be and is tailor-made in the same manner.

NO TIMETABLE

Further, the failure of America's patchwork, improvised foreign policy to make real headway in winning solid allies, and even greater failure to win mass support outside the United States, lends a peculiar attractiveness to the rationalization that Stalin's successes can be attributed to the Politbureau's ability to proceed according to a long-range "timetable."

If there be any basis to the story that the Russian Stalinists planned in 1946 to proclaim a "Monroe Doctrine" in 1952 which would include a China which at the earlier date had not yet been conquered by Mao's party machine, it would seem to be just the opposite of proof that the Politbureau's "timetable" was able to predict the conquest of the country by 1952. A "Monroe Doctrine" only makes real sense if it is proclaimed for territory which has not yet come under the

direct control of the country which is proclaiming it. It is a political instrument which is intended to interdict the political or military intervention of other powers in an area which the proclaiming government does not control, but which it wishes to establish as an exclusive sphere of influence pending future disposition.

Thus it would make little sense for the American government to proclaim a "Monroe Doctrine" for Alaska. That territory is a property of the American government, and military or other encroachment on it by other powers would be expected to elicit the same response from the American government as an encroachment on any one of the forty-eight states.

OVER WHAT AREA?

Today a similar situation applies to the whole territory to which the Russian "Monroe Doctrine" is to be applied, according to the guesses of the American papers. Formerly, the satellite governments in Eastern Europe and the government of China have mutual defense pacts with Russia which give ample warning to any would-be intervenor on their territory. Actually, the satellites are provinces of Stalin's empire, while China is more analogous to a kingdom which owes definite and enforceable allegiance to it. This is why to proclaim a "Monroe Doctrine" over this territory would make little if any sense.

In 1946, when most of China was still in the hands of Chiang Kai-shek, the proclamation of a "Monroe Doctrine" extending to Hong Kong would have been a significant act. That would have been a warning to the United States to get out or keep out of China on penalty of having to reckon with Russia if she failed to do so. It would have had the advantage of a real analogy to the situation which evoked the original Monroe Doctrine as applied by the United States to Latin America in 1823. That is, without openly implying the intention of Russia to conquer China, it would have constituted a powerful political interdiction

of American efforts to build up China as a potential ally and base of operations against Russia.

Today, a Russian "Monroe Doctrine" would only have political meaning if it were proclaimed not for the satellites and China, but for border territories such as Iran, Burma, Siam, Indonesia and, perhaps, India. It might even be extended to portions of the Middle East which are not contiguous to Russian territory, and in which the United States and its NATO allies do not have a military foothold.

"STALIN DOCTRINE"?

In effect, such a proclamation would be closer to a Russian "Truman Doctrine" than to the "Monroe Doctrine." The former, it will be recalled, states American intention to prevent the conquest by Stalinism of any countries over which it does not have control at present. As it has been proclaimed in rather vague terms, it does not actually indicate what America would do in any specific case of the extension of Stalinism or of Russian intervention. But it has had the effect of claiming as the American sphere of influence that part of the world which is not under actual Stalinist control.

If the Russian Stalinists are actually contemplating some kind of a major statement of world policy at their party convention next month, it would appear that only some kind of a "Counter-Truman Doctrine" would make sense. If in proclaiming it, they actually mention the Monroe Doctrine as a precedent, that would be only because of the greater respectability which the policy of 1823 has achieved through age.

The Stalinists should be aware of the fact that throughout Latin America the Monroe Doctrine has rightly been for over a century a symbol of Yankee imperialism. If they should actually invoke it as a precedent in any proclamation they may issue, it would simply mean that the imperialists of the Kremlin have become so arrogant that they disdain to conceal their aims.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERESTED? Get Acquainted

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- 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.....

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:
 Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00
- NEW RENEWAL
 Bill me. Payment enclosed.

NAME
ADDRESS APT.....
CITY
ZONE STATE.....

Readers Take the Floor...

Population And Hunger

To the Editor:

As a reader of LABOR ACTION I was disappointed by the lack of acquaintance your reviewer of that population book of some weeks ago apparently has with the sociology and biology of animal populations and natural resources. [The reference is to Carl Darton's column in "You and Science" for July 28, reviewing De Castro's *Geography of Hunger*.—Ed.]

Most people do not realize that it is an absolutely abnormal thing for an animal population to increase so tremendously as the human population has been doing lately. When animal populations do this, it is almost always a precursor of famine and disease or migration, as with the lemmings, the snowshoe rabbits, and the ruffed grouse, or the grasshoppers that form locust plagues.

Most animal populations are kept a community of healthy, vigorous individuals by predators that weed out the sickly, injured and aged, or their reproduction is limited by the amount of suitable territory for mated pairs.

Mankind has managed to kill off its predators but without taking over the responsibility for regulating the size of its population. Older methods of population control such as infanticide, celibacy, or deferment of marriage until an adequate financial stake has been accumulated are now considered barbarous and outmoded.

The causes of modern overpopulation and its resulting misery are not unconscious and uncontrollable, as so many kindhearted but shortsighted people like to think. The catastrophic increases in underfed people in already overcrowded countries such as Japan, Egypt, and Puerto Rico are largely due to the well-meaning introduction of only one aspect of modern civilization—public health measures—to populations which had depended for keeping their numbers low enough to avoid starvation on a high infant mortality and epidemic diseases.

I think, as only one species

among the thousands in the world, we owe something to the other inhabitants. At present, consciously or unconsciously, the efforts of most of mankind are being turned toward crowding out every other species, no matter how beautiful or interesting. We are turning the world into a China, in which no animals will survive except in captivity, like the Pere David deer (only living evidence there were once marshes around Peking), or plants except in cultivation, like the ginkgo tree.

If the reviewer would study the extensive literature on the subject, he would discover that every day there is less good crop land in the world and there are more people whom it must sustain. The extractive methods of cultivation widely used both in the U. S. and Latin America continue to reduce the amount of good land.

In most parts of the world, people are cutting or grazing down the forests and ruining the watersheds, consequently drying up their local climate and bringing in the deserts as the earlier civilizations did thousands of years ago. Certainly we need political remedies for hunger, but if socialism delays too long, it will find that only a reduction of population can insure a desirable life for the remainder.

People must learn to limit their numbers in such a way that, like most other animals, the average individual has enough room to be healthy and happy, not slowly dying of semi-starvation or consequent disease.

D. W.
Philadelphia, Sept. 5.

We can't say we see why D. W. thinks the Darton review showed "lack of acquaintance . . . with the sociology and biology of animal populations and natural resources." The column was entirely about the problem of human population, and while it is true that man is an animal the problems are qualitatively different. In any case, it was De Castro's conclusions that the column presented, and D. W. does not really seem to disagree with them. The question of animal and plant conservation that D. W. raises did not figure in the review at all.—Ed.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

CANADIAN PUPPETS.—Ammunition, September 1952.

Here's an array of solid facts for your scrapbook, about America's economic colony to the north—from the United Auto Workers (CIO) magazine:

"In 1948, according to the Canada Year Book, non-resident ownership of Canadian industry and business represented about 32 per cent, or almost one-third, of the total capital invested, and the great majority of it was owned in the United States. Even more significant, the *National Accounts*, published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, show that in 1948 over 54 per cent of the dividends paid by Canadian companies went to non-resident owners, and by 1950 this proportion had increased to over 62 per cent. These figures suggest that well over half the stock in the most profitable Canadian companies is owned abroad.

"Still more interesting, however, are the facts brought out by a recent publication of the Bureau of Statistics, *United States Direct Investments in Canada*. By 'direct investments' the Bureau means investment in companies controlled by U. S. citizens or U. S. corporations, either by direct ownership of a majority of the stock or, in certain cases, by ownership of a big enough block to guarantee control.

"Complete figures are available only up to the end of 1946, but indications are that the extent of U. S. control over Canadian companies has been increasing since then.

"In 1946 there were 2,015 Canadian companies controlled by U. S. capital, 1,022 of them in manufacturing industries. In numbers this represents only about three per cent of Canadian manufacturing concerns, but it represents 37 per cent of the total investments in Canadian manu-

facturing. In other words, U. S. capital is concentrated in big corporations. Ford, General Motors and Chrysler are outstanding examples. Although the average size of all Canadian companies, in terms of capital invested, was less than a quarter of a million dollars, 80 per cent of the capital in U. S.-controlled manufacturing companies was invested in 154 companies worth a million dollars or more, representing an average investment of over eight and one-half millions per company. Fifty-five per cent of the capital was invested in 34 companies worth 10 millions or more, with an average investment of more than 22 millions. These figures include a small amount of capital (less than one-fifth of the total) held by Canadian and British investors in these U. S.-controlled companies.

"Several Canadian industries are completely dominated by U. S.-controlled corporations. The larger companies alone (the 154 which are worth a million dollars or more) produce 95 per cent of Canada's motor vehicles, 66 per cent of her refined petroleum, 66 per cent of her electrical apparatus and supplies, 49 per cent of her sheet metal products, 49 per cent of her soap and other washing compounds, 40 per cent of her soft drinks, 34 per cent of her miscellaneous chemical products and 32 per cent of her pulp and paper. In other industries, such as textiles, sugar refining and various miscellaneous industries, U. S.-controlled companies play little or no part. . . .

"Approximately one in every six workers in Canadian manufacturing is employed by one of the 154 larger U. S.-controlled companies, and if the smaller companies are taken into account it is probably true that one Canadian factory worker out of five is employed by a U. S. concern."

New Disclosures on Trotsky's Assassin Add Documentary Proof on GPU Role

The identity of Trotsky's murderer, as first revealed by General Salazar and Gorkin in the book *Murder in Mexico*, has now been confirmed by another source, this time with public documentary evidence. It is now established to the hilt that the assassin was a tool of Stalin's GPU.

The new proof appears in the current (October) issue of *True* magazine and was accumulated by Dr. Alfonso Quiroz, the director of the Bank of Mexico's Department of Special Investigation. The article (written by Murray T. Bloom) explains that Quiroz was the criminologist assigned by the Mexican court in 1940 to make a physical and mental examination of the man who went by the name of Jason or Mornard.

The article suffers from the fact that it omits any mention of the prior revelation by the Salazar book, presenting Quiroz's story as if it were new in all respects, but its contribution is to add much more detail and, as mentioned, documentation.

CLUE IN MADRID

Quiroz had deduced from his examination that Jason-Mornard was a Spaniard. In 1950 he got his opportunity to check this in Spain, after he went abroad to attend a congress of criminologists in Paris. He went first to Barcelona to check Jason's fingerprints, but found that the records of all political prisoners had been destroyed there during the civil war. It was in Madrid that he made his find. It took exactly one minute and 40 seconds in the fingerprint division of the police headquarters. For it happened—no one had thought of checking in this place—that the murderer had been arrested on one occasion in 1935 and his identity was on file.

His real name is Ramon Mercader del Rio (the "del Rio" is, as in such Spanish names, his mother's maiden name, and we can refer to him as Mercader).

He had been arrested for taking part in an underground attempt to form a Young Communist group; at this time he was obviously new and inexperienced; he gave his real name, address, parents' names, etc. His father's name was Pablo Mercader, and his mother Caridad. This information, plus a picture, was in the Madrid police dossier.

THE MOTHER

Back in Barcelona, Quiroz told the police there of his find and they informed him that they had long been of the opinion that their Mercader was the assassin. They explained their silence by saying: "in those days no one was talking to Spain officially. We were outcasts. So why should we volunteer information?"

The rest of the story, as Quiroz tells it, was pieced together from further investigations. Leaving aside the manner in which the supplementary information was obtained, here is a summary of the facts as *True* gives it.

The big influence in the life of Ramon Mercader was his mother, Caridad. His father was opposed to the Stalinist sympathies of his wife. Having joined the CP in Barcelona, by 1925, Caridad "had become so trusted a member that she was made a courier for secret trips to France and Belgium." Pablo died in 1926 and the woman's Stalinist career expanded, to "full-time work for the Communist International." In the late '20s she was among those infiltrating the French Socialist Party for the Stalinists. "The party sent her on occasional courier missions to Belgium and from time to time she probably took Ramon."

SCREEN THE NEWS with LABOR ACTION

A sub is \$2 a year—
Subscribe now!

Caridad returned to Barcelona in the middle '30s, and it was thus that Ramon came to be arrested there. With the outbreak of the Spanish civil war, the mother "was given an important Soviet Secret Police post, ferreting out unreliable members."

IN MEXICO

It was in Spain that she met the Mexican Stalinist artist, David Alfaro Siqueiros, who later organized the machine-gun assault on Trotsky's home in Coyoacan. Siqueiros took up Ramon as a protégé. After the Loyalist defeat, the Mercaders came to Mexico as refugees in November 1936, obtaining their visas by fraudulent means, as it turned out later. By February 1937 the Mexican authorities were looking for them because of the fraud but they had disappeared.

Trotsky arrived in Mexico in 1937, having been given asylum by President Cardenas after every other country in the world had refused. At once, of course, the GPU forces started organizing its plots to take the life of their most feared enemy. It appears that two plans were set in motion; and the first—organized by Siqueiros via a machine-gun assault—failed. The Mercader setup was the second string and had already been set in motion when Ramon found the means to get into the Trotsky household. This part of the story has long been given in detail.

MEDAL FOR MURDER

Quiroz's investigations added the following: He believes that it was Caridad Mercader who persuaded her son to sacrifice his life in order to take Trotsky's.

"Just to make sure that her son's nerve wouldn't fail, Caridad Mercader remained in Mexico City. From time to time she would secretly visit her son—he was staying at the Hotel Montejito—to make sure his courage wasn't failing. She was seen in Mexico at this time by several Spanish refugees. . . .

Youth and Student Corner

Stalinist Line on Teachers' Rights Stands in Way of the Fight

By PAUL GERMAIN

The pro-civil-liberties elements at Brooklyn College certainly have their work cut out for them this semester. Campus liberals and socialists have been faced with the current investigation by the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee into Stalinist "infiltration" of the municipal school system.

Now, in addition, their work has been made more difficult by the antics of the Stalinist group at Brooklyn College.

The current witchhunting activities of the subcommittee have presented an additional problem to those that are usually brought forth in circuses of this sort.

For the most part, liberals and socialists are usually faced simply with the task of defending the right of members of political minority groups to teach or hold office, and of opposing all attempts to include within the criteria of competency for teaching or holding office all questions of personal or public political convictions.

Also, we are obligated to defend the constitutional rights of all witnesses to refuse to testify against themselves on the grounds of the protection offered by the Fifth Amendment.

The additional barrier thrown up against the defenders of civil liberties left in this city, however, and a chief factor in the case here considered, concerns a "legal" city ordinance, Section 903 of the New York City Charter.

According to the *New York Times*, Section 903 carries the stipulation that "any city employee [which necessarily includes instructors and professors at any of the four municipally owned colleges] who refuses to testify before an authorized body on grounds of possible self-incrimination forfeits his job."

In other words, all city employees are, in such situations, "legally" denied the constitutional protection of the Fifth Amendment.

Section 903 Gets Teeth

The repercussions at Brooklyn College have been immediate and expected. Professor Frederic Ewen of the English Department was able to forestall his dismissal by the Board of Higher Education by filing his retirement papers. Because of his thirty years of service, and

the fact that he was not dismissed, Professor Ewen is entitled to the benefits of the faculty pension fund.

Professor Harry Slochower of the German Department, however, while declaring in the witness chair that he is not presently a member of the Communist Party, refused, on constitutional grounds, to testify on any past affiliations with the party. It is the general feeling on campus that the professor will not be with us much longer.

This whole sordid affair, which has also precipitated incidents at Queens and Hunter Colleges, and also at Columbia University, becomes even more interesting when, upon investigation, it is discovered that so-called liberal elements had a hand in the original enactment of this legislation, which now becomes a juridical basis for witchhunting.

Section 903 was first utilized by the Samuel Seabury investigation into the corruption-ridden city administration of the late Jimmy Walker. The Seabury revelations were not long after followed by the La Guardia reform administrations. We need not doubt that the "Little Flower" did not hesitate to use Section 903 against "tin horns," chiselers, racketeers, etc.

At that time, liberals and socialists can perhaps be excused for failing to be sensitive to the implications and potentialities of Section 903, given the fact that it appeared to be a handy weapon against political corruption. Today, and particularly given the uses to which it has been turned, its earlier beneficent motivation can hardly be decisive.

The attitude on the part of the Stalinist elements at Brooklyn College to this bit of jurisprudence is most interesting and, given their basically totalitarian and anti-democratic mentality, was to have been expected.

How Not to Defend "Our Teachers"

The line on Section 903 was given its formulation at the first public meeting of a newly organized Stalinist front group, blissfully entitled the "Committee to Defend Our Teachers."

The assembled handful of Young Progressive and Labor Youth League members, and a few assorted innocents, were informed by Miss Charlotte Goldberg of the history of the ordinance and the "suggested" position to be taken on it.

Let us digress for a moment to state that Miss Goldberg herself is a peculiar subject. Readers of the anti-war student magazine *Anvil* and *Student Partisan* may remember her much chuckled-over articles, in the Stalinist sheet *New Foundations*. There, in addition to criticizing *Anvil's* prose content, the author revealed herself as an expert in exposing the "fascist" propaganda to be found in its "Trotskyite" poetry.

However, Miss Goldberg does not have all of her time to spend on such intellectual pursuits. On the Brooklyn campus she is known as the most cacophonous Stalinist hack ever to set foot in this fair college.

But—to get back to our story—the ordinance, all present were informed by Miss Goldberg, was a most useful weapon against crooked politicians and officials, but has turned out to be a most appropos thing when it is used to prevent the invocation by honorable citizens of their constitutional rights—especially when private political convictions happen to be involved.

From this, the hearty group of liberty-lovers went on to adopt as their official position opposition not to Section 903 but only to the methods by which it is currently being put to use. In addition, plans were made for the circulation on campus of a petition, worded accordingly, to be forwarded to the Board of Higher Education.

In the opinion of the Socialist Youth League, such a position, if taken by any truly representative body of students at Brooklyn College, or elsewhere in the city, would be self-defeating. We are not too concerned about Miss Goldberg and her front-group cohorts—who have just about as much chance of covering up the real political nature and composition of their "Committee to Defend Our Teachers" as we have of selling Miss Goldberg a year sub to LABOR ACTION—but of the possible disorientating effects that this line may have on the already confused liberal student body.

A Reminder

And so we would like to present the reminder that constitutional rights are possessed not only by Stalinists, fascists, and all political and racial minorities, but also by those who are justly denounced as "tin horns" and crooked politicians.

We believe in these basic democratic precepts: first, that any man is innocent until proven guilty; and secondly, that the burden of proof of guilt lies with the accuser. In addition, and most important, we hold that the establishment of guilt by any accuser cannot rightfully be attempted by constitutional methods as far as one segment of the population is concerned, and unconstitutionally with regard to another segment—no matter how debased and implicated the latter may appear to be. Unlike Miss Goldberg and her friends, we of the SYL do not believe in second-class citizenship as a juridical institution.

We can only add that the approach of the aforementioned Stalinist committee, reminds us of the CP attitude in the "Good old days" of the Smith Act, that is, when it was used to prosecute only Trotskyists and suspected seditionists for their ideas. We remember how the CP applauded when that expert on Oliver Wendell Holmes, one Max Lerner—he was a "good" guy then, wasn't he, dear friends of the LYL—wrote in *PM* that maybe it would be a good idea, in the case of the Justice Department trial of the suspected seditionists, to throw the "clear and present danger" concept out of the window. But the Stalinists don't applaud Chief Justice Fred Vinson of the Supreme Court when he takes the same approach today.

Perhaps they would all answer—in unison, of course—that Vinson is a "bad" guy who is using the "right" kind of law against the "wrong" people?

In conclusion, we would like to state to all concerned that we hope the Committee to Defend Our Teachers does not become too disturbed by our typically sectarian attitude of opposing authoritarianism wherever and against whomever it rears its ugly head. Why, we shall even continue our policy of defending the civil liberties of Charlotte Goldberg herself, and of her coterie, though one must certainly admit that at times they make the task for us a bit tougher than it need be.

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).....

The First Yiddish Daily In Israel—for the 3rd Camp

By AL FINDLEY

We have just received copies of a daily evening newspaper printed in Israel, the *Democratic Journal*, published and edited by M. Stein of Tel-Aviv. The publication is noteworthy for two reasons.

The first is that this is the only Yiddish daily ever published in Israel.

As is well known especially to readers of LABOR ACTION, the Yiddish language is frowned upon by the Zionists and, though not outlawed by the Israeli government, is subject to many restrictions and discriminations.

Until a few months ago, no plays were permitted in Yiddish. A test case in the high court declared that prohibition illegal, and Yiddish plays were permitted to be presented. However, it is still difficult to get halls, fire permits, etc., except in out-of-the-way places.

While daily papers in most European languages are published in Israel, no permit has been issued for a Yiddish daily. Yiddish, however, has been permitted in weeklies, in magazines, and above all in political meetings.

It was quite a surprise, therefore, to see the *Democratic Journal* publish as a Yiddish daily—especially since this event has not been treated as news by the local Yiddish press here, which has been advocating the rights of the Yiddish language in Israel.

Permission to publish was originally obtained from the British, toward the end of the mandate in 1946, and not from the Israeli government.

Government Revoked Permit

Here we must explain that the Israeli government has carried over many permit laws and other laws from the British regime, unless these have been annulled by further action. The necessity for a permit to publish a newspaper is, of course, the heritage of a colonial administration, and obviously anti-democratic. (Such a permit is different from applications for the allotment of scarce newsprint; for this, a different permit is required. It is not a matter of clearance by the censor; this is still another step. It is purely and simply an attempt at administrative control of the press by the government.)

The Israeli government immediately ordered the *Democratic Journal's* permit revoked, and that the newspaper be closed down. The editor appealed to the high court of justice for an injunction against the government. He was granted a stay, and the government was ordered to show cause why the paper should not be allowed to continue. Though this took place in July, we do not know the outcome, nor whether the paper is still appearing.

The second and more important reason for noting the appearance of this daily is its political point of view. The editor says that "our aim is not merely to fill the need for a Yiddish daily in Israel... we want the *Democratic Journal* to be an instrument in changing Israel to a country where one can and will want to live."

The reference to "want to live" in Israel stems from the fact that the paper directs its appeal to the new immi-

Not in the
Headlines

Footnote on "Thomas vs. the SP"

Once again—as we pointed out in a recent article on "Norman Thomas versus the Socialist Party," Thomas has managed to write a magazine piece on the election campaign without mentioning the existence of the Socialist Party or of the candidates it is running in this election. (He is theoretically supporting the SP candidates.)

The current example is his "The Democrats and Party Realignment" in the *New Leader* for Sept. 29, in which he is supposed to be discussing precisely the question of third parties. He does find space, however, to compliment the Democrats because "a good man was nominated for president," who, he says, made a "tremendous impression" on him. That was Stevenson, of course. (The unmentioned Hoopes is merely the presidential candidate whom Thomas is supposed to be for.)

It is fine irony, worthy of a master hand, that in this same article Thomas—for whom his party's discipline has always been a joke—can write: "I do not believe that, under American conditions, it is wise to seek a mass party held together by the degree of discipline to which the American Socialist Party has been accustomed."

The Nixon Type

"Have you ever tried screwing your face into an expression which shows shame and apathy, desperation and hunger, weariness and illness, pleading and misery—all at the same time?"

That may sound like a comment on Senator Nixon's recent performance on TV, but it isn't. It's the defense presented by a beggar in Rome to explain why his chosen profession is harder work than what other people call a job.

Unreconstructed

The president of the NAM, William J. Grede, not having to run for any political office, frankly declares that he doesn't believe in democracy. So he told students at the University of Wisconsin's School of Banking in an address. "Nothing can be as autocratic as a majority. . . . This word 'democracy' that is bandied across the country and around the world does not even appear in our Constitution or Declaration of Independence."

Orators, he said, should not refer to America as a "bulwark of democracy" but as a "frontier of free enterprise." By free enterprise he means freedom to exploit workers and gouge the public, unhindered by autocratic majorities.

Labor 'Scope

(Continued from page 2)

"enlightened" labor policy of GM, it seems that this is another occasion whereby the UAW will use concessions from GM in return for labor peace as a lever to make additional gains throughout the industry.

Throughout the national conference no mention was made of the need for preparing the ranks for a struggle to win the demands; in fact no mention was even made of the possible need for a struggle. One might be so crass as to write that these new terms, though not yet signed nor sealed, are delivered. Nevertheless, they do represent gains for the auto workers. Yet, it's entirely another matter when one measures the amount of these gains as compared to what could be secured from the healthy auto industry under a shorter term contract.

grants, among whom there is a great desire to emigrate. Naturally, the difficulty of finding a country that will accept them, plus the almost complete refusal of the Israeli government to grant exit visas, makes this an unreal perspective. The paper does carry some factual material on emigration but points out that "emigration solves the problems of only a few, and the real problem is to change conditions."

From a journalistic point of view, the paper seems to be on a par with the other Israeli papers, which are forced to condense everything into one sheet. The *Democratic Journal* is also a one-sheet publication, in tabloid form, and tries to compress news, views, features, etc., into that small compass, with all the difficulties which it creates. It has its compensation, however, in the fact that a small group can equal the output of a well-financed outfit.

Anti-War Policy

On foreign affairs, the paper takes a Third Camp position, opposing both Stalinist imperialism and Western imperialism. It actively advocates Arab-Jewish friendship and unity, and proposes a Near East federation, eventually an Asian federation. In this, and not in "neutrality," it sees the hope of saving the East from becoming a victim of the war and the hope of delaying or preventing a Third World War.

[Its programmatic views in this field were embodied in an editorial which appeared in Stein's Hebrew newspaper *Ha'Iton Ha'Democrati*, which LABOR ACTION translated and published in our issue of December 10 last year, under the heading "From Israel: A Socialist Voice on the War." This year, in our issue of May 26, we also translated and published the election manifesto drawn up by Stein's group when it was planning to run a "Third Camp list" of candidates in the election. The latter article was headed "Israel and Middle East Unity."—Ed.]

In addition, we find in the *Democratic Journal* such statements as "Stalinism is the opposite of Communism," and an emphasis on understanding the upheavals in the Near East. Its reports sympathetically follow these developments and show that peace between Jews and Arabs depends on the emergence of truly progressive forces in the Arab countries.

Appeals to New Immigrants

On the domestic front, the paper, as has been mentioned, directs its appeal to the new immigrants, but it does so on what seems to this writer to be an unnecessarily low and oversimplified level. It accuses the more settled portions of the population of using the misery of the immigrants for their own gain.

One editorial says: "Never in their lives did they have such Frigidaires as now and the Frigidaires are full. They do not need the black market. The millions raised in America are not thrown into the sea; part is used to produce food. The production of food is in their hands and they always have sufficient both in quality and quantity."

"The death rate for children in Israel is 40 per 100. In kibbutzim it is 26 per 1000. But in an immigrant camp 100 out of 300 children died."

The "they" referred to are not the capitalists, not the Zionist leaders, but the older settled inhabitants in general and the Mafai in particular.

Unfortunately, the paper does not present, anywhere, any real positive suggestions for improving the food situation, such as reduction of armament expenditures, diversion of funds from overambitious capital expansion to food and housing, etc. While it may be unfair to demand of a daily paper which is the size of a single tabloid sheet that it do all this in its first weeks of publication, and while it is perfectly true that the immigrants are getting much the worst of the deal, emphasis on this alone seems to me to be agitational oversimplification. Without in the least giving up the fight for a better distribution of the available goods, a more rounded and fundamental analysis of the causes of poverty in Israel could have been presented.

[In the election manifesto of M. Stein's group, referred to above as having been published in LABOR ACTION for May 26, there is an excellent connection made between the economic situation within Israel and the foreign policy of the Israeli government, which, if elaborated, could go far in meeting Comrade Al Findley's criticism.—Ed.]

One of the issues of the *Democratic Journal* carries an appeal by a consumers' society addressed to the Jews of the world, to protest against the Israeli government's tax on food parcels, a tax which is imposed to get dollars. The appeal also says that the "scrip" gift certificates do not buy food at a reasonable price, and urges that packages be sent directly.

ISL Urges: Vote Socialist! — —

(Continued from page 1)

progressive planks in it are worse than meaningless when everybody knows that the failure to carry out these same pledges up to now has been due not so much to the Republicans, who are not the administration party, but to the opposition of outstanding leaders and representatives of the Democratic Party itself.

There is absolutely no reason to believe that the party which failed to get the Taft-Hartley Law repealed, a compulsory FEPC enacted, effective price controls set up, and so forth, when it had power up to 1952, will succeed when it comes to power after 1952.

Brothers Under the Skin

Anybody or anything Democratic—whether senators in office or candidates for the Senate, whether candidates for other national offices, including the presidential offices, whether speakers for the Democratic platform or the platform itself, whether members of the Democratic Party or labor leaders who endorse it—anybody or anything Democratic that says the next Democratic administration will fight for the demands of labor, particularly for those included in the platform, without saying in advance what is to be done about the reactionary Democratic Party leaders who have systematically opposed and sabotaged these demands, is a political hypocrite and a fraud.

The party bosses need these reactionaries in their party, not only because they are brothers under the skin, but because without them it would be impossible at one and the same time to pretend friendship for labor and to be unable to do anything about it. That is why they protected and saved the Southern Democratic reaction at the Chicago convention. For the same reason, they could and did ignore and flout the labor representatives. The party bosses nominated Stevenson and supplemented him with the notorious Sparkman. The bosses knew that once labor had failed to organize a party of its own, it would have no choice—so far as the official labor movement is concerned—than to swallow what was rammed down its throat and to endorse the Democrats with spurious enthusiasm and shameful faces.

Free Field for GOP

By its endorsement, the labor movement has forced upon it the responsibility for an administrative record which it did not determine, for a hypocritical platform which it did not write, for candidates which it had no word in selecting, for a campaign which it has no word in conducting. This utterly unwarranted assumption of responsibility is just what contributes heavily to what labor seeks to avoid—the advancement of Republican reaction, under the auspices of the Republicans themselves, or under the auspices of the Republican-Southern Democratic coalition in Congress.

By its endorsement, the labor movement, which should be assailing the criminal and futile war in Korea from the working-class and genuinely democratic standpoint, is forced to take responsibility for that war. This leaves the Republicans a free field for criticism and attack, which they conduct from a reactionary and chauvinist standpoint, to be sure, but which appeals to the millions who are rightly indignant about the Korean adventure.

Reading the Record

By its endorsement, the labor movement likewise takes responsibility for the always imperialist but always muddleheaded foreign policy of the Democrats, before and after the election. That foreign policy is opposed not only to a truly democratic foreign policy for the U. S., but even to the foreign policy of the present labor movement. But the Democratic trap in which official labor is held keeps its voice silenced. The Republicans are left to attack it from the reactionary and demagogical standpoint, but one which, in the absence of any responsible criticism, appeals to multitudes who are uneasy or in outright opposition to the present foreign policy.

The same holds true in every other important field: with regard to the record of corruption and graft in the administration; with regard to the record of hypocritical impotence on the Taft-Hartley Law and on a serious FEPC law; with regard to its record of failure to keep the standard of living of the people at least by serious price-control measures, while unprecedented profits by the monopolists continue to rise; with regard to its outrageously anti-democratic record of witchhunting, of "loyalty" oaths, of "subversive lists," of "administrative" law, which, far from eliminating McCarthyism, only whetted its vicious appetite and encouraged its monstrosities; with regard to its record of out-and-out strikebreaking in the strike of the railwaymen and then of the miners, a record which cannot be concealed by its hollow pre-election gestures in the steel strike which ended with a modest gain for the workers and a piratical gain for the companies; with regard to its record and shameless claim of a "prosperity" which is based exclusively on the blood being shed in wars going on now and on the blood which the arms economy is preparing to have shed in the Third World War.

Go Independent!

To support the Democrats in the light of all this, serves only to drive into the arms of the Republican reaction those inexperienced and unorganized workers, those among the white-collar groups, those among the middle classes, farmers included, who are discontented with the Democratic record of rule. They place the blame for this record, at least in part, upon the shoulders of the labor movement, which has no real responsibility for it, but yet takes responsibility by its endorsement.

These people see and hear no progressive alternative to Democratic Party rule, which is what the labor movement should offer; in consequence, they fall victim to the reactionary alternative offered by the Republican demagogues.

The present labor political policy, then, is a self-set trap. It not only strengthens the hands of the reactionaries in the Democratic Party, but it also strengthens the hands of the Republican reactionaries. It is a self-defeating policy.

Until labor is in a position to take command of the nation in the name of the people and democracy, it must seek to exact concessions from the capitalist parties and capitalist governments. There is only one way of doing that, and it is the same on the political field as on the economic. It is called the independent organization and action of the workers as a class—trade unions on the economic field, an independent labor party on the political field.

Vote Socialist!

The hypocritical "friends of labor" in the two capitalist parties would have a thousand times more fear and more respect for the working class and its labor movement if it elected just a few of the candidates of its own party, as a beginning, no matter which Democrat or Republican was defeated in the course of the election, than they have for labor when it stands hat in hand at these parties' back doors.

However, the official labor movement, and its leadership in particular, for this election shut off the road to an independent labor party, that invaluable instrument of the working class in every other democratic country of the world. Nevertheless, the thoughtful, class-conscious, responsible workingmen and workingwomen have at their disposal a means of registering a working-class vote, a vote for independent political action by labor, a vote for working-class democracy and freedom and peace. That means is:

VOTE SOCIALIST!

That is what the Independent Socialist League urged in the presidential election of 1948. It repeats its recommendation in 1952. All the reasons why it was so grave a mistake to endorse the Democratic capitalist party, indicate

why it is right and valuable to support a socialist candidate for every office for which one is nominated.

Vote for the SP!

In 1952, the Independent Socialist League believes that the most effective way to "Vote Socialist!" is to cast the vote for the candidates of the Socialist Party.

The Independent Socialist League is unable to endorse the entire program or the policies of the Socialist Party, either before the election campaign or while it is going on. The Socialist Party has not freed itself from the confusion, uncertainty and half-heartedness on some of the most vital questions of our day, the question of the Third World War in particular.

The Independent Socialist League calls for a vote for all the Socialist Party candidates, especially its presidential and vice-presidential candidates, Darlington Hoopes and Samuel Friedman, for particular reasons.

This year—unlike 1948 when we recommended without distinction a vote for any of the three socialist candidates—we select the SP for this electoral support, from among the socialist organizations that have nominated candidates, because the more staunchly socialist and internationalist members of the Socialist Party have succeeded thus far in defeating the efforts of the right-wing members and leaders, notably Norman Thomas, to commit the Socialist Party to support of American imperialist foreign policy and to American imperialism in the Third World War which is being prepared. They have also defeated the right-wing efforts to liquidate the Socialist Party by transforming it into a "left wing" of the New Deal, the role which so many ex-socialists pretend to play as a cover for their base desertion of the fight for socialist peace and freedom.

The Vote That Counts

To "Vote Socialist!" in the 1952 elections therefore means, most effectively, to vote for the candidates of the Socialist Party. It is our duty, and the duty of every socialist and class-conscious worker, to record the largest possible socialist vote this year. It is our special duty, by voting for the Socialist Party candidates, to encourage those in the SP who are resisting the right-wing dissolutionists, to encourage those who want to continue the fight for socialism in the name of socialism, to encourage those who want to see the Socialist Party return—or better yet, to advance—to the internationalist traditions of Eugene V. Debs, to encourage those who grasp the fact that the only progressive way of combating the menace of the Stalinist despotism is to combat capitalist imperialism as an independent, working-class, democratic power.

At the same time, the Independent Socialist League takes this opportunity to renew its intransigent opposition to the Stalinist party and to its electoral tool, the Progressive Party. A vote for this creature of the Kremlin, which endeavors to exploit the democratic and socialist aspirations of tens of thousands of workers, professionals and intellectuals, is a vote to endorse the cruelest tyranny and exploitation in existence today.

To all workingmen and women, to all true progressives, to all students and intellectuals, the Independent Socialist League repeats:

Redouble all efforts to break the labor movement from its exploitation by the parties of capitalism!

Forward to the creation of the new and invincible political power in this country, the Independent Labor Party!

Vote Socialist in the 1952 elections!

Vote for the candidates of the Socialist Party!

NATIONAL COMMITTEE of the
INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE
Max Shachtman, National Chairman
Albert Gates, National Secretary

Get acquainted with THE SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

For information on SYL program and activities, write to:
SYL, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

THE NEW COURSE

by LEON TROTSKY

The Struggle for the New Course

by MAX SHACHTMAN

Both in one book—Trotsky's historic essay on the beginnings of Stalinism, and Shachtman's study of the development of Russian totalitarianism

\$1.50

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

114 W. 14th St.

New York 11, N. Y.

Amazing Political Spectacle —

(Continued from page 1)

stressed then that what was new and unprecedented in the situation was the inability of the administration even to make a pretense of cleaning up. It reached the climax of its fiasco with the firing of corruption investigator Newbold Morris. At the same time it was clear that a real investigation of corruption even at the mink-coat level would deeply involve the GOP as well as the Fair Deal party.

Now the stink raised over the Nixon affair, which the Democrats at first greeted (even if cautiously) as a boon, has also quickly extended itself. It turns out, for example, that a darling of the liberals, Senator Benton, admitted some months ago to a financial arrangement somewhat more malodorous than Nixon's.

But the main counterattack of the Republicans has been against Governor Stevenson, who, it seems, has had a fund or maybe two himself. Let us take a look at the debate about the Stevenson vs. the Nixon Fund—not in order to judge whether one was worse than the other, and still less to apologize for either, but to point up an element common to both, the element moreover which lies at the bottom of the whole Bipartisan Mess in Washington.

Story of Two Funds

"Remember, half the lies they tell about the Dodgers are not true."—Telegram by Walter O'Malley, president of the Brooklyn Dodgers, as reported by the AP.

That will do also as an excellent statement on the charges flying thick and fast over The Funds. It's the other half of the "lies" that concern us.

Last week's LABOR ACTION discussed the case against the Nixon fund. The Stevenson fund is different. But different in what way?

As all our readers must have heard to satiety by now, Stevenson, while governor, accumulated a special fund through contributions to increase the compensation of several of his key appointees in the state administration. By a coincidence the amount of this fund was roughly the same as Nixon's. With this fund Stevenson gave Christmas bonuses to eight state administrators working for him. Donors to the fund included bankers, businessmen, a race-track manager, trade unions, etc.

In evaluating this scheme one can take either of the same two approaches that have been used on the Nixon affair: what we may call the "abstract-legal approach" or the "view-with-alarm approach."

From the abstract-legal point of view, Nixon's political activities were merely being helped out by men who agreed with his policies—being thoroughly reactionary—and who wished to further the kind of political education he was carrying on. There does not seem to be any real evidence that they expected, or that Nixon performed, any special personal favors for them. At any rate, it has largely been denounced, and correctly so, on the ground that the very existence of such a type of support serves to bind a senator to the moneyed interests which are capable of putting out the kind of coin it takes to swing such a scheme.

It is misleading, I think, to emphasize that Nixon "delivered" his votes to suit the interests of his contributors, as for example Kroll of the PAC argued. In a sense, this argument tends to reduce the issue of the Nixon fund to too low a level, to an almost trivial case of plain vote-buying. This may be more effective as election-year ammunition but it puts the stress in the wrong place. The fact is that, at bottom, it was not Nixon who delivered his vote to suit the contributors, but it was the reactionary big-businessman contributors who delivered the cash to build up "their boy," already knowing what kind of votes he cast.

The revelation of the Nixon fund, rather, cast a strong light on the power of money and the possessors of wealth to use this economic power to tie a senator to capitalist apron-strings. It may have been abstractly legal, and even from a non-legal point of view it may be difficult to draw the line between this setup and other forms of subsidization of legislators. In the last analysis that line probably can't be drawn, and it may be futile to try to do so. What gave the Nixon fund its justified impact on the public consciousness was the direct, personal way in which this relationship of capitalist subsidization was set up.

WHAT ARE THE DANGERS

For, as the "view with alarm" approach rightly puts it: even granted that Nixon on his own behalf is as reactionary as his pursestring-holders, what if on any occasion he wished to act differently? Nixon may be consciously innocent of wrong-doing (that is, conscious corruption)—this view would go on to say—but it is the DANGERS of the extension of this kind of setup which make it intolerable.

But if it is a question of the potential dangers inherent in a setup, apart from the actual use made of it, then there are at least questions to be raised about the Stevenson device, which the Fair Deal liberals defend so heatedly as fundamentally different. Here too it can be granted out of hand that the conscious motivation for the salary-stretching Christmas bonuses was unexceptionable. Men, explains Stevenson, were making a financial sacrifice to enter government service; he wanted good men in his offices, and the pay wasn't big enough for good men; therefore the fund.

The Fair Dealers argue that the money went to the officials through Stevenson, and the officials did not even know who the contributors were. This would be a point if what was involved was solely the danger of special favors for the contributors. But, as we have seen in the case of Nixon, this is not properly the main point. The fact that the money went through Stevenson means that

the question mark is not over the appointees but over Stevenson himself.

Does the pattern of this fund setup mean the existence of an external pressure upon an elected official who uses it? It can hardly be doubted that the danger exists, if we are going to view-with-alarm. These contributors were willing to kick in because they wanted to help the Stevenson administration. What if they were to withdraw because of displeasure with the policy of that administration? It certainly is irrelevant at this point merely to claim that Stevenson would have enough integrity to say "Take your money and be damned."

Anyone who wishes to do so is free to argue that the Nixon device is "worse" or "more dangerous." The current issue of the *New Republic* takes this line in an even more peculiar way than most. It actually cites the example of Joe McCarthy's acceptance of a \$10,000 "fee" for signing the Lustron pamphlet, and the fact that "there are numerous instances of lawyer-congressmen seeking government favors for clients," and still it adds: "But the method by which Richard Nixon has added to his income as a senator is the worst of all."

It must take a very fine calculation, using chemical balances to weigh the iniquity, to come to a conclusion in such a comparison. But it is not the matter of degree that we are interested in, with respect to the Stevenson fund pattern.

There is another consideration which might give pause to those who view the funds with alarm. The Stevenson method may not tie the appointed official to the contributor, whom he does not know, but it certainly ties him to the governor who is cashier for the money, and who decides on his arbitrary say-so which official shall get a slice of the pie and how much. To be sure, an appointed official is supposed to be beholden to his chief executive's wishes in any case, but there has been many a time when the independence of an appointed administrator and his willingness to break with the head of the administration over righteous issues has been a valuable element in cleaning out murky corners. The examples are legion. If it is real dangers we wish to forestall, how can we avoid raising questions about a setup where the head of the administration has other methods, besides the correctness of his policy, to exercise pressure for the uncritical loyalty of his department heads?

Again: this may not be "as bad as the Nixon fund," but we are pointing at a different question; and certainly, in any case, it does not matter at this point whether the existence of the setup is "secret" or "public."

STEVENSON'S BLIND SPOT

Now it happens that there is positive proof that Stevenson—who is undoubtedly a personally honest man, even if cynics would add that he can afford to be—IS NOT SENSITIVE TO SUCH DANGERS, the very dangers over which his supporters make such an outcry in the case of the Nixon fund.

This proof lies in Stevenson's statement, made publicly in November 1948, with reference to the dollar-a-year-man scheme whereby corporation and big-business executives come to Washington to administer offices in fields in which their own economic interests lie—not to speak of the economic interests of their corporations.

The dollar-a-year-man arrangement has been defended as an emergency wartime measure, in spite of the notorious practices to which it gave rise. But it was Stevenson who proposed that it be institutionalized. He stated:

"I wish more individuals felt the urge to make the sacrifice to serve the public. I wish that more businesses were disposed to subsidize important employees to serve in public capacities in peacetime as they did so generously in wartime." (My emphasis.)

Note that the motivation for this proposal is exactly the same as for his salary fund in Illinois.

We are not interested in casting reflections on Stevenson's desire to be "ethical," any more than we think the main point about the Nixon fund was along these lines. What is clear is that Stevenson's conceptions about "ethics in government" and the actual dynamics of corruption have a most amazing blind spot. Here he is proposing that government administrators be directly subsidized by their corporations, under circumstances where everyone and his grandmother knows that, at the very best, the subtle influence of economic interest makes objective "public service" an impossibility!

Perhaps, however, the difference is that Stevenson's subsidized men are not to be elected officials but appointees, whereas the subsidized Nixon was an elected official? It is a difference, to be sure, but not one that speaks altogether in favor of Stevenson. In the hearings of the Congressional Committee on Ethical Standards, chaired by Paul Douglas, Senator Humphrey vigorously emphasized:

"Where does the corruption come in? Does it not come from where you have two things—a substantial economic reward, not a two-bit one, or a favor to a very limited group, which reward or favor is administered by a political appointee—repeat, by a political appointee."

In its editorial, the *New Republic* comes to a conclusion which will remedy everything: "a man who serves the public should be paid by the public alone." That is the only possible rule. . . ." (Emphasis in original.) If that is the only possible rule, it was broken by Stevenson as well as by Nixon.

What this discussion of Stevenson discloses is not personal corruption—we can leave such charges on both sides to the campaign orators—but, at the very best, no sense whatever of where the real source of corruption in government lies.

What the earlier scandals of this year revealed about Truman was also not personal corruption but rather his complete inability to fight corruption. I likewise do not believe that special personal corruption in this sense can be proved of Eisenhower or has been proved of Nixon.

It can be summed up in an apparent paradox: *Never has so much corruption been headed up by such honest men.* The paradox is resolved when we look at the corruption as a phenomenon of the society and not primarily as the failing of an individual.

The corruption lies a bit deeper. But it's not a very deep question, at that.

The Goose and the Common

"The law locks up both man and woman
Who steals the goose from off the common,
But lets the greater felon loose
Who steals the common from the goose."
—Old English jingle.

"You notice," writes the current issue of *U. S. News and World Report*, "that almost no Democrats in Congress took shots at Senator Nixon for accepting financial help for political activities. The reason: It's common practice in one form or another."

There is a completely bipartisan gentleman's agreement in Congress that ethics in politics is something to be discussed in congressional hearings but never, never enforced. In fact, it has been pointed out that, even with regard to the hole-ridden laws which Congress has passed on the subject, there is no section of the government even theoretically charged with enforcing them.

In 1942 the War Investigating Committee headed by the then Senator Truman looked into the charges against Senator Chandler (Dem., Ky.), as the result of the acceptance by Chandler of a swimming pool from a war contractor. The Truman committee cleared the senator. It did not comment on the propriety of a senator's accepting a swimming pool from a contractor who has business with the government.

As a recent book summed it up: "No member [of Congress] has been expelled or disciplined in any way for receiving money, gifts, services, swimming pools, lakes or anything else from contractors or other persons doing business with the government. . . . No member has been expelled for violation of the law even when indicted, tried, and convicted of crime." (*Graham, Morality in American Politics.*)

Congress has consistently voted against the proposals by Truman, Wayne Morse and others to make mandatory the disclosure of the financial status of government officials; and the fate of the Newbold Morris questionnaire showed that, when it came right down to it, Truman himself backed down.

Senator Humphrey, speaking at the hearings of the Committee on Ethical Standards, perhaps has his own Democratic reasons for pooh-poohing the mink-coat scandal, but what he said was justified:

"All of these exemptions in the excess-profits tax, all the exemptions . . . in the Renegotiation Act . . . lead to the possibility of the most vile forms of corruption. . . . We have the law of depletion and allowance [devices for cutting corporations' taxes]. I think that is improper. But who am I? Nobody gets as steamed up as they do about the mink coat. I think it is improper to have some of the exceptions in the excess-profits tax. I think it was improper that the insurance companies did not pay any federal income taxes for two years. That only amounted to \$147,000,000, and here is a \$9,000 mink coat that gets the headlines."

THE SOCIAL MIASMA

What cries aloud, out of the Bipartisan Corruption Mess in Washington, is the all-pervading character of the corruptive forces in American politics—and it cries out that indignant denunciations of the morals of this man or that congressman are like complaints about wet cabin floors in a leaking ship. To say this does not derogate indignation about cases of open graft or bribery, and indignation about the failure of the dollar-honest statesmen at the head of the nation to punish it. To say this is not to counterpose an "abstraction" to concrete cases of corruption, or at any rate, this is the "abstraction" which is behind the futile efforts of honest-government liberals to close up the leaky seams of the ship with Scotch tape.

More than at any other time, in a presidential election year the intimate tie-up between politics and the money civilization of America's capitalism is highlighted. What is at stake is control of a government that spends \$79 billion a year, stakes high enough to outweigh what passes for ethics in the profit system and among the politicians who serve the profit system and who assume all its values. The political campaign itself is a big business. It is estimated "conservatively" that \$85 million will be spent in this election campaign, but what is \$85 million as an investment for \$79 billion?

It is a measure of the political level in the United States that the only choice that the average voter sees is to decide whether the Nixon-Republicans or the Truman-Democrats are the worse crooks. It is understandably a hard choice.

The labor movement and liberals, who above all others should be carrying on a struggle against this corruption which has become a major social phenomenon of American capitalism, are instead reduced to apologizing for and whitewashing the Democrats, with specious "distinctions." They are powerless to take advantage, for progressive purposes, of an issue which arouses the voters with far greater justification than it ever did before.

They are in the disgraceful position, along with the Fair Dealers, of pointing the finger at Republicans instead of at the real sources of corruption. Having refused to declare their political independence, they must gloss over the Democrats' dependence, in the last analysis, on the same sinister forces that finance both capitalist parties. That is one reason why there is only one protest vote possible in this campaign and that is a socialist vote.