

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

LABOR AND THE DEMOCRATS

A CHALLENGE TO LABOR'S POLITICS . . . 2

WHERE DO THEY GO FROM HERE? . . . 3

BUTLER ATTACKS REUTHER'S LINE . . . 3

The SP Convention and Socialist Unity . . . page 4

SDA Divides in Fight Over Democracy . . . page 5

JUNE 25, 1956

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

CAN THEY SUPPORT THE DEMOCRATS THIS YEAR?

NAACP Parley Faces Issue of Using Political-Action Weapon

By MAX MARTIN

The 47th annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People opens in San Francisco on June 26.

The NAACP delegates gather for their deliberations at a momentous point in the course of the Negro people's struggle for democracy and equality, at a moment when the conflict is becoming ever more widespread and ever more intense. And they meet at a time when decisive steps can be taken to effect a progressive outcome for that struggle.

A new climate exists in America today on the question of Jim Crow, an atmosphere in which it is impossible to evade or long postpone a showdown over whether racist discrimination shall once and for all be ended. A number of important legal rulings have helped to create this climate, notably the Supreme Court decision declaring segregation in the schools unconstitutional.

But above all, the new national atmosphere results from the growing mood of militancy and the rising tide of struggle by the Negro masses themselves.

The determination of the Negroes to end Jim Crow has manifested itself in many ways: the Montgomery and Tallahassee bus boycotts, the efforts of Southern Negroes to register and vote; the fight of Autherine Lucy to attend the University of Alabama and of other Negroes to obtain education on a footing of equality with whites; the dozens of mass rallies and demonstrations for civil rights in Northern cities; the zooming membership of the NAACP.

The NAACP has played an outstanding role in these developments and for this it has earned the hatred of all of the racists.

It is not for nothing that Alabama and Louisiana have outlawed the NAACP and that other Southern states try to prevent teachers from belonging to it and adopt other repressive meas-

ures aimed at it. The NAACP has been instrumental in planning and executing all of the legal work which is part of the struggle against Jim Crow; it deserves the credit for the legal victories which have been scored, as well as for its general educational and propagandistic campaigns. All fighters against Jim Crow will hail it for these activities.

But as many sections of the NAACP know, legal activity while necessary is not sufficient. Far from it. Many of the rulings and decisions for segregation remain paper victories; what is now required is to translate them into reality.

And for this mass action by the Negroes and their white allies, the labor movement in the first place, is needed.

Throughout the South, Negroes have demonstrated that they understand this, Montgomery being a magnificent example of this demonstration. Moreover, NAACP chapters in many Southern communities have by their participation in such campaigns shown that they too recognize the necessity of mass action

(Continued on page 4)

The latest Smith Act atrocity is going on in New York City, in Judge Alexander Bick's federal courthouse at Foley Square, where seven Communist Party leaders have again been indicted under the vicious thought-control act.

After the government wound up its case on June 13, the defense attorney, Prof. Royal W. France, reminded the court that it had the duty of taking a new look at the Smith Act, since the domestic and international situation had changed considerably since the Dennis case decision by the Supreme Court. He cited the change in the United States' relations with the "Communist world" since the end of the Korean War and the death and downgrading of Stalin, and pointed out that the late Chief Justice Vinson—ruling on the Dennis case—said new conditions would necessitate the re-consideration of the "clear and present danger" issue.

"Whatever has been said about the original Communists in the Dennis case," France declared, "there has been nothing done by these defendants to accomplish the things feared. There is nothing

(Turn to last page)

At the ISL's Washington Hearing, Shachtman Takes the Stand In Defense of Democratic Socialism

By ALBERT GATES

Washington, June 14

For a considerable period of time, Max Shachtman read into the record a fifteen-year history of articles from LABOR ACTION dealing with the organizations' attitude toward world Stalinism and particularly activities of the American Communist Party.

This material covered almost every phase of American politics, both in general and as it specifically concerned the labor movement. This enormous volume of material was important to illustrate that the differences which the Workers Party, Socialist Youth League and Independent Socialist League had with the Communist movement were anything but episodic or tactical.

The evidence produced and introduced into the record by Shachtman showed that the differences with Stalinism were fundamental, touching the very essence of Marxian socialism, and that these differences were and are unbridgeable.

After the introduction of this material, in which the term "Stalinist" appeared repeatedly, government attorney Maddrix wanted to know whether Shachtman meant the Communist move-

ment, because "I have not heard him yet refer to the people who support the Communist Party as Communists. He refers to them as Stalinist."

Hearing Examiner Morrissey said he thought the term was used as being "relevant to the Communist Party of the United States." Maddrix went on: "So, when he refers to the members of the Communist Party as Stalinist, he refers to that as Communist also?"

Here ISL attorney Groner made the point that the government had consistently refused to define its use of the term "Communist" or "communist" (small C or big C) and that therefore "we are operating one thousand per cent in the dark."

Shachtman then went on to define further the differences between the three organizations in the hearing and the Stalinist movements, and to summarize the meaning of the large amount of evidence read into the record.

But he did not get very far because the government objected on the ground that the period for summaries had not been reached and that this properly belonged under argument. The objection of the government was upheld.

The direct examination of Shachtman was continued by Counsel John Silard.

SILARD: "Mr. Shachtman, are the terms Communism and Stalinism, so far as the organizations are concerned [identical]?"

A—"So far as the political movement is concerned, yes, identical."

Q—"When you have referred to Stalinism in your testimony, would Communism have been synonymous?"

A—"Yes. Again as a political movement the identity has been recognized throughout the world."

Q—"Has the attitude of these organizations towards Stalinism-Communism

and towards Russia changed since the death of Stalin?"

A—"No. We have gone out of the way to clarify that in recent issues of LABOR ACTION. If you wish, I can cite to you exactly."

Shachtman then read from the May 28 issue of LABOR ACTION and the current issue of *The New Internationalist* for the ISL analysis of the 20th Congress and the revelations of Khrushchev, which warned against any illusions on the score of Stalinism.

Indeed, so concerned was the ISL with this question, Shachtman testified, that he was sent on a national tour to speak on "The Meaning of the 20th Congress" and "Stalinism Without Stalin."

MATTER OF REVISION

The examination of Shachtman continued on the ABC of Marxism, referred to in our previous reports. The government had introduced an old and unrevised edition of this outline or syllabus, even though it knew that a revised edition was in existence. It knew this by the fact that it had introduced as "Government's Exhibit No. 5" a report of the National Committee where reference was made to a decision assigning Hal Draper to the task of re-

(Continued on page 6)

NOTE

Because of the space devoted to reporting the vital ISL case in the Washington hearing, we are falling behind in commenting on many current events and political issues in the news. We'll try to catch up on that soon as possible.—ED.

LABOR AND THE DEMOCRATS—I

A CHALLENGE TO LABOR'S 1956 POLITICS

By BEN HALL

What to do in 1956? The question rises with mounting urgency in the labor movement as the presidential elections draw near.

So far, the unions and their leaders are without a reply. Their difficulty is as perplexing as it is fundamental.

For four years they have awaited the opportunity to rid themselves of an administration which openly, even clumsily, bowed to the needs of big business. Now, on the eve of the elections, they discover that the party which they have always supported is dominated, in Congress and out, by a right wing which has blocked the way for labor and Negroes.

And, to their dismay, they realize that the so-called liberal wing of the party has no intention of opposing the conservative right. Quite the contrary: so far there has been nothing but appeasement.

Labor appears doubly doomed to defeat: by appeasing conservatism and white-supremacy, the Democrats cannot win the election, but even if they could, a "victory" under such conditions would be a defeat for labor, Negroes and democracy in general.

Four years ago, or two years ago, this sad situation might have been deplored but ignored. Labor leaders would perhaps have been satisfied to do the best they could; to press for a "really" liberal slate but settle for what they could get, confident that in the end they could support the party's main ticket.

But now, they cannot do it. Their old policy is outlived.

For one thing, labor is too powerful to be waved aside like a poor relation. It is now united; with 16 million members, it is ready to demand and insist rather than humbly petition. The AFL and CIO did not join together in order to transfer power from Eisenhower-Knowland to Eastland-Johnson.

But if labor now can be more demanding, events have propelled it to the point where it must be.

In the South, a mass movement for democracy is shaping up: the struggle of Negroes for equality; and this struggle has the enthusiastic support, in the first instance, of Negroes all over the country, including hundreds of thousands of AFL-CIO members. And the most bitter enemies of the Negro struggle are found where? Inside the Democratic Party.

And in the same party, labor's "friends," the spineless Northern liberals, cling to "unity" with Southern reaction and try to shrug off the Negro's fight.

FOR AN ACTIVE PROGRAM

As the Democratic convention approaches, there is no sign that Humphrey, Stevenson, or Kefauver will lead a fight against the right wing. If the fight for democracy is to take place inside the Democratic Party, labor alone can lead it.

Key Negro leaders have already called upon them to remain uncommitted in '56. Now, voices are raised in the unions for neutrality; for "sitting out" the presidential elections. Both George Meany and Walter Reuther have openly threatened Democratic leaders that they will refuse to support the party's national slate if its candidate and platform dodge the key issues, especially civil rights.

Everything points to the need for a new party—for a new party led by labor; for a new party to stimulate and support the Negro struggle. It is so clear; it is so urgent. It is so in accord with what is necessary and possible at this stage in U. S. politics.

Tragically, however, the labor movement does not look toward the formation of a labor party; everyone rejects "dogma" and genuflects before "realism." But the labor movement is trapped by a thoroughly dogmatic commitment to the present two-party system, a system of parties which is unrealistic and outlived.

But if there will be no labor party in 1956, and even if the labor movement decides finally for "neutrality," its political activity will continue. The big issues remain; the struggle for democracy goes on. Negroes continue to demand full rights; and their white-supremacy enemies will persist in the effort to repress them.

"Neutrality" as a policy, however effective as a pressure weapon, describes only what labor will not do. Yet, even from the standpoint of its own policies, even within the limits of its anti-labor-party dogma, labor can fight for an active, positive program of action.

AT THE CONVENTION

Obviously, the labor movement wants to do something.

Labor leaders will be at the Democratic convention. The question is: what will they do there?

John J. Grogan, president of the Shipbuilders Union, will represent the New Jersey 14th Congressional District. With him, will come other labor district delegates: Daniel Arnold, IUE; Michael Chanti and John Proto, steel union; Margaret Holmes, Amalgamated Clothing Workers. And a special labor "advisory" committee of leading union officials will confer with the official Democratic platform committee.

For decades, the unions have decried the power of the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition which has thwarted the nation's liberal majority. Angry frustration and discontent burst out, as can be seen in the quotations assembled on the next page.

Now, for the first time in more than 20 years, the strength of the reactionary coalition comes under direct attack by more than words and resolutions. The Southern Negro who fights for democracy shakes up the reactionary wing of the Democratic Party, a wing whose power rests upon the denial of democracy.

Thousands of people are ranged against the right-wing Democratic section of the coalition in demonstrations, court fights, campaigns for the right to vote, formation of NAACP branches. Some have already given their life in the fight.

This is the moment for labor to add its power. But how?

The Dixiecrat-Republican coalition holds on because its influence and ties run up and down through every section of both parties.

Consider: The Republicans cooperate with the Dixiecrats; the so-called "middle of the road" Democrats like Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn insist upon continued unity and cooperation with the Dixiecrats; so-called liberal southerners like Hill and Sparkman will not move without Rayburn, Johnson and the Dixiecrats; and the Northern liberals like Stevenson and Humphrey do not intend to break their ties with Hill, Sparkman and their allies.

From the Money-Dealer of Wall Street, through the Slave-Dealer of the South, to the New-Dealer of the North, there is an interlinking rope that strangles the power of labor. And at the very end, the labor movement holds tightly to Stevenson and Humphrey.

The basic fact is this: labor can never fight the Dixiecrat coalition effectively unless it is ready to deliver an ultimatum to its own "friends."

As the Democratic convention nears, the deadline approaches. Labor can an-

nounce: we intend to fight reaction in the Democratic Party and make clear once and for all that we want no more collaboration with it; you self-styled liberals must be on one side or the other.

What will happen at the Democratic convention? Two possibilities are already foreshadowed by events in Texas and in Michigan.

In Texas:

Governor Shivers supported Eisenhower in 1952 and succeeded in throwing the state's electoral votes to him. Last month, a struggle for control of the Democratic state party machinery erupted between him and the "loyalist" Johnson-Rayburn faction. The labor movement rallied actively behind Johnson-Rayburn, calling upon its members to come to precinct meetings and elect party convention delegates pledged to Johnson.

Union News, published by the Oil Workers Union, summarizes labor's role by reporting the events in Texas precinct 242. A committee from the Communications Workers Union and the Steel Workers Union took the initiative in organizing the convention; a leader of the Oil Workers acted as temporary chairman and was elected permanent chairman when the labor bloc defeated the precinct Shivers supporters 111-47, and went on to elect a liberal-labor delegation opposed to Shivers. Floor leader of the anti-Shivers group was J. C. Gray, a member of Local 4-227 of the Oil Workers Union.

In every precinct the fight went on with organized labor in the forefront.

On May 22, the state Democratic convention, with labor votes, chose a national convention delegation pledged to Johnson. For a moment, it was a great victory; but only for a moment. A labor-liberal bloc put forward a motion for the immediate replacement of the Shivers state executive committee. This motion was defeated when Johnson and Rayburn lined up with the Shivers bloc in the name of party "harmony."

After an all-out mobilization against Shivers, Texas labor finds itself united in the same party with him because Johnson and Rayburn insist upon it.

MICHIGAN PLATFORM

Meanwhile, in Michigan, under the pressure of the powerful UAW, a Democratic state convention on June 2 adopted a vigorous platform on civil rights and, in the words of one reporter, "showed no disposition to compromise their stand on civil rights to appease Southern Democrats."

At the same time, however, it designated Governor Mennen Williams as its favorite-son candidate for president. But what guarantee has labor that Williams will stand up without compromising with the Southern bloc at the national convention? Where has he been? If he has spoken out against Eastland and his supporters by name the news has not yet percolated down to the public.

Demo Party Chairman Butler Attacks Reuther's Political Line

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, June 16

Overshadowing all other events at the Michigan CIO Council's 16th (and perhaps last) convention was the discussion held on labor's role in the Democratic Party and the future of that party.

This debate vied in interest with the clash between two Michigan Republican spokesmen and two Democratic Party defenders, one of whom was Ed Carey, UAW member who is Democratic Party minority leader in the Michigan state legislature. This session was lively, in-

The Michigan platform demands the following:

- Support and implementation by Congress and the president of the Supreme Court decision.
- An effective FEPC.
- Abolition of the poll tax and a federal anti-lynch law.
- A civil-rights division in the Department of Justice and a permanent federal commission of investigation to recommend action.
- Refusal to seat congressmen whose elections were obtained by unconstitutional and illegal denial of the right to vote.
- No federal aid to segregated housing and education.

To this, we would add at least one other measure: a vigorous denunciation of the congressional White Supremacy Manifesto and a repudiation by name of all those who signed it.

What happens now? Will the Democratic national convention respond to the Michigan call to battle, or will it take the road of Texas appeasement? Labor has the opportunity to test all candidates and to separate those who will fight for democracy from those who compromise with the Slave-Dealers.

Walter Reuther and Emil Mazey have warned the leaders of the Democratic Party that they cannot have Eastland and have labor at the same time. But so far, without apparent effect.

A typical representative of Southern reaction, Georgian Herman Talmadge, has volunteered to support Stevenson if he becomes the Democratic nominee. No note of distaste from Adlai.

Nor have any of the Key Democratic liberals indicated any intention of putting up a fight against Texas conservatives, Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn, Democratic leaders in Congress. In their own state, Johnson and Rayburn are obviously determined to keep peace with reactionary Dixiecrat Governor Allan Shivers.

WHICH ROAD?

The ultimatum by Reuther and Mazey will be taken seriously only if the unions accept nothing less than an open fight at the convention for the Michigan platform and if they refuse support to the shirkers who stand on the sidelines.

To paraphrase Reuther: if liberals take the easy road of compromise and convenience at the convention of their own party, can they be relied upon to stand up against the Republican and Tory Democratic coalition?

Such a genuine fight for labor's program inside the Democratic Party is the least that can reasonably be expected from anyone who claims to believe, as so many do, that it is possible by supporting Democrats and other old-party candidates to further the workers' interests and the needs of progress.

We ourselves believe that these aims can be achieved only by taking the first step of breaking with the old parties, forming a labor party. We even venture to predict that labor can find out that this is true through making a real fight inside the Democratic Party. Or if this opinion is false, it can be disproved in the same way: by carrying on the fight to the end.

But first of all for its own reasons, not for ours, the labor movement is pushed into conflict with the conservative and reactionary machines of the old parties. It is only a question of whether it will truly hold up its own end in this conflict, whether it will stand by the Michigan platform and draw all the conclusions therefrom.

teresting, and worthwhile.

But its importance was minor compared to the clash in ideas between none other than Paul Butler, national chairman of the Democratic Party, and Emil Mazey and Walter Reuther, speaking for the UAW.

Mazey told the CIO delegates that labor and the liberals should organize "to drive the Eastlands and the Talmadges out of the Democratic Party." Referring to the Dixiecrats, Mazey emphasized: "we should drive them out so we

(Turn to last page)

LABOR AND THE DEMOCRATS—II

WHERE DO THEY GO FROM HERE?

In section after section of the labor movement across the country, discontent with the political-action policy of tailending the Democratic Party is mounting to a peak for the whole recent period.

On this page we reproduce some of the outstanding expressions of this growing feeling, which can achieve fruitful expression only in independent political action by labor.

For discussion and comment see the article by Ben Hall on page 2.

COULDN'T BUY

George Meany, AFL-CIO president, speaking to representatives from the Industrial Union Department at a legislative conference in Washington on April 27, said:

"We couldn't buy the Democratic Party with its Dixiecrats and its record on civil rights, and we couldn't buy the Republican Party with its subservience to big business."

WANTS A WALKOUT

Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the United Auto Workers, was interviewed on May 21 by Labor's Daily at a UAW conference on civil rights in Los Angeles. The following is an excerpt from the paper's story:

"The United Auto Workers union hopes to see such a 'tough' civil-rights plank in the Democratic Party platform that the Dixiecrats will walk out of the party, Emil Mazey, UAW secretary-treasurer, said here.

"In Los Angeles to participate in a UAW-sponsored fair practices and civil-rights conference, Mazey said 'such a walkout' by 'conservative' Southerners would make the Democratic Party a truly liberal one."

"What's more, Mazey pointed out, it would give the American voters a clear choice in November between liberalism and Republican conservatism.

"The idea of a Senator Eastland being in the same party with Sen. Wayne Morse is ridiculous," he told Labor's Daily. The UAW leader hinted that his union might sit out the campaign if there were no campaign worthy of supporting.

"For instance if the Democratic Party candidate is strong and the civil rights platform is weak, we would sit it out. We would do the same thing if the candidate is weak and the platform strong," he stated."

NO BLANK CHECK

At its national convention in Washington on May 18, the ILGWU warned that labor might decide to boycott the presidential elections and concentrate its activity on the congressional contests. One resolution clearly repudiated the Eisenhower administration. The delegates applauded a declaration by William Schnitzler, AFL-CIO secretary-treasurer, that labor wanted no "middle of the road" candidate.

At the closing session, the convention resolved that labor would be "reluctant to issue blank checks of endorsement to political leadership or parties whose liberalism is tainted with regressive policies or anti-New Deal philosophy and outlook."

Of this resolution, New York Times reporter A. H. Raskin wrote: "The resolution represented a new move in a growing effort by major unions to convince the Democrats that labor would not back a presidential candidate picked to appease Southern defenders of racial segregation."

SITTING OUT?

At its convention in Washington last month, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union dodged the big issue of 1956. Its resolution on political action promised nothing to anyone, pledging only "continued support of the Com-

mittee on Political Education." But on May 22, the New York Post, reporting that no one had suggested supporting the Republican presidential slate, added:

"But there has been some quiet talk in the lobbies about 'sitting out the election' to show disapproval of segments of the Democratic Party, notably the Southern segregationists."

PRESSURE

At its convention this month in New York, the Hatters Union, like the ILGWU, adopted a noncommittal statement pledging support to COPE, taking no formal position on candidates. But in his convention speech on June 6, President Alex Rose bitterly condemned reaction "in both parties," and went further:

"If labor cannot defeat reaction in both parties," he exclaimed to big applause, "then it will have to form its own party."

Two days later, the resolutions committee reported that a resolution had been introduced by a New York local officer calling for a nation-wide "labor-farmer-liberal" party. Ordinarily, such a proposal is rejected out-of-hand; but this time the Resolutions Committee announced that it "does not recommend non-concurrence in this resolution; we feel, however, that it should be referred to our GEB and consider it in line with our adopted policy on political action. . . ."

Thus the union sought to put pressure on the liberal wing of the Democratic Party.

TWEEDLEDUM & -DEE

In the Hat Worker (April 15), newspaper of the Hatters Union, Secretary-Treasurer Marx Lewis writes with diffidence and restraint, but his deep underlying dissatisfaction is obvious. He calls for a return to the spirit of the early days of the New Deal and warns:

"The people want some plain talking and something to indicate that there will be a change of policies; not merely a change in the people who will administer them."

On the big issues of the day—natural gas, farming, schools, civil rights, highways, foreign aid, labor, health—he finds inaction or chicanery. Then he asks, "Why are the Democrats dragging their feet?" His reply is instructive:

"To begin with, the party is handicapped by internal divisions. These have often given a coalition of reactionary Democrats and reactionary Republicans a decisive voice in legislative matters. Right now the conservative wing of the party is in the ascendancy and determines party policies. Under the seniority system which prevails in Congress, and which gives the chairmanship of important committees to those having the longest service, most of the important committees are manned by Southerners who are in many respects more reactionary than the Republicans.

And, of course, he is dismayed by the controlling coalition of right-wing Democrats and Republicans.

"On labor legislation the coalition of Southern Democrats and reactionary Republicans succeeded in preventing any improvement in the Taft-Hartley Act. Instead, they worked together in the drive to silence labor. The so-called 'right-to-work' laws have been enacted mainly in the Southern states, where

gress, Republicans and Democrats are working together to curb the political rights of organized workers by trying Democrats are in control, while in Con- to prohibit workers from making even voluntary contributions for political purposes.

"On health, housing, and kindred reforms the thinking of many of the Democrats is not a great deal different from that of most of the Republicans.

"No better evidence of the fact that the Democratic Party, as it is now led, cannot be the force for good that it must be if it is to succeed, is the support which the reactionary Democrats gave to the natural gas regulation bill, and to some other giveaways, including the tideland oil deposits. How the Democrats can make a consistent attack on giveaways, as the party has done, and then provide the votes necessary to insure such giveaways, is difficult to understand.

"Certainly, on civil rights and liberties the Democratic Party is not only divided, but the differences between the factions on these issues are greater than any difference any of them may have with the Republican Party.

"Then there is the feeling among the Democrats that a policy of moderation is the best one to pursue from a political point of view. Like the Republicans, they, too—or at least many of them—think that it would be best not to rock the boat. In this process it is difficult to distinguish between the 'conservative liberalism' of Eisenhower and the 'liberal conservatism' of the Democrats who now determine party policy. The voters who are confronted with this choice may feel that once more the two parties are engaged in shadow boxing, and that it is a choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledee."

UNCOMMITTED

A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and a vice-president of the AFL-CIO, at the mass meeting in Madison Square Garden in New York on May 24, said:

"Because of the long history of utter failure and refusal on the part of both the Republican and Democratic Parties to initiate and fight for federal civil-rights legislation in Congress, we believe that Negroes should remain politically uncommitted before the coming presidential election in order that neither the Democrats or Republicans may feel that they can take the Negro votes for granted."

NO ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCE

On May 5 Labor's Daily, published by the Typographical Union, printed excerpts from a radio address by William J. Evjue, the editor of the Madison (Wisc.) Capital Times. Editor Evjue ended with this thought:

"Liberals will not be satisfied with a candidate who will play the role of political opportunism in trying to be the candidate of both the North and the South. . . . They are going to ask why we can't have political parties that will square with reality and where the dividing line will be between conservative and liberal instead of the meaningless Democrat and Republican."

On Democrats and Republicans:

"For years I have been saying that the words Republican and Democrat no longer have any meaning. We said that there was no essential difference in the philosophies of Republican Senator Taft of Ohio and the Democrat Sen. Byrd of Virginia; not much difference in the political philosophy held by the Republican leader in the Senate, Knowland, and the Democratic leader, Lyndon Johnson; and not much of a gap in the political views held by the Democrat Sam Rayburn of the House and the Republican former speaker John Martin.

"After the cheers had died down over

the election of a Democratic Congress and the wallop that was given to the cult of McCarthyism in 1954, the liberals in the Democratic Party must gag over the fact that we have gotten the it a coalition of Southern Tory Democrat from Mississippi, in place of the Northern Republican demagogue McCarthy to carry on the cult of McCarthyism."

On representing big business:

"During this campaign we will hear the Democrats attacking the Republicans as the party of big business, but millions of liberals and independents over the country will be asking, Wasn't is a coalition of Southern Tory Democrats and Northern Republicans who brought about the passage of the tidelands oil bill, the 27½ per cent tax-depletion bill, and the natural gas bill? Liberals view with alarm the power which the fabulous millionaires of the oil states have over both political parties today."

And when the Senate voted to investigate bribery:

"Sen. Lyndon Johnson, the Democrat, and Sen. Knowland, the Republican, went into a huddle to bring about the appointment of a dummy investigating committee that wouldn't uncover what members of the Senate got from the oil millionaires. Johnson and Knowland barred real prosecutors like Hennings of Missouri and Gore of Tennessee as chairman of the investigating committee. Instead they came up with Sen. McClellan of Arkansas whose legal firm has represented oil interests and who can be trusted not to embarrass members of the Senate. . . . Liberals don't like the way in which Tory Democrats, supported by the oil interests, are tightening their grip on the Democratic Party."

CRUEL DISILLUSIONMENT

In Minnesota Labor, March 9, Rodney C. Jacobson, state CIO secretary, deals with the same theme. His article was reprinted in several union papers including the Lithographers Journal. The Lithographers use the headline, "Plain Talk on North Democrats Bootlicking the South:"

"In 1948 I had great hopes for the Democratic Party. As a delegate to the national Democratic convention in Philadelphia, I was impressed with the genuine thrilling response of the delegates to Hubert Humphrey's courageous and stimulating speech on civil rights. Here was a new day dawning, a new era in the political life of America."

But with time, cruel disillusion comes. Now he realizes that the party and Congress are dominated by anti-labor forces. What to do? He ventures no big reply, but this much is clear: we of labor "must abandon our defensive attitude and start fighting for our principles. . . ."

He wants to fight inside the Democratic Party, but really to fight. He sees that, "the truly decisive vote in national elections has come from the industrial centers of the north and west. . . . And yet, on each occasion when the welfare of the industrial workers is at stake, the Democratic Party and its representatives in Congress seem disposed to bargain and compromise with the interests of this constituency in behalf of 'unity' on the terms of the Southern conservative." Liberals, north and south alike, "have been disposed to cajole the conservative Southerner in the name of 'unity.'"

Yet the conservative Southerner who ". . . gets the deference of the other Democrats . . . represents the South the least. Almost without exception, the conservatives represent a small minority of their constituents, being the products of political organizations which retain power by discouraging the exercise of franchise. . . . These conservatives are able to accumulate seniority which gives them power in Congress and thus with the Democratic Party, which is not justified by the number of people they represent. For instance, Senators Herbert Lehman and Paul Douglas together polled more votes in their last election than the combined votes of Senators Byrd, Russell, Eastland, Ellender, McClellan, Robertson, Thurmond, Stennis, Fulbright, Smathers, Bible, Ervin, D. Johnston, L. Johnston, Holland, and George."

Labor wins the battle; the Southern Democrats take the power:

"In 1954, it was the industrial centers of the North that upset Republican control of Congress and gave it to the Demo-

(Turn to last page)

SP Left Wing Proposes Unity With ISL at Party Convention

By HAL DRAPER

At the Socialist Party convention which met in Chicago over the June 8-10 weekend, two questions figured most largely on the agenda. One was an old one: to run presidential candidates or not. The other was a new one: a proposal by a left-wing group for a socialist unity conference, in particular looking toward unity with the Independent Socialist League.

Background of this convention is the fact that the Socialist Party has been steadily losing ground. The organizational state of the party is a deplorable index to the weakness of socialists in this country. This visitor heard no report on membership, if there was one; but the convention was organized with some 50-odd delegates voting (there may have been more delegates elected who did not appear) and the basis of representation was 1 to 10.

This weakness was the reason for the convention decision to run a write-in slate of candidates for president and vice-president (Hoopes and Friedman) rather than, in most states, try to get on the ballot by dint of great sacrifice of energy and money, in the face of anti-democratic state laws. It was also in part the reason for a minority right-wing proposal to run no candidates at all, in order to leave the way open for SP members, especially in trade unions, to support labor-endorsed Democrats.

This weakness was also the concern of a left wing group which had originally organized two years ago, and which was acutely concerned with building the party. The perspective which this group adopted was one of socialist reconsolidation, the reunification of the socialist groups so as to lay the basis for a stronger and revived (and also more militant) socialist party.

LEFT WING FORMS

The immediate background of this development goes back to 1953. In that year, the Young Peoples Socialist League, under the leadership of principled left-wingers who were pressing for a Third Camp anti-war policy, broke away as the youth section of the SP and subsequently merged with the ISL's youth to form the now independent Young Socialist League.

Thus the SP lost not only its national youth organization but also the chief "ginger" element in its left wing. (Virtually the only YPSL unit that remained affiliated was the one in Los Angeles, which continued to function locally.)

Consequently, at the 1954 Philadelphia convention of the party, with an important sector of the left wing now out, there was a very sharp swing to the right. Soon after, a group of California members sent out a communication to party sections calling for the reorganization of the remaining left-wingers into a "Committee for a Socialist Program." They were "deeply shocked," they wrote, by the party's rightist shift on civil liberties, foreign policy and labor politics, as well as by the growing "inertia" in the party. (See LA for July 12 and Nov. 22, 1954.)

This left wing began largely with leading elements in both the Bay Area and in Los Angeles, including the YPSL comrades in the latter city. In the last period it also gained dominant influence in the Chicago local of the party.

At the recent convention its strength of about 11 delegates came from these two places plus a scattering of delegates from other locals, while the right wing's strength was centered on New York and Pennsylvania.

MOTION FOR UNITY

Unlike most of the convention proceedings, the discussion on unity was an organized debate on policy. The right-wing motion reaffirmed the perspective of unity with the right-wing Social-Democratic Federation and the Bund, for which negotiations have been going on and off for some years. The left-wing motion called on the party to convene a conference to discuss the possi-

bilities of unity among socialist groups. The four socialist groups named in the text of the motion were the ISL and the Socialist Labor Party in addition to the SDF and Bund, but the discussion in this debate was centered solely on the ISL.

In general the discussion that ensued was relatively mild and without recrimination. It was clear that the majority regarded the left-wingers as a loyal opposition, who were indeed among the most active elements in the party; and it was implicitly recognized that the perspective of unity with the ISL had arisen quite spontaneously among the left-wingers as the outcome of their concern with the future of the socialist movement.

The left-wingers argued that unity with the ISL was both possible and desirable. They cited joint experiences in collaboration, such as this year's joint May Day celebration in Chicago; they cited the ISL's effective and principled anti-Stalinism, while the right wing stressed its antagonism to the ISL's revolutionary socialism.

David McReynolds (Cal.), summarizing for the left, argued that many do not belong to any socialist group but are waiting for a socialist movement with more dynamism; times have changed in the last 20 years, he emphasized in response to horror tales about the past; it is especially the locals that have been active that say the time has come for unity, he urged.

SECTARIAN APPROACH

In opposition, speakers for the majority rested mainly on the charge that the ISL was too close to the revolutionary tradition of Lenin. But often their approach could be most accurately characterized as sectarian, in the strict sense of that abused term. That is, they did not try to grapple with the question whether unity could be a healthy step toward the revival of a woefully weak socialist movement, but rather approached the left-wingers' proposition primarily from the standpoint of intra-mural advantage; their eyes were turned inward, and at points this was overtly expressed simply as a fear that the ISLers would "take over" the party in the event of unity.

For example, in opposing the unity motion, Norman Thomas ventured the prediction: "I know this group [the SP], and the 'Shachtmanites' would take this bunch over in about a year," he said, followed by what may have been a qualification which I did not catch. According to one delegate who explained this viewpoint to me, this was so not because the ISL would be "insincere" if and when unity ever came about, but simply because its people were more competent, devoted, energetic and capable and so would naturally tend to "take over" the leadership of a united movement.

Such at least was one strand in the right wing's opposition. Equally sectarian in tendency were some of the arguments used by ex-national secretary Robin Myers in arguing against the proposition.

She complained with some evident vexation that in 1953 "they took away our members," apparently meaning the YPSL defection; though, in actual fact, the ISL did not "take away" the YPSL: the latter was repelled by SP reformism, broke on its own, and gravitated toward a merger with the Independent Socialist youth on the impetus of its own politics.

Robin Myers also complained that "one of our difficulties is that the 'Shachtmanites' have taken the socialist name," this causes "confusion between us," and this "confusion" would only be given recognition if we invited them to a conference... It is only surprising that she did not see that this typically sec-

tarian approach had an obvious answer: the only sure cure for this "confusion" would be unity.

Another right-wing consideration of mainly internal import concerned relations with the extreme right-wing social-democrats of the SDF, who (Thomas and Myers stressed) are affiliated with the Socialist International. In effect, this argument counterposed unity toward the right against unity on the left.

Another delegate, Richard Parrish, opposed the left-wing motion in another way. He explained he had been in charge of organizing activity on behalf of the recent civil-rights rally at Madison Square Garden in New York, and emphatically recounted how the "Shachtmanite youth" had done "a fine militant job" in this activity. After this very complimentary prelude (as I thought it) he related that he had discussed Russia with one of these "fine" youth; the latter had very enthusiastically condemned Stalin and Khrushchev et al, but "when I said, now disavow Lenin," why, the youth had declined to "disavow" Lenin.

The two aspects of this contribution were not untypical of some others: grudging or ungrudging recognition of the quality of the ISL-YSL movement, combined with a drawing-back from "Lenin."

Thomas, for example, while speaking against the left-wing unity motion, said he admires the ISL's criticisms of Stalinism even though he thought Stalinism grew out of Lenin's concepts, etc.; and he also went on to say, "I can conceive of cooperation in many ways" with the ISL. Incidentally Thomas had just come from Washington where he had testified for the ISL at its Washington hearing [see report in last week's LA] and he said again that, although he disagreed with the ISL, it ought to be taken off the subversive list. He did not spell out what "cooperation" he conceived of.

The vote against the unity motion was 36 to 11, with 3 abstentions recorded.

"PEOPLE ASK"

Immediately following this point on the agenda, there was a brief separate discussion when a left-wing motion was made to strike out "SDF" from the majority's unity motion. Seventeen votes were cast against unity with this group.

Following this, National Secretary Herman Singer informed the convention that, although the SDF had broken off unity negotiations some months ago, it had now voted to resume them and to aim for SP-SDF unity in January.

The reason for this reversal he read from a letter by the SDF's Louis P. Goldberg: the SDF committee learned that if a unity convention were held in January, none other than Hugh Gaitskill (himself) would be in America and would consent to address them; and "that news stirred them so that they voted for negotiations..."

I report this remarkable motivation just as it was reported by Singer.

One additional observation on the unity question should be given. It was made by a left-wing delegate from California. He argued that "people ask" why there is no socialist unity. If we invite the ISL to discuss unity possibilities, he said, and the ISL turns it down, then such people will be "disillusioned" with the ISL; there is no reason for us to fear "disruption," he continued; those who say this show a very poor opinion of the SP; is our position so weak that it cannot stand up against the ISL's? if so, what legitimate reason do we have for existence?...

The point is well-taken, it seems to us, and naturally applies all around. For one thing, it is true that many a person wants to know "why can't all socialists get together," and the SP action helps to explain.

For another thing, it is also true that unity possibilities have to be explored as a political question, not as a matter of organizational amour-propre, and of course the ISL would be entirely in favor of exploring it, since its militant socialism has no sectarianism in it.

A couple of other interesting aspects of the SP convention will have to be held over to next week for lack of space.

NAACP — —

(Continued from page 1)

by the people as a lever for achieving civil rights.

What is necessary now is for the NAACP as a whole to orient itself on a national scale in this direction: To be sure the NAACP has already organized various national lobbying campaigns, such as the recently held civil-rights mobilization in Washington. But all of these, while needed, have lacked mass character.

What suggests itself at once is the need for a national March on Washington movement, one similar to that which won an FEPC ruling from Roosevelt in 1941.

Were the San Francisco convention to call for and set in motion the machinery for establishing such a campaign, it would inaugurate a movement which would be in a position to register some very real victories for civil rights.

Together with such activity should go a new look at politics.

Formally, the NAACP does not take political positions nor endorse political parties or candidates. In actuality the NAACP through its leaders, together with the bulk of the Negroes in this country, usually supports the Democratic Party, ironical as that is. It supports the party which contains the Southern racists who are the bitterest enemies of the Negroes and of civil rights.

Were the NAACP at this convention to break from the Democratic Party, were it to call for the formation of a new political party, an independent third party, based on labor and its allies, it would take a step of overriding significance in the struggle against Jim Crow.

There are unfortunately, no indications that such a move will be proposed at its convention. Given the political thinking which currently exists in its leadership, such a development is not expected.

But what one does have a right to expect from the NAACP at this convention is a clear-cut program which it will, together with its allies, the labor movement and the liberals, demand from the Democratic Party, and for which it will fight at the Democratic Party convention in August. Among the delegates at the Democratic Party convention there will be a labor-liberal-NAACP bloc. This bloc could conduct a serious struggle for a program demanding teeth in the Supreme Court decision, the repudiation and condemnation of all those who oppose it, including the Southern Democratic congressmen and senators who signed the racist "Southern Manifesto," endorsement of the Powell Amendment, a concrete program of federal aid to the embattled Southern Negroes, and a whole host of other points.

It is the great duty of the NAACP to adopt such a program and to issue a call to the labor movement and to the liberals for a struggle in its behalf. It is its duty to reverse the course which liberalism and many parts of the labor movement now seem embarked on, capitulation to the racists inside the Democratic Party, and readiness to support its candidate regardless of what it does on civil rights.



LABOR ACTION

June 25, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 26

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:
GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

SDA Divides Over Fight on Democracy

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Out of an atmosphere of confusion and splits, the 1956 convention of Students for Democratic Action emerged last week with one obvious and fundamental result: a basic disagreement among the delegates over the nature of SDA and its role as the liberal student organization on the campus today.

Because of this division, the convention was unable to formulate a positive program and ended with a minority of the delegates virtually walking out because of a defeat of their candidate for national chairman.

While the division in SDA has been apparent for a number of years, this convention dramatically revealed two sharply opposed groupings.

On one side, the SDA leadership, the right wing of the organization, called for "programming," i.e., an acceptance on SDA's part of the politics and policies of ADA, an abdication in the area of democratic internal life, an orientation toward "action."

The other side, grouped around the SDA left wing but attracting elements from both right and center to form a convention majority, were also committed to "programming," but within the context of a quasi-autonomous SDA which would engage in meaningful discussion and democratic decision.

Essentially, there was only one question debated at the convention: should SDA be a democratic organization in which the members determine policy and politics?

The right wing continually argued in terms of the disruptiveness and inefficiency of a democratic internal political life; the left fought for the rights of minorities and for an SDA with politics of its own, within the context of a general, basic agreement with ADA as the representative of adult liberalism in America.

This opposition was a factor in every issue discussed: in the debate on the convention rules, on the question of YSL membership in SDA, in the election of a national chairman.

RIGHT-WING BUREAUCRATS

The first major convention fight on Sunday was symptomatic of the currents which were to prevail throughout the deliberations. The right wing proposed a series of convention rules which would expedite its desire that the convention concern itself with "positive programming."

No one quarreled with the programming point, but the left wing fought against the means which the right proposed: a bureaucratic suppression of convention discussion, e.g., a motion from the floor could only come up for debate if it were accompanied by a petition of a quarter of the delegates.

Thus, at the very outset the actual differences between the two sides manifested itself. By "positive programming," the right wing meant a convention which would not make any serious decisions, or in general involve itself in the give-and-take of democratic discussion, but which would content itself with technical questions of implementing a policy accepted from on high. By "democracy," the left wing did not propose an opposition to positive programming, but rather a democratic means of arriving at the positive program.

The left wing carried this point, as it was to carry the major points at the convention. And at least one factor in its victory (and this was true throughout the convention) was the fact that the "positive, anti-disruptionist" right-wing showed itself to be a negative, disruptive grouping.

Indeed, the right wing's rule-or-ruin

policy was a major factor in creating the convention's majority coalition, a heterogeneous grouping of diverse elements united in their opposition to the bureaucratic tactics of the leadership.

This same split of democracy-versus-bureaucracy was at work in the next disputed point, that of membership of YSLers in SDA.

STALLING

The session was opened by a statement from Michael Harrington, national chairman of the YSL, who was given unanimous permission to make a brief statement on the character of the YSL. The chairman of the session (a right-wing leader) then asked for questions to the YSL spokesman, ruling that comment and debate should be deferred until later.

After an hour or so of this procedure, left-wing speakers began to ask why not one of the right-wingers had defended the right-wing policy of opposition to YSLers belonging to SDA. No answer was forthcoming, and when the left wing attempted to call the question, the right-wingers protracted the session until adjournment was voted.

At a late evening session on Sunday night, debate on the YSL was resumed. Sam Perelson, national chairman of SDA last year and a right wing leader, based his opposition to YSL membership on pragmatic grounds: the YSLers were "intransigent," "factional," didn't compromise, and thereby stalled the organization with endless debate. This was primarily a reference to the left-wing fight in defense of academic freedom in which YSLers in SDA played an important role. But Perelson's charges of intransigence, dilatory tactics, etc. were somewhat undercut by the fact that he was leading a caucus whose tactics were those of... intransigence, dilatory tactics, etc.

The crucial vote came on an amendment offered by Barry Keating. A compromise motion had been put forward, rescinding SDA's official position on dual membership and establishing a commission to study the whole question of membership criteria and report back to the organization just before its next convention. But the right wing wanted blood: Keating proposed that the convention instruct the commission that it base its findings on the incompatibility of YSL membership in SDA.

ENTER THE STALINISTS

The Keating amendment was defeated by a roll-call vote of 38 to 35. Thereupon the original compromise, rescinding SDA provisions against YSLers, was passed 58 to 8, with 8 abstentions. The right-wing leadership (and this is particularly interesting in the light of their later position) voted in favor of the motion to rescind, and a leading right-winger moved that two YSLers be readmitted to SDA by the convention. This carried by more than a two-thirds vote.

At this point, it appeared that the YSL question had been settled. But enter the observer from the Stalinist Labor Youth League who attended the convention and played a role in "corridor discussion."

The LYL representative took the position that the convention should now "unite for unity" and exclude the "dis-

ruptive" YSLers. This point of view had a certain impact on the left-wing caucus, and part of the right-wing took up the cry, even going so far as trying to make a bloc with the left-wingers on the question and... discussing the issue with the LYL observer.

However, both right and left caucuses split. A portion of the right-wing leadership was aghast at the notion of working for a motion whose Stalinist inspiration was fairly apparent. And some of the left-wingers objected to the whole idea of bringing the YSL question up again.

The motivation of the LYL move is clear enough. On the one hand, it is a function of the new Stalinist popular-front line in which they are turning to the "official" liberal movement. If that means attempting to bloc with a right-wing leadership, bloc they will. But more particularly, the LYL observer was moving to exclude SDA's only socialist, anti-Stalinist tendency, i.e., a considerable obstacle to LYL success in SDA.

An interesting political morality develops from all of this: the LYL was in favor of excluding those who had fought for the rights of Stalinist teachers, and was trying to become friendly with some of those who had opposed the rights of Stalinist teachers!

The move to reconsider the YSL question was dropped but not before the entire right wing was forced to disavow any connection with the LYL and to attack the LYL observer on the convention floor.

RULE OR RUIN

After this, an even more incredible development began. The right-wing leadership—which had voted for the motion to rescind the by-law against YSL membership in SDA at the Sunday session—ran its slate of officers and National Board candidates on one (mimeographed) plank: a promise to call a national referendum to overturn Sunday's convention decision by October 15!

Once again the right wing appeared as a bureaucratic tendency which was not too tender on questions of democracy. The left wing nominated a candidate for national chairman who was himself opposed to the membership of YSLers in SDA but who simply promised to abide by Sunday's decision.

Thus the fight on the chairmanship: on the one side, a hard, intransigent right-wing, openly proposing to overturn a convention decision by winning the National Board and officers; a flexible and conciliatory left wing, which was however not willing to see democracy eliminated from SDA.

The right wing's rule-or-ruin tactics managed to alienate various people from its own caucus, and, on the issue of democracy, a board coalition was formed which defeated the right-wing candidate.

As soon as the election result was announced, the right wing compounded its intransigence and moved to split. By doing so, they placed themselves in the unenviable position of walking out as a minority whose main strength now lay in its connections with the ADA bureaucracy.

At this point, the facilities of Sarah Lawrence were closed, and the convention adjourned to a parking lot. There the right-wing caucus named its price for unity: that the majority concede on every point (national chairmanship, national board, YSL membership) to the minority!

It was during the parking-lot meeting that a public offer of withdrawal from SDA was made by the YSLers. They offered to do so if their SDA membership was the only cause of the split and the only thing standing in the way of unity.

This offer was turned down by the right-wing leadership which informed the YSL spokesman that the question of dual membership was only one among many issues dividing the two caucuses. And this admission leads to the heart of the problem.

The real split was on the nature of SDA. The right-wingers wanted an auxiliary to ADA, an organization which would not have a meaningful, democratic internal life of its own, but which would be "activity-oriented."

The convention majority was grouped around the issue of democracy: democracy in the convention itself, in terms of the rules dispute and the question of abiding by democratic decisions; democracy in the organization, in terms of allowing the membership the right to discussion and decision. Because this was the issue, the right wing, with its bureaucratic and rule-or-ruin tactic, helped create the majority coalition by alienating support from itself.

FOR DEMOCRATIC UNITY

The significance of this split is of considerable importance.

In the short run, the right wing is correct from its standpoint: a youth organization of Jimmy Higgins workers who simply accept the dotted i's and crossed t's from ADA would not "waste" time in discussion and might even be able to be very active in carrying out a bureaucratic program.

But in the long run, SDA fails unless it provides a new leadership for the liberal movement. And that leadership can only come out of an organization which is political and democratic, in which there is debate, discussion and decision, preparing the members to play a meaningful role in adult work.

At the convention, the right wing attempted to ram through its short-run program with fantastic ineptness. And at every turn, the left wing was fighting for a democratic SDA in the broad sense of that term.

For what, after all, is "positive programming" for a liberal student organization? Is it simply an unthinking activism? Or isn't it rather a rounded development of political people, in terms of independent thinking and action?

A liberal youth organization based on the latter principle is a necessity in America today and it rightfully belongs as an affiliate to ADA. But if ADA and the right-wing SDAers refuse to see this, if they intransigently fight to prevent it within a rigid orthodoxy of their own, then the split is likely to be permanent. Unity is still very much of a value—but not a value at any cost. Future developments of SDA's future depend on this being understood.

EVERY WEEK—

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

appears as a section in all regular issues of Labor Action. Published, and independently edited, by the Young Socialist League,

it is the only socialist youth weekly in the country. Don't miss it!

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION—
\$1 a year for Student Subs

In Defense of Socialism: At

(Continued from page 1)

vising and bringing up to date this same document.

The revised edition was introduced into evidence by Silard and he then examined Shachtman on the circumstances surrounding the revision of the ABC.

In summary, Shachtman testified that the document had appeared originally in 1938 in the Young Peoples Socialist League, long before the Workers Party had been formed. Following the split and the formation of the WP, there was a great dearth of material. It was suggested that this ABC existed and could be used. As a result, it was hurriedly mimeographed in small quantity and "held available for distribution" in about 1942.

Silard then put the following question to Shachtman:

Q—"Now, bearing in mind the importance which your answer may have in this hearing and to the contentions which have been made, can you indicate what led to the revision?"

A—"To the best of my knowledge, and I believe it to be accurate.... Government Exhibit No. 12 entitled ABC of Marxism was originally written in 1938 by the then Young Peoples Socialist League and had some degree of circulation in that organization."

Shachtman then described the split in the SWP and the period following the formation of the Workers Party and how it came about that this outline was used. He related how after it had circulated for a time, it was brought to the attention of the NC.

"A number of formulations contained there were found to be inadequate, inaccurate and open to misconstruction.... The matter arose formally at the plenary meeting of the National Committee of the Workers Party in 1944."...

Q—"Can you tell us what happened then? At the plenum a decision was made to revise that?"

A—"Yes."

Q—"Was that carried out?"

A—"...After considerable delay a revised edition was run off in New York. Whether the stencils for the revised edition were provided by the author from California and made available in New York, I can't say with real certainty.... There were contained something like twenty changes of minor and major significance."

On the following day Shachtman continued his testimony on the ABC of Marxism. The revised edition had been received in evidence the day before.

Q—"Now, tell us the reason why [it was revised]. I think you discussed it briefly yesterday, but tell us again the reasons why changes were made in that document...."

A—"I think I already indicated, after the original text published under the auspices of the Workers Party had circulated for some time, it was evident that the original was inadequate and had to be revised because in some places it was obsolete, not up to date; in other places it was very poorly formulated, while in other places it was open to misconstruction as to our point of view. That is why this plenum of the National Committee that I referred to, which was read into the record as a Government Exhibit, instructed the author to draft revisions for a subsequent edition."

Asked to refer to some of the inaccuracies, Shachtman pointed out that the ABC discussed World War I at a period when World War II had been fought and finished; that in one important respect it contained a political position which was not the position of the organizations, as was publicly known to everyone, including the government: namely, for the "Defense of the Soviet Union." This had never been the position of the organizations at any time since their formation.

To complete this evidence, Shachtman read into the record all of the changes that were made in the revised edition.

RECITING THE RECORD

Near the end of his testimony, Shachtman was asked what efforts the organizations had made with respect to the listing by the attorney general. At this point, the witness read the long record of the fruitless efforts of the WP and ISL to get a hearing from the Department of Justice.

This devastating recital was read from the brief which Attorney Joseph L. Rauh had presented in the now famous Shachtman passport case, in which the Court of Appeals found against the State Department.

With the record clearly established that the current hearing had come as a result of the unceasing efforts of the WP and ISL and the their imminent passport decision, the direct examination of the organizations' principal witness ended.

Maddrix, for the government, began his cross-examination, at first mainly on Shachtman's early political biography. Before getting into that, however, Maddrix asked Shachtman:

Q—"Were you allowed as editor of *The New International* to formulate your own policies or were you directed by the organizations in which you were a member to write in accordance with their policy?"

A—"I was never directed to write anything in *The New International* that I can recall. But I don't mind saying that, in general, it was understood that if somebody is designated as editor, it is because he is, in general, in agreement with the ideas of the organization to which he belonged and is acceptably competent to express those ideas, in his own way, his own style, etc."...

Q—"Does the same obtain now as it did when you were editor prior to the present time, formulating your own ideas without being dictated to by anyone else?"

A—"Even more so. If I may add, Mr. Maddrix, we have tried to get away, and we have gotten away, from the atmosphere that existed in the older days of the Communist Party, especially in Stalinist Russia. Everybody who wrote, from the editor on down, simply parroted exactly the same words, exactly the same ideas which were the policy of the movement.... We have tried, I think with some success, to get back what we consider the old tradition, where Marxists not only thought freely but expressed themselves freely...."

QUIZZED ON FATHER

In the testimony on personal biography, Shachtman had mentioned how he became interested in socialism in high school (1918) and in the brief period he attended CCNY. He pointed out that the atmosphere in his home was not unfavorable to that interest because his father had considered himself a socialist and had been one in the "old country." Shachtman's father was apparently of interest to Maddrix for he then asked:

Q—"When you say 'socialist,' you mean 'revolutionary socialist' as distinguished from 'conservative'?"

A—"My father was not up to these finer distinctions."...

Q—"Can you tell us when you refer to your father being a socialist whether or not he was a revolutionary socialist or conservative socialist?"

A—"No, the distinction was not made at that time, at least not by my father."

Q—"Was your father familiar with the works of Karl Marx, do you know?"

A—"... with popularization of Marx's works from the socialist press that he read at that time."

The government, as would appear from the subsequent examination of Shachtman, is trying to establish that there was no evolution in the witness's personal political development, but that it remained constant.

So Maddrix spent a great deal of time on Shachtman's political activity during his youth—in the twenties when he was a member of the Workers' Council, the American Labor Alliance, and the Workers Party of 1922, which subsequently became the Communist Party; his expulsion from the CP; his activities in the Communist League of America, the first Trotskyist organization in the U. S.; and his participation in the Workers Party of the thirties, the Socialist Party, Socialist Workers Party, and the organizations after the split in March 1940.

A considerable time was spent on the meaning of the theory of "socialism in one country" in the fight between Trotsky and Stalin-Bukharin, and on Shachtman's pamphlet *Ten Years of the Left Opposition*, which was published in 1933.

All of this has nothing to do with the government's charges against the organizations; but the purpose of the cross-

examination was to try to establish a link from the politics and organizations involved in the hearing. How this relates to the charge that the organizations "advocate the change of the government of the United States by unconstitutional means" is beyond ordinary understanding. But then the whole listing is in the same category of phantasmagoria.

RELATIONS WITH F.I.

The afternoon session on Wednesday dealt largely with the relations of the organizations to the Fourth International:

Shachtman had testified to the formation of a minority group in the Socialist Workers Party in 1945, five years after the formation of the WP, and on how the fight in that party had raised the question of unity with the Workers Party, even though political differences remained deep. The evolution of that internal struggle brought about negotiations for unity, which was never consummated. This event was part of the struggle of the Workers Party against the ideas of the Fourth International and the SWP, which based themselves on Trotsky's theory of Russia as a "degenerated workers' state" and its defense.

After the war and the formation of the satellite states in Europe, a widespread discussion occurred throughout the socialist movement of the world on attitudes to be taken toward those states. The discussion was particularly deep-going in the movement of the Fourth International. Shachtman pointed out that his organization tried to bring their views to bear in opposition to the positions taken by that movement.

This was the background, he testified, to his appearance at the 1948 congress of the Fourth International where he was present as a representative of the Workers Party, but not as a delegate, since the WP was not a member, sympathizing or otherwise, of that body, or in any official or formal relationship to it.

Shachtman said that he had presented the views of the Workers Party on Russia, the nature of the satellite states and the nature of the Communist Parties as non-working class, anti-socialist organizations. These views were rejected by the congress.

Since the Workers Party, at the time it was founded, had said that it was in agreement with the fundamental policies of the Fourth International, the government had incorporated that fact in the Interrogatories in an effort to make it a real and living part of the movement in the years following 1940.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

Maddrix asked:

Q—"What were the fundamental policies of the Fourth International with which the Workers Party was in sympathy and harmony?"

A—"I already said in my reply in direct examination.... I can reiterate them in substance for you as follows:.... The basic economic theories of Marxism, namely, the labor theory of value. The theory of historical materialism. The theory of the class struggle as the motor force in history. The theory of the state as the instrument of coercion.... of the economically dominant class in a given society. The task of the socialist movement to base itself upon the working class as the instrument for its self-emancipation by helping to make it conscious of its position in society as a class and its historic mission to raise itself to the position of ruling class, that is, to achieve democracy by overturning the economic foundations of capitalist rule and to establish the classless society."

Q—"Do you say that the things that you have just mentioned are the basic principles and writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky?"

A—"Yes, as we understand them and have taught them."

Q—"Did you consider the means by which this socialist state is to be achieved....?"

A—"By the working class, that is...."

Q—"What statement did you give showing the means whereby this is to be attained?"

A—"It has already been indicated.... the organization of the working class into a political party of its own, and in a country like the United States, gain

political power, establish a labor government, and then proceed by the means indicated to the gradual nationalization of the means of production and exchange.... their democratic control and management, and usher in the classless society."

Q—"Now, I won't go into that any more right now, except to ask you this question: do you mean to tell us that it is the ISL's position to establish a labor government?"

A—"That is correct."

Q—"Do you or have you at any time ever drawn any distinction between a labor government and a workers' government?"

A—"In a certain sense, we have always drawn that distinction."

Q—"Tell us what that distinction is."

A—"You can have labor governments that are not socialist governments in the full sense of the word. A labor government and socialist government.... have been used interchangeably except where sometimes it has referred to a government of an organization which calls itself Labor Party, as for example, the Labor Party government in England.... We distinguish, however, for example, between the third Labor government of 1924, 1927 or 1928. The 1945 Labor government was infinitely a more socialist government from our point of view. The mere organization of the working class into a party of its own does not automatically and immediately mean a socialist program. [Shachtman here described the development of the British Labor Party and the socialists to leadership in the course of years.]...."

In the United States, we believe, once it is formed, the labor party will have a much more rapid development, a much more rapid development because of the different conditions prevailing in the United States than prevailed in England in the early days of this century. We consider it our particular task to work inside such a labor party, loyally and devotedly as socialists, insuring and increasing the degree of socialist consciousness, increasing the degree of socialist program, increasing the degree of socialist leadership. That has been stated in articles and resolutions that we have adopted in the Independent Socialist League.

Q—"Then, is it fair to state that the Independent Socialist League would not be entirely satisfied with a socialist government, but would only be satisfied with a workers' government?"

"SATISFIED"?

A—"It would be satisfied with a socialist government, of course."

Q—"You mean to say that your organizations would be satisfied with a socialist government, as you have just explained, such as the British Labor Party had in England not too many years ago?"

A—"Yes, except we, of course [want], a more clearly socialist program, a more actively socialist policy pursued by the government, and a more democratic foundation under the government itself. We don't have as our ideal a parliamentary democratic form. We have as our ideal—let me make this clear—we have as our ideal for a workers state a completely democratic, representative form of government. However, that may develop in the course of each nation's political evolution. In one country, it may take one form; in another country, another form...."

Q—"Let me see. I want to be very careful about this point. Do you contend, both the Workers Party and ISL would be satisfied with a workers government such as, for instance, existed in England under the Attlee regime?"

A—"Well, that depends on what you mean by 'satisfied.' Satisfied from what standpoint?"

Q—"Is that your goal? Is that what you are after?"

A—"Yes.... we would be completely content with an Attlee type of government in the United States.... We would consider that an enormous advance for the working class.... If it were established, we would want to go still further. That is what I meant by satisfied and not quite satisfied. Do I make that clear?"

Q—"You exactly do make it clear because you are now answering the ques-

The ISL's Washington Hearing

tion so I can understand just exactly what your position is. Let me repeat it again. Ultimately, you want a communistic society, isn't that true?

A—"One based upon the principle of 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.'"

Maddrix reverted to the question of the Fourth International and asked, since the question about agreement in "fundamental policy" had been answered, in what respect the Workers Party was not in harmony with certain fundamental policies of the Fourth International.

Shachtman referred to the reply to the Interrogatories of the Attorney General and said that these revolved around such questions as the character of the Stalinist state, the satellite countries, the nature and role of the social-democratic parties; and that the differences had increased with the passing years. These differences not only increased but were clearly and firmly held by the Independent Socialist League.

He added that "For us Marxists, the development and clarification of our thought proceed not in a vacuum but in relation to actual political problems. Marxism, for us, is not a dogma, not even for one day. It is a guide."

A long examination followed, with Maddrix reading lengthy sections from the program of the Fourth International entitled *The Death Agony of Capitalism*. The purpose was presumably to establish some connection between that document, adopted in 1938, before the organizations were formed, and the views of the WP, SYL and ISL. The reading of the quotations showed that whatever the historical merit of the document, the developments of the past almost twenty years showed it to be outlived and above all established that it had no living relationship at all to the organizations.

Daniel Bell Testifies In Behalf of ISL

Washington, June 14

Daniel Bell, labor editor of *Fortune* magazine, and Barry Miller, first challenger of the army's "dishonorable discharge policy," testified in behalf of the organizations.

After Bell identified himself, he testified as follows under direct examination by Attorney Rau:

Q—"Where are you employed?"

A—"I am employed at *Fortune* Magazine... I have been labor editor of *Fortune* magazine since 1948."

Q—"Did you prepare an affidavit in 1955 in connection with this case?"

A—"Yes, I did. I was asked by Mr. Gates if I would submit a statement to the Hearing Board and I said I would, because at that time I did not know if I could come down to the hearing or not. In lieu of that, I prepared a statement which wrote out my conclusion about the case itself."

Q—"Is this the statement that you prepared at that time, Mr. Bell?"

A—"Yes, it is. This is the statement which I had notarized at the time."

When Rau asked Bell to read his statement, the government objected on the ground that, although the rules established for hearings permitted the introduction of statements, it did not believe this applied to cases where witnesses were personally present. Maddrix argued that such a procedure prevented objections to questions which might be put if the witness were examined. Since the statement expressed opinions that could not be objected to if they were in reply to questions, the government felt that the reading should not be allowed, but that questions should be put to the witness.

The hearing examiner ruled that since the witness was present and the substance of the statement could be brought out by questions and answers, the examination should proceed on that basis.

Rau accepted the ruling, although he pointed out that cross-examination could have proceeded on the statement itself.

Bell testified that he had been managing editor of the *New Leader and Common Sense*, and had taught sociology and economics at the University of Chicago from 1945-8. In 1948 he became labor editor of *Fortune* magazine and, in recent

years, a lecturer in sociology at Columbia University.

Q—"Now, Mr. Bell, in connection with these various activities, have you had occasion to follow the activities and writings of the Workers Party, the Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League?"

A—"I think that I have followed their activities in quite some detail for a period of more than 16 or 17 years... Since my area of interest has been the socialist movement, I have done a study on the history of the Marxist movement. I think you will see from the statement I have signed, I have written a monograph on the history and background of the Marxist parties in America. This was sponsored by Princeton University on a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. This was published in 1952. In addition to that, I am now doing a large book on communism in the American labor movement under a grant from the Fund for the Republic..."

DEFINES "COMMUNIST"

Q—"In connection with these various activities, and also your work at *Fortune*, have you been a reader of *LABOR ACTION*?"

A—"I have read *LABOR ACTION* regularly in the last eight years. I have been a subscriber, as I have subscribed to a variety of other publications. I have read *LABOR ACTION* regularly for the last eight years and before that quite regularly. I can't say every week before that..."

Q—"Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?"

A—"I have never been a member of the Communist Party or any Communist front organization. I have never been a member of the Trotskyist party or any Trotskyist organization."

Q—"Have you ever been a member of anything?"

A—"Yes, I was a member of the Young People's Socialist League beginning 1933. When the party split in 1936, I was a member of the so-called right wing group, which was against Norman Thomas."

Bell described how his group became supporters of Roosevelt and the Dubinsky wing in the then American Labor Party. He described his membership in the American Committee for Cultural Freedom and his activity on the Administrative Committee of that body.

Q—"What is your understanding of the meaning of the word Communist today?"

A—"... A Communist, generally speaking, is an individual that subscribes to the political doctrines of the Leninist parties, an attempt to follow the political line established by the Communist Party... individuals who subscribe in many ways to the doctrines of the Lenin-Stalin regime... A Communist is an individual who supports the Communist Party. It is as simple as that... If you say Communist today, he is a man who supports the Communist movement, who subscribes to the doctrines of the Communist Party in a variety of other activities, and supports the political line of the Communist Party."

"OUTRAGEOUS"

Q—"Would you state in what way you believe the Independent Socialist League is not a Communist organization?"

At this point, Waterman, one of the government's attorneys, rose to object to answer by the witness on the same ground that the government had objected to the testimony of Norman Thomas, Dwight Macdonald and Harry Fleischman. He contended that such an answer would invade the prerogative of the Hearing Examiner.

As in the case of the other witnesses, he claimed that Bell was not qualified to answer because he too did not attend National Committee meetings or conventions of the organizations.

Thereupon Bell said:

"I would like to respond since my professional criteria have been questioned. I think it is a question of reading. I don't know what it means to become an expert. I am an expert on this. This is my professional reputation, my reputation as a writer and sociologist, and profes-

sion as labor editor of *Fortune*..."

RAUH: "May I please say something? I would like to say that I subscribe to Mr. Bell's statement that the performance of the government here was slightly outrageous. The reason I say that is something that Mr. Bell does not even know. You have already ruled on this very question that indicated that persons who follow the activities of these organizations in different capacities may indicate their views on the organization... I think Mr. Bell was subjected to unlawful conduct..."

MORRISSEY: "If this is part of your affirmative defense and you think it is material to the defense in the case, you may proceed, but I am still of the opinion it is just a personal opinion and statement."

WATERMAN: "There should be some basis for that personal opinion other than reading *LABOR ACTION*..."

MORRISSEY: "I think the witness has testified that he is familiar with the literature and that he has followed their activities for a period of years and he wants to give his personal opinion as to what they stand for. It may become part of the record but I am still of the opinion that it is his personal opinion."

EXPERTS—AND EXPERTS

This statement by examiner Morrissey about "personal opinion" is odd, especially since he made no such ruling in the case of the government witness, Professor Robinson, whose claim to "expertness" was that he had read some volumes of Lenin. He was accepted as an expert though he had never heard of the organizations and knew nothing about them, let alone any of the socialist political movements in the United States. As to the testimony of those like Norman Thomas and Harry Fleischman who have spent the whole of their adult lives in the socialist movement, their ideas were accepted merely as "personal opinion"!

Bell told Morrissey:

"May I say, Mr. Examiner, I don't know the procedures in this hearing... I would like to make a personal statement if I may... I have professional standing if I am quite jealous of. This professional standing is the thing I am talking about. I have no political sympathy for the organization. It is more than a question of personal opinion. I think some of your remarks are a challenge to me... Let me point out [referring to his written study] this is the first major publication on this subject. There were none before. That is why the Rockefeller Foundation put up some money for my monograph, *The History and Background of the Marxist Parties of America*. It is the first of its kind..."

Rau continued with Bell's testimony: "... on the basis of your studies, knowledge and following the organizations involved, in your opinion and belief, do they advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence?"

A—"Let me say first that generally speaking I do not believe that the Independent Socialist League favors or advocates the overthrow of the United States government by force and violence..."

INTERPRETING LENIN

In a lengthy discussion of the problem, Bell gave his interpretation of what he considered the key Leninist doctrines, dictatorship of the proletariat, nationalization of property, conspiratorial organization, and explained what he meant by these, discussing their history and context. He continued:

"... I would say in the evolution of that party, in the terms of their own debate, they have moved substantially away from almost every one of those doctrines [dictatorship of the proletariat, nationalization of property, conspiratorial organization]... I think that the debates of the Workers Party and the Independent Socialist League reveal their own awareness of the pitfalls of these problems and whatever early advocacy of the doctrines, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the problem of force and violence... they have moved away from that completely... They certainly have repudiated the idea that socialized property itself would provide the basis for a democratic society. I think in the nature of their party organization they are not a conspiratorial party. It is these

three criteria: they don't believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat; they don't believe that the nationalization of property provides any guarantee... they are not a conspiratorial party..."

Q—"Would you explain the last two of your three criteria that you gave us? I think you had explained on the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the other points?"

A—"... Regarding the third statement, I would follow the distinction—this is a personal opinion—I would follow the distinction of Professor Hook on conspiracy and dissent. I would be against any conspiratorial movement, but not dissent. I don't think the ISL is a conspiratorial party or the Workers Party is a conspiratorial party. I think all debates were quite open. Its documents were circulated. I have a complete file of internal documents of the party which I have assembled. And to that extent, all debates were open. Their decisions were published. They can't be called a conspiratorial party."

Q—"On your second criterion, when you say that government ownership or nationalization is not enough, what would you consider additional factors that they believe in that would make it enough?"

A—"The additional factors, primarily, institutional safeguards... the right of opposition press, the right of opposition movements to be heard..."

Q—"Mr. Bell, would it be fair to summarize the statement about the word 'revolutionary' that you made before, that as used by the Workers Party and the Independent Socialist League, it goes to the ends rather than the means?"

Maddrix objected and was overruled.

A—"I would say it certainly applies to the ends... The question of means is a very difficult question to answer... I would say, certainly, in recent doctrines, the last fifteen years or so that I have been acquainted with the doctrines of the ISL, following constantly and reading back of the material they had, they don't favor in the sense of advocating any action of violence for their own sake. There have been discussions, of course, as in many Marxist movements, under what conditions would one advocate—the word advocate is an ambiguous word—there have been many debates where they felt under certain circumstances it would be necessary to take up arms. I would say that increasingly this doctrine—was repudiated."

Bell, of course, elaborated in greater detail on the question. The Government did not cross-examine him.

MILLER CASE

Barry Miller followed Bell to the stand and was examined by Attorney Silard. Miller identified himself as a former member of the organizations prior to his induction into the army.

He explained under direct questioning, how he became interested in socialism and found that his ideas corresponded most closely to the Workers Party which he joined at the age of 18 and subsequently became a member of the Socialist Youth League and ISL.

Silard then began a series of questions pertaining to Miller's case in the army. [See LA for June 28 and other issues in 1954.] He had been transferred, because of derogatory information about his pre-induction political associations, from White Sands to Fort Monmouth, where he became an instructor in microwave radio repair.

Miller then described the development of his case, his precipitate severance from the army with a "dishonorable discharge." He obtained a formal hearing and succeeded in having that discharge changed to a general discharge.

At this point Maddrix objected to the entire line of questioning.

"I don't think," he said, "it pertains to the issues in this case. The issues are clearly whether or not these organizations were properly listed on the Attorney General's list in pursuance to Executive Order 10450."

"Now, what Mr. Silard is attempting to do, it seems to me, is to show that this witness, that his membership in either of the organizations, proved to be

[Turn to last page]

Dem Chairman vs. Reuther — —

(Continued from page 2)

can realign our parties. Let the Dixiecrats join the Republican Party."

Reuther developed a similar theme in his speech: "The Democratic Party had better come out of the convention with a strong civil-rights program. They need to take the kind of actions giving meaning and substance to the principles of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. That's how Harry Truman won in 1948."

As for the Dixiecrats: "They are a liability. If the Democrats try to be all things to all men, they will lose as they should lose."

In a state with 200,000 unemployed, with the Negroes in political ferment aroused by the events in the South, anything less would have fallen flat at the convention. The remarks of Mazey and Reuther were greeted enthusiastically, and their ideas made a deep impression on the delegates. The resolution adopted on political action contains this line, just as the recent Democratic Party convention in Michigan adopted a declaration of principles with these same Reuther ideas as the central point.

However, the Michigan CIO convention also heard Paul Butler, national chairman of the party, speak, and he questioned the judgement of people who ask labor if they are going to take the Democratic Party and Senator Eastland too.

"Are you going to turn away from the Democratic Party that befriended labor? Are you going to repudiate the party of Roosevelt and Truman? The Democrats gave workers a new economic bill of rights."

"This is not the time for us to say we

Where Do They — —

(Continued from page 3)

crats. It was the Northern conservatives whose power was thereby enhanced and who used that power to prevent the enactment of laws to benefit workers. . . . And in many instances they did it without challenge from Northern Democrats whose obligation to industrial workers is even greater."

He cites examples:

• "Not one voice was raised in protest, not one 'friend' rose to fight for the repeal of the infamous and dangerous section of the Taft-Hartley act which permits and recognizes the right of states to enact union-repressing laws in the normally federal field of interstate commerce. Of the 18 states which have enacted such laws, 12 are completely under Democratic administration and legislative control. Eleven of these are in the South, one in the Southwest."

• "It was because of these conservative Southerners, and the cowardly reaction of Northerners, that the subject of civil rights was carefully avoided in the 84th Congress."

• "It was the Southern conservatives who quickly abandoned the effort to relieve the tax burden on the lower-income families, with the Northern Democrats meekly following like sheep."

• And he wants to know, reminding us that only two Democrats opposed Eastland's elevation to the chairmanship of the Senate Judiciary Committee:

"Where were the rest of the liberal voices in the Senate? There wasn't even audible indignation expressed in the Senate or by the leading candidates of both parties."

• And he sums up:

"The concessions that are made to the Southern conservatives by the Democratic Party, the acquiescence of Northern Democrats to the conservative opposition because they hope some day to be running for office on the national ticket, would be a stench in the nostrils of an honest Democrat if the full story were told. And we should tell it."

What is wrong? Jacobson understands why labor is so easily kicked around:

"For many years, the conservative has been counseling the Democratic leaders—'Never mind labor, it has nowhere else to go.' And the Democratic leaders reply—'That's right. Labor has nowhere else to go.'"

But Jacobson knows the facts of life. They have no place else to go, he points out: Without the support of labor, liberal and conservative alike would be nothing. And so, labor should start to speak up and fight for its rights inside the party, he concludes.

can get along without the South or that we can ignore their people who are being denied their rights. I believe in equal opportunities for every man, woman and child. But we must win over those who disagree with us by persuasion and logic, not by force.

"I would oppose just arbitrarily or brashly leaving out of the party those states south of the Mason-Dixon line."

Butler laid it on the line. The Democratic Party machine is going to resist the UAW and Michigan CIO policy all the way.

His arguments, of course, didn't convince anybody here. But at the Democratic Party convention? That is something else. Given the bold stand of the UAW leaders, a retreat on their part at the forthcoming convention will be difficult indeed.

HITS HOFFA

The Michigan convention took strong positions against racketeering in the union movement following a vigorous denunciation of the unholy alliance between "the most corrupt labor leaders and the most reactionary politicians."

In Michigan that is the alliance between AFL leaders, notably Jimmy Hoffa of the Teamsters, and the Republican Party. Many important AFL leaders here already are endorsing Mayor Cobo of Detroit against Governor Williams.

Pointing out that as many AFL unions as former CIO unions have jurisdictional problems with the Building Trades unions, Reuther criticized the tactics of the Building Trades and the Teamsters Union for slowing up merger on state and local levels.

But his sharpest blast at Hoffa, without mentioning names, was this: "Some fellows made a fast buck by applying business practices to the labor movement. I say, if you want to make a fast buck, get out of the labor movement and get into business where you belong."

Reuther added: "You can't do this job of cleaning out the racketeers with a powder puff."

He insisted the AFL-CIO ethical-practices committee ought to have power not only to pick on small unions but also to take on "the biggest unions, if necessary."

Clearly Reuther is taking the offensive in Michigan to win the sympathy and support of the 350,000 AFL rank-and-filers

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

here that shows that there was any danger to the government in the actions of these defendants."

This argument went along with the line of the Vinson decision itself in basing the guilt or innocence of the defendants on the state of the cold war rather than on their rights.

Defense lawyer Mary Kaufman added that "the only evidence of force and violence in this case is testimony of alleged statements of third persons made outside the hearing of the defendants. . . . The evidence, assuming it is true, is nothing more than opinion and belief, which is protected by the First Amendment."

The defense begins its case this week. It is more important than ever that democratic opponents of Stalinism raise their voice against the continuation of the Smith Act witchhunt. Several recent court decisions have lightened the atmosphere of civil liberties very recently; and the new events in Russia have, or should have, pointed up the need of dealing with the Stalinist movement by means of political exposure and not by the cop's billy.

But the Department of Justice is steadily pursuing its vicious objective of driving the CP underground with its Smith Act prosecutions, on the basis of precedents which gut civil liberties.

What's on in N.Y. Thursday, June 28 — ISL Forum Abe Stein on THE CRISIS OF RUSSIAN STALINISM Labor Action Hall at 9

WHAT'S ON IN N.Y.

Thursday, June 28 — ISL Forum Abe Stein on THE CRISIS OF RUSSIAN STALINISM Labor Action Hall at 9

here against their leaders dominated mainly by Hoffa. His remarks, of course, are popular with the 700,000 former CIO unionists here.

PRESSED BY DISCONTENT

The debate between Republican State Senator Edward Hutchinson and George Van Peurseem against Ed Carey and John Swainson for the Democratic party was a wholesome addition to the convention, for it gave many delegates a better insight into American politics as it really is, rather than just seeing it through the narrow viewpoint of the union movement, as handed down by its leaders. It served as a reminder that merely moral indignation over conditions, or belief in the justice of the workingman's case, is not enough to win the fight in the decisive political arena.

This point is being emphasized by the special session of the Michigan state legislature which is considering various proposals to either increase unemployment compensation and/or lengthen the weeks of eligibility, for the rate of termination of unemployment benefits is increasing alarmingly here. By August 15,000 to 20,000 persons a week will have exhausted their unemployment benefits! Getting relief from this situation is proving difficult for the union movement.

In the context of this over-all economic picture and the changing political climate in Michigan, the tone and viewpoint of the union movement reflect the conditions by the resurgence of what has been called Reutherism in the active union ranks, who are in turn pressed for even more action and militancy by the dissatisfied people in the shops and the embittered unemployed.

In Defense of — —

(Continued from page 6)

an impediment when he was serving in the armed forces.

"I think that is beyond the issues here. If we are going to open up that fact then there is no telling how far we can open this matter up. . . . We claim that it is a separate issue. It can be taken care as Mr. Rauh took care of it in Mr. Shachtman's passport case. . . ."

Morrissey then inquired of Silard the purpose of the testimony. Silard stated that the effects of the listing were in issue in this case; that he could not see how the government would be prejudiced by such testimony.

Morrissey said that while he took judicial notice of the use of the list in some other ways, he did not believe it had any bearing on the issues in the hearing, suggesting that perhaps the government would stipulate that in Miller's case "it was used in that particular respect."

Following further argument, the hearing examiner agreed to accept an offer of proof from Silard as to what Miller would have testified to had he been permitted to do so.

Rauh then asked Morrissey if by that ruling he would be required to bring other witnesses down, have them sworn and prepared to testify, only to have an offer of proof then made on the basis of the ruling; or could such an offer be made without bringing the witnesses physically to the hearing, he wanted to know. Morrissey said it would not be necessary to bring the witnesses personally to the hearing, but in the case of such other witnesses as were prepared to testify to the effects of the list, an offer of proof would be acceptable.

Silard thereupon put his offer of proof into the record of hearing. The offer of proof was a recital of the entire Miller army case, beginning with the charges presented to him at Fort Monmouth, his dishonorable discharge even before his time had run for army service, the hearing held with counsel at which time he received a general discharge, and finally his appeal against that ruling for an honorable discharge which is now pending before the Army review Board.

This concluded that part of the organizations' case concerned with the presentation of outside witnesses.

The hearing resumed Tuesday, June 19 with continued cross-examination of Shachtman. This week's proceedings, which are perhaps the last, will be fully reported next week as usual.—ED.

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!

Get Acquainted! Independent Socialist League 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y. I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL. I want to join the ISL. NAME (please print) ADDRESS CITY ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE LABOR ACTION 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C. Please enter my subscription: 1 year at \$2. 6 months at \$1. Payment enclosed. Bill me. New sub. Renewal. NAME (please print) ADDRESS CITY ZONE STATE