

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

THE SP-SDF AND POLITICAL ACTION

... page 6

REVERSING POLAND'S OCTOBER

... page 7

Two Symposiums on Socialist Regroupment

... page 2

Biggest Post-War Strike On in Britain

... page 3

Mollet Swings Cop's Billy on the Opposition

... page 3

MARCH 25, 1957

FIVE CENTS

Labor-Racket Hearings Raise a Basic Issue:

BUSINESS-UNIONISM OR LABOR-UNIONISM

Case of Hoffa, Beck and the Teamsters Ramifies Out to Politics and Social Life

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, March 17

Jimmy Hoffa returned to his headquarters here somewhat subdued, for the Teamsters boss found himself embroiled by a federal rap, as is often the bane of big-time operators. "Never mess with the feds" is an old saying among the boys, and in this case Hoffa seems to have violated the code.

But whether he is indicted, convicted or not, of trying to bribe a Senate investigator, the union movement has a task related to him and Dave Beck, and Frank Brewster of the Teamsters union, that shouldn't and can't wait, if the union movement is to save itself from an avalanche of criticism.

Such officials ought to be cleaned out from all labor organizations for betraying a sacred trust: the handling of union funds, the abuse and misuse of the hard-earned dues dollars of the rank and file. All three of them have admitted that they destroyed union financial records—Beck and Brewster in the current hearings; Hoffa in the 1954 congressional hearings. In all cases, the rank and file have no method of getting proper financial reports on what happened to their money. In each case, the records were destroyed deliberately, just before investigations.

James B. Carey, president of the electrical union (IUE), has done quite a service to the labor movement by his open criticisms of the men involved, rather than just sticking to moral preaching and generalities, like Walter Reuther and George Meany, in the current mess.

JUST THE SURFACE

As sensational as the Washington hearings may seem at present, they have just scratched the surface. In Beck's case, the whole story of an attempt to establish a beer monopoly, through his being sole representative of a major beer company in a 9-state area, hasn't even been mentioned.

For Hoffa, the jukebox scandals, the tie-up between him and Dorfman of Chicago, and the way millions of dollars were handled, still have to be discussed fully in open hearings. Then there is a "Portland" story to be unfolded in many other cities.

In every case, the solid tales of bribery, corruption and racketeering go far beyond the scope of "labor racketeering." They serve as an indictment of American politics even sharper than the Kefauver hearings of a few years ago. Not since Lincoln Steffens wrote his muck-raking *Shame of American Cities* almost 50 years ago has the nation had such a critical look at itself and at what is called successful politics.

Can the Senate committee avoid, for

example, digging into the full story of how the congressional committee investigating Hoffa was forced to call off its hearings in Detroit just when the exposé started getting sensational?

Among the higher-ups mentioned as putting the pressure on to end the hearings were Arthur Summerfield, postmaster general of the United States, Thomas E. Dewey, then governor of New York, and others. Why? These names were brought into the picture by Republican congressmen who complained against the pressure.

Another look into New York politics, and into the connections between racketeers in the union movement and high political figures, can hardly be avoided when Owen J. Bert Brennan, Hoffa's buddy, is questioned. It will touch off an-

(Continued on page 4)

By GORDON HASKELL

The biggest sensation to date in the Senate investigation of racketeering in the labor movement has been the arrest and indictment of James Hoffa, Teamster Union vice-president, on bribery charges. The charge is that Hoffa sought to plant an attorney on the Senate committee's staff, who would then tip him off on any developments which might be dangerous to him. The FBI claims its agents caught Hoffa with documents on his person which had been turned over to him by his "plant," who had double-crossed him.

As an interesting sidelight, it turns out that the man alleged to have contacted Hoffa's "plant" for him, one Hyman I. Fischbach, had once served as an attorney for Senator Joseph McCarthy. Hoffa's present attorney in Washington, Edward Bennett Williams, has also twice represented McCarthy: once in the hearing which resulted in Senate censure against the Wisconsin Windbag, and once in an action brought against McCarthy by columnist Drew Pearson.

The hearing of the Teamsters' Union is just beginning, and is far from having reached its climax. The committee and Teamster President Dave Beck are still sparring over just when and how his personal records will be made available to it. Leads have been opened which (committee counsel darkly hints) will

connect Beck, Vice-President Brewster and possibly others with business interests in the Middle West.

Hoffa's indictment, while sensational, still leaves unanswered just what and how much the committee will be able to bring to light about the ramifications of his connections in the underworld and the business world.

PILLAR OF SOCIETY

Dave Beck, honored citizen of Seattle, member of the Board of Trustees of the University of Washington, has already admitted two financial transactions which, if well within the law, raise a series of interesting issues for the labor movement itself.

One was the purchase of his \$160,000 home in Seattle by the union, as well as (it is reported) \$90,000 worth of furniture in the home. Beck now lives in this modest residence rent-free. He does not even have to pay for its upkeep, as that

(Turn to last page)

Nixon Tours Africa as Cold-War Arena

By SAM TAYLOR

The well-publicized trip through the northern half of Africa by Vice-President Richard Nixon officially inaugurates that part of the world as an arena of the great power struggle.

It is notification that the United States is preparing to take active interest and play an active role in African affairs south of the Sahara desert.

The play was ostensibly touched off by the inauguration of Ghana's independence. Sending the vice-president as Eisenhower's representative indicated that far more than a ceremonial gesture was intended.

For some time now, there have been reports that the State Department has been looking for the occasion to send a person of high rank to that area to demonstrate U.S. interest. Ghanaian independence, the Middle East crisis and the Eisenhower doctrine accounted the timing for the Nixon trip.

The threat, real and imagined, of Communism was stressed in the dispatches stretching from Morocco to Ghana, Uganda, Ethiopia, Sudan, Libya and Tunisia. While the planeload of U.S. reporters sent back pictures of Nixon wearing native costumes and shaking

hands, Nixon also went into serious diplomatic discussions on military bases, military aid, economic aid and the Eisenhower Doctrine, and generally tried to line up support for or acquiescence in the impending struggle for this awakening continent. Whether the newly emerging free African nations want to line up in either the U.S. or Russian bloc is another question.

Nixon on a stop-over in Rome explained the developing interest in Africa in the following way: Africa is the last great area in the world where natural resources are still largely unexplored. It is important, therefore, that free nations outside Africa work in cooperation with new African nations to develop these resources. Because of Africa's position, it is a major target of Communist intrigue, since whoever controls Africa controls the world. (Paraphrased in the "Christian Science Monitor," March 18.)

We now have it from the vice-president that the U.S. intends to control

and dominate African resources and economic life, if possible. Then what about colonialism and imperialism?

With all the assurances of a man who has his hand in your pocket, Nixon defended the U.S. against the charge of a "new colonialism." "As far as Africa is concerned," Nixon said, "there is only one kind of colonialism to fear and that is Communism." (Ibid.) It is not going to be at all easy to convince many Africans that the U.S. has no imperialist interests in Africa, by claiming or proving that Russia also has these interests.

In Morocco, Nixon cautiously indicated a favorable attitude on the Sultan's aspiration for the establishment of a North African Federation; at the same time he had to be careful not to step on too many French toes with respect to Algeria, which has to be included in any such federation. At the same time he was discussing the future of the four big U.S. bases in Morocco, which has to be renegotiated now that Morocco has won independence.

In Ghana, Nixon was buttonholed by Rev. Martin Luther King of Montgomery, who suggested to Nixon that since he had traveled several thousand miles to extol freedom and independence in Ghana, he might travel seven hundred

Two Symposiums on Socialist Regroupment

In L.A., Shachtman Debates SWPer

By TED ENRIGHT

Los Angeles, March 13

An audience of 160 this evening heard a symposium on "The Meaning of Socialist Regroupment" by three spokesmen of three socialist organizations: Max Shachtman of the ISL, Arne Swabek of the Socialist Workers Party, and Harry Siitonen of the Los Angeles local of the Socialist Party.

Because of the general agreement in the ideas of the spokesmen for the Socialist Party and the ISL, the audience heard a sharp debate between the contrasting viewpoints of the SWP and the ISL—on the possibility of unity, its political basis, the road to achieving unity and on some of the activities of the SWP which that party has carried out behind the façade of the unity discussion. In every respect, it was a most successful meeting, in attendance, in response and above all in the manner in which the ideas of the ISL and the SP were received by the audience with enthusiasm.

As the first speaker, Arne Swabek presented for the SWP a conception of unity based upon agreement on program. Among the nine points presented as essential to this agreement was one on the "defense of the Soviet Union," and another on the necessity of a "Leninist party."

The rest of this speaker's talk consisted of a denunciation of "the rotten unity of the SP-SDF based on the rotten foundation of State Department Socialism," a denunciation of Norman Thomas for his proposition "for probation of all ex-Stalinists to test the sincerity of their renunciation of Leninism." From this point he proceeded to denounce Shachtman's support of "unity of the SP-SDF" and then proclaimed to the audience "that it was no wonder that there were many comrades in the ISL youth now studying Marxism under the tutelage of the SWP."

A ROAD TO UNITY

Shachtman began his presentation with the fact that no socialist movement existed in the United States. There were, he asserted, only propaganda groups, or sects. Besides these sects, which included all the groups speaking from the platform, there existed only the discredited and disgraced Communist Party, which had no future; but this Communist Party used to be a movement yesterday, insofar as it could lead the workers in significant numbers—whereas the other socialist groups were ignored when they attempted to lead the working class.

The honorable role of all the sects of yesterday was the presentation of their ideas on the "Russian question," which Shachtman called the only question that has split and divided the socialists. But the events of last year in Poland and Hungary clearly establish that all non-Communists are united in support of democracy. He therefore proposed that

YOU, DEAR READER

are in this too. The ISL Fund Drive needs your dollars. Send a contribution in now, even a small one, if that's all your poverty can afford. Make checks payable to Albert Gates.

NEW YORK LABOR ACTION FORUM

Thursday, March 28

SAM TAYLOR

Labor Action writer

on

Eisenhower's Dilemma:

U.S. and the Middle East Crisis

8:30 p.m. at L. A. Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

all these groups "freeze their theoretical positions" on the "Russian question" and unite into the only party which has always presented a broad, loosely defined program based on democratic socialism—the Socialist Party—which had the respect of American workers, and in no way shares the disgrace of the Communist Party.

In clarification of his conception, he pointed to the fact that the sects knew each other's positions on the "Russian question," that they had no hope of persuading any significant group of the correctness of their particular positions—other than scattered individuals already organized in these movements—and that in effect to insist on unity of program meant only opposition to that unity which was now practical, desirable and urgent. This could not lead to unity; it could lead only to a "reshuffling of individuals" among all the sects and to the further weakening of these sects or to further splitting.

As a result, the socialist groups who held to this theory of "regroupment" were making themselves ridiculous in the eyes of the public, or engaging in wrecking activities which repelled every honest socialist. He pointed to the *Militant* and the SWP, which, when it captured one member of the California Socialist Party, proclaimed that capture with banner headlines as the beginning of a mass movement.

Pointing up the meaning of Swabek's remarks on the discontented youth of the ISL—all 12 or 15 or 18 of them—he said that he had no objection to the SWP recruiting, capturing or stealing them; but he did object to calling this "regroupment" or "unification." He warned the SWP that if this was the entire substance of their conception of unity, they should prepare themselves for the "rude surprise" which awaited them: i.e., the hostility of the public and of all socialists to this deceit. He insistently challenged Swabek to explain why they called their "commando raids" by the name of "regroupment."

ISSUES IN DISPUTE

Siitonen, for the SP, presented an able defense of the Socialist Party and the facts of its democratic character. He forthrightly cited those groups with whom unity could be considered, and most specifically eliminated the SWP and the members of the Communist Party. He cited the factual, democratic record of the SP and its democratic traditions in contrast with the lack of democracy in the SWP and its flirtation with Tito.

In the rebuttal period Shachtman said that if Norman Thomas thinks Leninism means deceit and treachery, that he also rejects this conception, although he believes that Thomas is mistaken. He asserted that even if there were no unity question, and if he thought that Thomas was right, he (Shachtman) would also spurn and reject this dishonesty—and without hesitation.

For the ISL, in a unified socialist party, he ably defended his conception that it was not entitled to special privileges. In any case he said he believed that it was essential for all socialists to recognize that only a permanent conception of working and living inside the SP was compatible with his own conception. "To think," he said, "of entry as part of a tactic of a quick split is idiotic!"

In conclusion, it remains only to be added that Swabek had absolutely nothing to say in refutation of the charges and challenges made by Shachtman in both his presentation and rebuttal. To Shachtman's question, "Is it not true that there is not a party, not a sect, not a sectarian grouping, of any kind, with whom the SWP is prepared to unite?"—no answer. Swabek had nothing to say in answering the charges that the SWP was presently engaged in a split maneuver in the YSL.

Thus it should not be a surprise to anyone that the audience responded to Shachtman's positive approach and that it felt that only the ISL had anything to say which had practical meaning.

In Philly, Five-Way Discussion on Unity

By FRANK HARPER

Philadelphia, March 16

About 200 last night attended a symposium here on "What's Ahead for the American Left?" Those who traveled downtown through the rain were treated to a unique event on the local political radical scene when spokesmen for the viewpoint of five socialist and revolutionary organizations exchanged opinions on socialist regroupment and revitalization.

Represented were the viewpoints of the Independent Socialist League, Socialist Party, *Liberation* magazine, Communist Party, and Socialist Workers Party. The Socialist Labor Party and *National Guardian* had also been invited but did not participate.

Plans for the meeting were initiated by the Philadelphia Third Camp Contact Committee. The meeting was officially sponsored by a committee of the participants.

The highlight of the evening was the proposal made by J. A. Davidson speaking for the ISL that the easiest and most practical form for socialist regroupment at this time was an all-inclusive and democratically functioning Socialist Party. His program was closely patterned after that of the Political Committee of the Independent Socialist League for merger of the ISL and the SP-SDF.

FOR A DEBS PARTY

What Davidson portrayed was a party patterned after the SP of the time of Eugene V. Debs, a party with a wide but minimum program which has room in it for all who call themselves democratic socialists and who fight for the ever-increasing extension of democracy in the United States and in the Russian world. There is no room in the socialist regroupment for defenders of the Kremlin regime and associates.

John Lewine, speaking for the Socialist Party, essentially seconded Davidson's viewpoint and stated that there should be no prejudice in the SP-SDF against those individuals who are now members of the Communist Party.

Chairman of the meeting was Lyle Tatum of the American Friends Service Committee. The speakers had agreed to draw lots for position and to speak a total of 22 minutes—15 or more in presentation and the remainder in summary. Tatum expressed the appreciation of the entire group to Carl Dahlgren who had worked out most of the meeting details in behalf of the Third Camp Committee.

DISCUSSING VIEWS

Lewine, of the SP-SDF led off with an expression of conviction that the American left was reviving; it was reacting to and stimulating a more critical attitude toward our government and our way of life and also attempting to rephrase its own role and concepts. This modest advance he attributed, as did every speaker, to a realization of the weakness and isolation of all the socialist groups, to an attempt to evaluate the Hungarian revolution, and to big events in the labor movement such as AFL-CIO unity and the Negro struggle in the South.

He saw regroupment mainly as a move into the united SP-SDF. While he pictured the SP-SDF as broad he stated that it did not seem possible at this time to bring all socialists into one organization. He concluded: "Join that socialist organization which to you seems most effective."

Joseph Roberts was second for the viewpoint of the Communist Party. He included in the American Left socialists, Communists, and others.

His regroupment proposal was an anti-monopoly coalition sparked by those in the left and helping the labor and Negro movements to form a new party of labor, Negroes and small business. His proposal seemed much like another united front but with the Communist Party willing, even eager, for socialists to participate. He also proposed united action for Communists and socialists now on such issues as civil liberties, ballot rights for minority parties, etc.

J. A. Davidson saw ahead, he said, a complete re-evaluation of the way in which a socialist movement can be built at this time.

The Marxists are isolated in the United States; the U.S. labor movement gets along (from their viewpoint) very well without Marxism. The reasons lie in the relative wealth of the country, the non-participation of the citizens in political life, and in the identification of socialism and Stalinism in the minds of the workers. Any regroupment must be such as to destroy this identification.

ISL PROPOSAL

In describing the ISL proposals for merging and joining the SP-SDF as the best way to regroupment, Davidson stated that the day of the socialist sects is over and that the lack of a "full-blown" program by the SP-SDF is an asset for the regroupment of socialists and for attracting others to socialism. This must be coupled with the fullest democracy inside the party.

Charles Walker of *Liberation* presented a revolutionary pacifist viewpoint. He stated that there is a long way yet to go before socialist unity can take place and that "new wine will not be placed in old bottles." He asked that attention be paid to the concepts of "human values," the position of technology, and the importance of a peaceful world obtained by non-violent methods. As a Third Camp exponent he expressed his distaste for Stalinism and American militarism. He is convinced that the left must build a new political home if it is to grow.

Tom Kerry of the SWP was the last speaker. In contrast to all of the other speakers he put socialist regroupment on a theoretical-programmatic basis. The twelve points which the SWP has selected should form the basis for any consideration for socialist unity he argued. Most of his time was spent in defense of the slogan "Defense of the Soviet Union." Kerry insisted that "no one must be barred from discussion" but just as firmly asserted that "as contrasted to democratic socialism bolshevism had proven itself right for all time."

QUESTIONS

A number of written questions from the audience were answered by the speakers. The CP was asked to explain why its convention had not condemned Russia's action in Hungary. The answer reminded the audience that the CP neither condemned or condoned the action; that the errors which caused the Revolution were more important, etc.—in short, no good answer could be given, SDF as a center for regroupment.

Kerry was asked to explain why the "correct program" of the SWP had not guaranteed its growth. The pacifist speaker was asked about non-violence and the realities of the struggle in the Hungarian revolution. Questions to Davidson and Lewine concerned the SP-SDF as a center for regroupment.

The summaries also centered around the ISL and SP-SDF merger proposal. The SWP contended that the SP-SDF had not opened its doors to all socialists; that it had not even invited the ISL to merge; that it had in fact a "security" clause against "quasi-Leninists" (a charge which Lewine was not able to answer). Walker spoke against rash action on unity. The CP said that the solution is not one of merging present groups, for that would by-pass the masses. Davidson reiterated that regroupment demanded the end of sectarianism and the condemnation of Stalinism.

In his rebuttal Lewine said that there is room in the SP-SDF for all socialists, Marxists and pacifists, even for members of the Communist Party if and when their inquiries into the relationship of socialism and democracy carry them to the conclusion that they can have no sympathy with the Russian leadership or its social system.

The reaction of the audience to the meeting was enthusiastic. A large amount of literature was sold and exchanged.

LONDON LETTER **Shipyard Workers Touch Off Biggest Post-War Strike in Britain**

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, March 16

Britain's biggest post-war strike is on. From the Clydeside in Scotland to Falmouth on the tip of England's South Coast, shipyards are stilled and silent following the big walkout by some 200,000 shipbuilding and ship-repair workers just three hours ago.

Not for thirty years, since the general strike in 1926, have Britain's bosses been faced with a determined strike on such a wide scale.

But more may be yet to come. In exactly seven days' time the shipyard workers will be joined by workers from engineering plants. Just what form next week's stoppage will take is not yet known.

So far the leaders of 40 unions with men in the engineering industry have only announced their intention of sparking off nation-wide strike action among their 2½ million members. Whether this will take the form of an all-out strike call, or whether it will be a selective stoppage at places designed to hit the bosses hardest, will be decided in a few days' time when the union leaders concerned meet to draw up detailed plans for the campaign.

IT WAS BREWING

This widespread industrial unrest is the culmination of angry feelings which have been brewing up among Britain's workers for a long time. Rising living costs and the Tory government's economic policies have made it obvious that sooner or later a big industrial battle would break out. The only question has been: in which sections of industry would the spearhead battle take place? And the action of the shipyard

workers has now provided the answer.

The scene for the conflict was set nearly a year ago when, last Easter, the annual conferences of the engineers, electricians, boilermakers and foundry workers asked their executives to press for more wages. A few weeks later, without waiting for a demand to be filed, the association of the engineering employers announced that they would reject outright any future claims for higher pay. This, they said, "in view of the national inflationary position."

When the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions (a federal body of 40 unions with members in the two industries) met a month later, there were angry expressions of resentment at this action by the bosses of rejecting a wage claim even before it had been filed and its merits considered. Strike action, the union men threatened, would surely follow if the employers stuck to this position.

And stick to it they did. Twice the unions have met the shipbuilding and twice they have met the engineering employers. And on each occasion the demand for a ten per cent pay lift has been met with a firm no from the bosses.

Tired of all this shillyshallying, the shipyard workers decided to call the employers' bluff, and ten days ago they announced their members would down tools on every job in the country if the employers did not make a pay-rise offer around which bargaining could begin.

The mood of the workers was accurately summed up by Ted Hill, secretary of the Boilermakers Union and member of the Trades Union Congress General Council, when he spoke at a union meeting in Glasgow a couple of days ago.

"I want to make it clear," he said, "that this strike can only be averted with an offer from the employers of hard cash. There will be no court of enquiry. There will be no arbitration." Ted Hill also alleged that the Tory government had told the employers to throw the wages claim out as part of its economic policy.

"—OR ELSE"

Initially the employers tried to talk in the same terms. Sir William Grant, big noise in the engineering employers association, said a day after Ted Hill's speech: "This time we do not want government interference... We want to fight it out ourselves... We have got to stand firm and prove to these fellows that things are not done so easily."

But, in spite of all this big talk, the employers took a step back a few days ago when they agreed with the government's offer to appoint Lord Evershed to arbitrate on the claim. The unions, however, weren't going to be hoodwinked by this move; they merely repeated their statement of "Cash, or else." As the cash has not been forthcoming the employers have not got the "or else."

The importance of this stand was clearly summed up by Labor's Daily Herald in an editorial three days ago. "Here are men," it said, "controlling prosperous and expanding industries. They seek to dictate that there shall be no expansion of the workers' share; the worker must be clamped down while the cost of living overtakes his pay. This is a threat to every wage-earner in the country. It is impossible that it should be tolerated."

The fact is, of course that the Herald, along with most trade union leaders

(left, right or center), now realize that the present conflict is not an isolated incident. It is the outcome of deliberate policies by the government and employers to get back to "the good old days" of the 1930s.

Capitalist propaganda is trying to undermine the strikers' support among the rest of the workers by spreading scare stories of the intense activity in German and Japanese shipyards. Britain, they say, will lose orders to Germany and Japan—where the workers are "good boys" and never go on strike.

The union's answer to this is short and sweet. Shipyards in Britain already have sufficient orders on their books to keep them going full steam for the next four and a half years. And German and Japanese workers do go on strike—as evidenced by the recent almost total stoppage in Japan and a fifteen-week-long strike in German shipyards.

And, in any case, British bosses can soon stop the strike—by paying up.

Nixon Tour — —

(Continued from page 1)

miles south of Washington to Montgomery to do the same thing.

In Ethiopia, Nixon presented a formal U. S. request for a naval base and an air communication base, and Emperor Haile Selassie gave him the dollars-and-cents figure at which he was willing to make the sale. Upon news of this request for bases, the Russian government threatened Ethiopia with involvement in a major war and possible nuclear destruction if the U. S. were given bases.

As Nixon moved toward East Africa, another purpose of the trip became clear, with respect to undercutting Nasser. This was evident in the purpose of the stop in Uganda, a British colony and the only non-independent nation on the trip. The only point of interest in Uganda, for Nixon, was an inspection of the giant Owen Falls Dam built by the British on Lake Victoria at the head of the Blue Nile River.

It was also indicated in press reports that Nixon also discussed the development of Nile River waterpower and irrigation while in Ethiopia and the Sudan. Howard K. Smith, chief European correspondent for the Columbia Broadcasting System, in a broadcast on March 17 reported that the U. S. was interested in building a dam at the mouth of the White Nile in Ethiopia, thus controlling the Nile all the way into Egypt.

The purpose of these secondary dams, according to Smith, would be to help to bring pressure on Nasser, and to make it impossible for the Egyptians to build the Aswan High Dam, even if they got aid from the Russians, without acquiescence in U. S. policy for the Middle East.

If Nasser does not play ball, then the British- and U. S.-controlled dams would not release enough water to make the Aswan Dam feasible.

This arm-twisting scheme fits in with the recent speech by the former psychological warfare advisor to the president, C. D. Jackson, who in a recent speech stated that Dulles deliberately touched off the Middle East and Suez crisis when the U. S. withdrew its offer to aid the construction of the Aswan Dam in order to force a showdown with Russia.

Nasser, in order to counter Nixon's hand-shaking and baby-kissing tour of East Africa, sent the No. 3 man in the foreign ministry to Ethiopia and the Sudan as a kind of one-man "truth squad" shortly after the vice-president continued north on his good-will tour.

The itinerary of the Nixon tour is of interest for another reason. It may provide the clue to how large an area is to be included in the Eisenhower Doctrine.

At the time of the Senate hearing, Secretary of State Dulles refused to specify exactly which countries are to be included. Now it can be reasonably speculated that the "Middle East" is to be defined as including the west coast of Africa with the exception of the vestiges of the colonial empires of its European allies.

As Nixon finished his tour of friendship and good-will, the man with the \$200 million boodlebag set up by the Eisenhower Doctrine started out on his tour of the Middle East. Former Representative James Richards' well-heeled mission is going to be conclusive proof that money can't buy everything, or maybe anything, in this strife-torn part of the world.

FRANCE

Mollet Swings the Cop's Billy

By OWEN LEGRAND

The French government of Guy Mollet is consistently anti-democratic, consistently reactionary. Not only is it attempting to crush the national revolution in Algeria, but it is attempting to silence every criticism of this repression in France itself.

Under French law, issues of a publication may be seized if, in the opinion of officials, it contains "seditious" material. These powers are dangerously broad in

themselves, and are being interpreted still more broadly by the current government.

Broader still are the powers given to Mollet's colleague Lacoste as governor-general of Algeria. He has the power to seize any publication that he deems damaging to public order. He is exercising this right with zeal. Publications from metropolitan France which contain not merely criticism of but simply objective information on the situation in Algeria are seized. Those which are regularly critical, like *France-Observateur*, are regularly seized.

The power of the French authorities to seize the entire issue of a newspaper or magazine is more serious in its consequences than seizure in Algeria, for it obviously can cause big financial losses to a publication. In the life of the Mollet government various journals have been seized: *L'Humanité*, the Communist daily; *France-Observateur*, Claude Bourdet's weekly; but especially *La Verité*, the organ of the so-called Lambert group of French Trotskyists.

La Verité, unhesitatingly supported the Algerian nationalist cause. It is paying the price in seizures. It was seized eight times in 1956, and so far has been seized three times in 1957. The last time, February 8, it was seized on the incredible pretext of defending the USTA, the Algerian nationalist labor union, from attacks made upon it by the Stalinists. The Mollet government is obviously trying to force *La Verité* out of existence.

ARRESTS GALORE

More serious still are the assaults made upon personal liberties in France. In Algeria, personal liberty doesn't exist. One may be—and thousands have been—sent to concentration camps at the will of police officials.

The Algerian workers in France are in little better state. They may be arrested by the French police and sent to Algeria, or, if they are lucky, kept in prison in France. Parenthetically, the concentration camps in Algeria have the

euphemistic title of *centres d'hébergement*—shelter-centers.

Frenchmen themselves are not safe from these police measures. Many journalists who have told the truth about Algeria—for example, Claude Bourdet and Robert Barrat—have been indicted on various charges. The most popular of these is undermining the morale of the army. Indictments of this nature have been pressed with abandon by the Mollet government. It seems that thousands of French are engaged in wrecking military morale.

Most of these indictments, however, are merely intended to intimidate. In all but one case, none of those indicted on this charge has been brought to trial. This case however is indicative and quite dangerous in what it portends. The Mollet government is trying the leaders of the *Parti Communiste Internationaliste*, the Lambert group, the numerically smallest and most uncompromising of its critics.

For articles written in *La Verité*, four leaders of the PCI (including Lambert himself) are being tried for sedition and demoralization of the army before a military court. Civilians are being court-martialed in time of peace. This is a situation nearly unparalleled in the history of French justice.

The first Frenchman, as distinct from Algerian, to be sentenced for his opposition to the war in Algeria was sentenced quite recently. He is Guy Bezier, a 19-year-old shipyard worker in St. Nazaire, in Brittany.

Bezier belonged to no political group nor even to a union. Last spring during the great demonstrations of reservists against being recalled to fight in the war in Algeria, Bezier joined in a mass demonstration of sympathy of the workers of St. Nazaire. He was taken by the police. After a long delay, he went before a court-martial (he is a civilian) and was sentenced to five years in prison.

The Mollet government, involuntarily, is proving that freedom is indivisible. It cannot be suppressed in a colony without also being suppressed in the home country.

New Victim

The Mollet government has set a new low for its political repression in France by starting treason proceedings against one of the most prominent bourgeois journalists in the country for articles written criticizing its policy in Algeria.

The new target—now added to the radical victims of Mollet's clubbing of the press, described in the accompanying article—is Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, editor of *L'Express* and disciple of Mendès-France in national politics.

Servan-Schreiber recently completed 8 months' service in the army in Algeria and started a series of articles on "excesses" in military action against the Algerian freedom fighters. There have been constant reports of brutal methods and torture, etc. used by the French military. The editor is being prosecuted on the charge of undermining the army's morale.

The prosecution of Servan-Schreiber, because of his non-radical "respectability," underlines the heinous role being played by the man who heads the French Socialist Party but who acts as a catspaw for the reactionary Right and the colonialists. Mollet has also had to act as a policeman inside his own party, against left-wingers who wrote critically of the Algerian war.

YOU and SCIENCE

Businessmen and the Golden Goose

By GENE LISTER

A few weeks ago we reviewed the report of the American Association for the Advancement of Science on "Science and its Impact on Society." Mildas the report was in its concern over the misuse of science in the United States, it did not fail to arouse some violent comments from business and financial interests. Most outspoken was the *Wall Street Journal* which termed it "A clear call to the political barricades."

We wish it were all of that, but it would appear that Wall Street is mostly showing anxiety lest any protest, no matter how small, jeopardize the exploitation of science for profits.

The American business-military-government elite is all too conscious of the fact that future excess profits are dependent upon exploitation of the scientific frontier. It is not for fun that scientific administrators and consultants are employed by large financial investors to advise regarding a company's potential for profit based upon the competence of its research organization.

Within the past several months there has been increasing evidence that the "science steal is on." With the classic sources like land and other natural resources diminishing, the opportunity for bonanza profits rests upon the new discoveries of scientific research. Though research is expensive its rewards can be almost unlimited. If American business can have the people, through the government, bear the major burden of the cost while it reaps the profits, the robber barons of the past may be reduced to small-time operators.

What is the evidence for this gigantic steal? The scientific and technical journals put it very bluntly. In the February 4 *Chemical & Engineering News* there was the headline: "Government is R&D Golden Goose—Government puts up most of the money, Industry does most of the research, New NSF [National Science Foundation] survey finds."

Data exposing the government's giveaway in science have appeared frequently in this column. A report of the House of Representatives Committee on Small Business filed on Jan. 3 gives further documentation.

This report states that 95 per cent of the billions of dollars of government money given to private companies for research has gone to large firms of over 500 employees. Furthermore, 98 per cent of the funds go to the 500 largest corporations; this, according to the report, is "the kiss of death of small businesses."

LUCRATIVE SETUP

Not only do the large companies profit handsomely on the deals but they also retain much of the knowledge gained at government expense in the form of patents. Not to be overlooked is the experience and training which their scientists and engineers receive, later to be applied for profits in other areas.

The Defense Department, controlling the bulk of the funds, defends its policy of favoring the industrial giants by stating that in the emergency it applies the money where results are quickest and all else is secondary. That the objective is quick knowledge for death and destruction makes the policy even more cynical.

C. Wright Mills in his book *The Power Elite* describes the military-government-industry team at work. This is very evident in science utilization. Again from the *Chemical & Engineering News*, Jan. 21, under the title "The Military goes Scientific," we read:

"Much has been said on how to combat the scientific manpower shortage. With automation in the not too distant future, many feel that more and more technically trained personnel will be needed. Where is the U. S. going to get them from? A new twist to the 'where' is the military. Not the permanent military but the thousands of draftees and others such as those recalled through the active reserve. Many in industry feel that here lies a good potential for engineers, scientists and technicians."

A conference of the military and industry is suggested so that "with plan-

ning and some little additional effort the training program of the military could be guided and articulated so as to provide a continuous flow of technicians into industry." This would be an extension of the present military's Specialized Professional Personnel program which now provides training of such draftees.

The biggest science melon to be divided in industry today is that of atomic power. However, before this can be realized much costly research and development remains to be done. This is because, contrary to the situation in Europe, atomic power here is still more expensive than conventional sources of energy.

VITAL POINTS

Thus for the past several years there has been much debate in Washington over policies to exploit atomic power. The press puts this as a question of public versus private control. Actually, the issue is how industry can best put the costly burden of costly, and yet largely experimental, reactor construction on the government while industry retains control for future juicy profits.

One most vital point is that of the public health hazards of atomic installations and waste disposal. Industry prefers to have the government bear the cost of a gigantic insurance program rather than build costly safety devices into its atomic installations.

All these developments go on amid the apathy and feeling of helplessness with which the complex scientific and technical problems leave the general public. This cannot be otherwise when the educational institution, cued by industry and government, conceive of scientific education only as training increased number of scientists and engineers to provide the hardware and gadgets for profits and destruction. Almost entirely neglected is the concept of science as a way of life and a means to plenty and peace for all.

It is small wonder then that Wall Street is horrified at any attempt of the scientists themselves to raise the question of the rational use of science in society.

Case of Teamsters Ramifies — —

(Continued from page 1)

other look at the racing scandals in America and involve a former national committeeman of the Republican Party.

In terms of national politics, the ramifications seem endless and should be educational for everyone.

Within the union movement, the social pressure of these exposés will intensify the stirrings and unrest, and make life much more difficult for union bureaucracy. For once, the average union man—and there are 16,000,000 of them in America—will get a good look-see at his leaders; their salaries, their way of life, their conduct. Among other things this is hardly a propitious year for the AFL-CIO to hold its convention at plush Miami, in Florida surroundings.

In a broader sense, the issue within the union movement will be joined around two contrary concepts: Business-unionism versus labor-unionism. From the standpoint of the former, as exemplified by Hoffa and Beck, there is nothing wrong with a union leader getting rich. The union movement is like everything else and a man has a right to use it and get rich, provided he doesn't get caught in the hands of the law.

Just two weeks ago, the *Detroit Free Press* editorialized in defense of Beck along those lines: What's wrong with a union leader getting rich? Since then the climate has changed, and no one will defend that point of view. Even Beck tries to cover up with talk of union organizing drive, as if his acquisition of a million dollars hadn't occupied his main attention in recent years.

Trade-unionists see the union movement differently. It is a social movement with its own code of ethics and standards, along the lines written in the AFL-CIO

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

To Do Something About Labor Racketeering

To the Editor:

The Philadelphia branch of the ISL had a discussion this week on an issue raised by Jack Wilson in a recent issue of *LABOR ACTION*: "What can the labor unions do to end racketeering in their organizations?" The discussion was led by one who had much personal experience in one of the unions now being investigated in Washington and thus it might be valuable to bring some of his ideas before your readers.

The discussion leader's proposals were:

(1) Annual election of officers in local and national unions.

(2) Officers' salaries not greater than the highest earned by any worker covered in the union contracts.

(3) No major officer may succeed himself or run for another major post within one year of the expiration of his last term.

(4) Membership meetings should be held regularly with membership partici-

pation and attendance encouraged.

(5) No "second-class" membership on any basis.

(6) Any "conflict of interests" (e.g., union truck driver operating own trucking business) of any member should be prohibited.

(7) Educational committees should be set up in each local (if necessary by the international or AFL-CIO), to educate members on evils of racketeering (number-writing, loan sharks), racial discrimination, etc.

(8) Establish a low (say \$5 maximum) initiation fee for every union.

It may be argued that these suggestions are too mechanistic, have been made many times years ago, do not take into account the "corroding" influences of capitalist society, etc.; nevertheless we felt that they merited consideration or reconsideration by the union movement.

Secretary,

Phila. Branch ISL

March 8.

Note on SWPer at Compass Club Symposium

To the Editor:

Recently I attended a symposium of the Brooklyn Compass Club. The speakers were Farrell Dobbs (SWP), Simon Gerson (CP), and Tyrrell Wilson (unofficially representative of the SP).

The topic was "Civil Liberties and Socialism." The general atmosphere was one oozing goodwill and unity. But what I want to comment on is that the SWP speaker had not one word of criticism of the CP and Russian Stalinism, and did not deal with the subject of civil liberties under socialism or of civil liberties in Russia and East Europe. Dobbs and the SWPer who took the floor were simply trying to woo the CP.

In fact, the anti-Stalinist Dobbs left the only criticism of civil liberties in East Europe to be made by the spokesman of the CP, Gerson, who read a section of his article in *Mainstream* in which he came out for civil liberties, democracy and the Bill of Rights and criticized the lack of these in Stalin's "later years." Amazing, isn't it?

In the discussion from the floor an ISLer did make the point that Gerson's ideas on civil liberties were a good de-

velopment but didn't go far enough, as he explained; but in my opinion, your spokesman was too kind to Dobbs. Dobbs not only submerged all differences on the subject in an abject courtship of the CP but I believe on civil liberties he presented a worse position than did Gerson.

Only in his last summary did Dobbs mention that he is not only for the defense of Russia but is also opposed to the bureaucratic rule that prevails there and in East Europe and Hungary; but he does not make removal of this bureaucratic rule a condition for his defense of Russia.

In fact, it's a long time since I heard so much about defense of Russia. I wasn't embarrassed; Gerson was.

HANNA C.

YOU'RE INVITED

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

Code of Ethics. In a sense, the union leader is a do-gooder, whose primary satisfactions in life come from being part of an historically important social movement. Its moral values compete often with those proclaimed by churches.

ON THE SPOT

More and more, as the social pressure builds up on the union movement, union leaders will find themselves forced to become, and speak vigorously as, trade-unionists rather than successful business-unionists. The cleavage will be sharper, and it does offer a basis for another realignment within the union movement.

Hoffa's pretenses of being concerned primarily with "jurisdiction" in blocking AFL-CIO unity in many states are swept away in times like these. And most AFL unionists will desert him, as was indicated last week in Michigan where delegates to a special conference upset his plans completely to set up a counter organization to the regularly established forms.

There is ample evidence within the union movement that its leaders now are quite concerned with what is happening to labor's good name in the light of the current revelations. Some are already unhappy that things are getting out of hand; sometimes reform movements go too far.

At every union convention this year two questions will come to the forefront that no one can avoid: What kind of union is this? clean, good, bad, bureaucratized, corrupt? and what is the union leadership doing about it?

Labor leaders in America are now on the spot more than ever before, and it is a situation for which they must take responsibility, for they make the claims of

leadership and control. They have to answer to the workers and the public. It's about time.

In these days, there is even a sense of satisfaction for that small minority of union men and leaders who are motivated by a social philosophy as their reason for participation in and devotion to the union movement. Their record is clear.

STALINIST RUSSIA

A MARXIST ANALYSIS

By Tony Cliff

\$2.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

March 25, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 12

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, 1879.—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. Business Mgr: L. G. SMITH. Associate Editors: GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL.

Gates Case Touches Off Defense of Academic Freedom

Columbia Socialists Spark Big Rallies

By BOGDAN DENITCH

The New York campuses stirred last week as they have not stirred for years. More students heard John Gates, editor of the *Daily Worker*, more students listened to a debate between socialists and a Communist, more student newspapers, student councils and organizations protested restrictions of academic freedom this week than anyone would have believed possible.

The major thanks go to the New York City's Board of Higher Education, with a helping hand being lent by the Eugene V. Debs Society of Columbia, an independent democratic socialist club.

The week began to shape up when the provost of Queens College barred Gates from speaking to a student club. Fuel was added when President Gallagher of City College banned him from that school. It was set up in its final stage as an outstanding academic-freedom case when the presidents of the five municipal colleges met to agree on a joint policy barring Gates or any other Smith Act victim from speaking. The clincher, of course, is that Gates was originally supposed to speak at Queens as a part of the Academic Freedom Week celebration.

The reasoning behind the banning of Gates was fantastic. It was based on the assumption that a lecturer invited by a student group has the status of a teacher while lecturing, and that consequently similar criteria are to be used to determine fitness;

One particularly sad aspect of the case is that President Gallagher of City College has had a reputation as a civil-libertarian and is a member of the American Civil Liberties Union.

DEBS CLUB AT WORK

The student counterattack was sparked by the E.V. Debs Club of Columbia, which invited Gates to speak the day after his banning from City was announced. Gates was invited to speak as part of a rally in defense of academic freedom with Michael Harrington of the YSL and Sheldon Ackley of the N. Y. Civil Liberties Union participating. Subsequently Gates was also invited to speak at Columbia that same week by the John Dewey Society of SLID in a debate on the recent CP convention. Columbia, which in general has a very good record on academic freedom, permitted the two meetings to take place as a matter of course.

The really remarkable aspect of the Debs Club campaign and rally, however, was a conference the club called for Saturday, March 16, a few days after the case appeared in the press. The club invited all student governments, papers and clubs to come to a conference to discuss further action on the Gates case. It should be borne in mind, that the Debs Club is avowedly a socialist club. By an outstanding effort within two days, the members of the club has visited most campuses in the metropolitan area and had contacted the bulk of the groups involved.

Present at the Saturday conference were, besides a representative of the ACLU, representatives of the student governments of Queens, CCNY Uptown, Hunter Uptown NYU, Brooklyn, Columbia and Barnard, a large number of student newspapers, SDA chapters from City College and Brooklyn (the only two functioning in New York), the Hunter ACLU, the City College and Queens Marxist Discussion Clubs, Brooklyn College Young Democrats the Columbia NAACP, and a number of student observers active in other groups.

MAKE PLANS

This was the broadest-based student conference of this type that has been held for years, all the more unusual considering the inadequate time available to prepare for anything of this sort.

A statement introduced by the chair-

man of the gathering, Peter Novick, secretary of the Debs Club of Columbia, was signed by some twenty of the participants. Because of time factors no groups as such could endorse the statement and the students signed giving the names of their organizations for identification purposes only.

The group agreed in general to back an ACLU Rally to be held on Friday, March 22, and to help distribute leaflets announcing the rally on their campuses. Further action such as a projected picketing of the Board of Higher Education, was stalled by the reluctance of some and the desire of others to first attempt a test of the legality of the board's action. The student council of CCNY has obtained the services of the civil-libertarian lawyer Morris Ernst for this purpose.

However, the case is far from dead and a great deal more may still be heard from the students on this matter soon.

One unusual aspect of the case is the fact that a remarkable publicity job was done on it. Most of the metropolitan newspapers carried stories about it. Radio and TV announced the Columbia meetings.

The *Daily Worker*, it goes without saying, featured the case as a front-page story for days.

On the day before the rally at Columbia the campus was flooded with leaflets; thus it was possible to have an overflow audience of over 400 one day after Gates debated on the same campus for SLID.

SLID'S ROLE

SLID incidentally, is the only student group contacted by the Debs Club which point-blank refused to attend the Saturday conference or in general to cooperate in any way to publicize the civil-libertarian aspect of the case. Their meeting, originally scheduled for the day after the Academic Freedom Rally, was moved to the day before in an attempt to draw as much support away from it as possible. An offer by the Debs Club to jointly sponsor the SLID meeting, dropping its own speakers, was turned down.

SLID's contribution to the activities on this case apart from their debate, was a general attempt to smear the Debs Club and its members. They, almost alone, preferred to stay out of the growing student protest in sectarian isolation rather than seem to cooperate with a club "which includes members of the YSL, which in turn is close to the ISL, which in turn is 'Leninist.'"

In sum: this week the suppression of Gates, right to speak on the municipal campuses was attacked more vigorously than anyone had a right to expect. The student newspapers have almost all taken an excellent principled position on the right of a Communist, or anyone else for that matter, to speak. They recognize that without controversy academic freedom is meaningless, that freedom to speak has to be defended only in the case of those whose ideas are unpopular, and that if their rights are not defended no rights are safe.

The action of the Board of Higher Education in confirming the ban makes it obvious that further student activity around this case is needed. The excellent student response to this remnant of the academic McCarthyism makes it probable that the students will act, and will act in a way that will clearly show that the "silent generation" is far from silent.

New York, March 13

An Academic Freedom Rally was held today at Columbia University to protest the banning of John Gates, editor of the *Daily Worker*, from speaking at the New York city colleges. The meeting was sponsored by the Columbia E.V. Debs Society, a democratic socialist educational group. The speakers at the rally were Gates, Sheldon Ackley from the N. Y. Civil Liberties Union, and Mike Harrington of the YSL.

400 students attended the rally, with another 100 turned away because of the fire laws. It is a good sign that the times are changing; a heartening indication that people are once more becoming concerned over infringements of academic freedom and civil liberties.

Harrington spoke first. He immediately made the basic point: "the unrestricted exchange of ideas... is essential to the political life of a democracy... and at the center of the intellectual life of a university." Then he pointed out that this particular banning was itself based on another restriction of freedom, the Smith Act.

However, Harrington continued, we must also see this incident in its larger context. Harrington went on to describe the ten-year rivalry between the Communist bloc and the West; how the U. S. has carried on this struggle by relying on the forces of reaction abroad and by restricting democracy at home. And although the witchhunt has receded, "the fear of a decade, the laws of a decade, the bureaucracy of a decade, these do not vanish, like some demagogic senator, overnight. For they are rooted deep within American society; they are part of a process which extends to Spain and Formosa, which is within government, private industry and our schools."

Thus the action of the City College presidents was part of the "massive drift of a decade."

After these general remarks on how the Gates case related to the whole of the American scene for the past years and how it related to world politics, Harrington posed the questions raised by this case in regard to Gates' conceptions of academic freedom.

HARRINGTON CHALLENGES

Welcoming the steps taken toward a democratic socialist position by Gates on Hungary, Harrington pointed out that Gates still has quite a way to go to be a democrat. If the Gates suppression in New York is a denial of freedom, then what about unfreedom in Russia? Mustn't one be against both? And if the witch-hunt is deeply rooted in American society, then aren't denials of freedoms in Russia deeply related to that society? Gates must consider these questions and Harrington called upon him to give an answer.

Harrington went on to call for an organized protest against the decision of the Board of Higher Education upholding the ban on Gates. And he concluded with the thought that in this interrelated world of ours one must demand the defense of freedom in Madrid and Moscow, in Budapest and New York.

John Gates spoke next and agreed with most of Harrington's remarks about the witchhunt, that it was related to the cold war, and so forth. He made a couple of sharply cutting remarks about the administrations, these "fearful five" who are the real "juvenile delinquents" in the case.

In answer to Harrington's question, "Are you for freedom everywhere?" Gates replied "Yes, I would even fight for the right of Harrington to speak in Moscow." But there was no attempt to answer the basic question, "How is unfreedom in Russia related to the social system?"

Sheldon Ackley outlined similar re-

strictions on academic freedom that have taken place in the U. S. He spoke of the Gag-Rule Law at Ohio State which bans speakers who do not have previous approval by the administration, and how many non-conformist opinions, including Communists and socialists, have not been allowed on the campus as a result. He told the audience that Harvard and the University of New Hampshire have rulings similar to the one that banned Gates from the city colleges, regarding anyone convicted or indicted under the Smith Act.

To the chuckles of the audience, he remarked, "I doubt that the percentage of students who become stockbrokers upon graduation was affected" by Hiss speaking at Princeton University. And Ackley concluded with a complete denunciation of the action of the city colleges: "They have subverted education and even democracy."

GATES EVADES

The question period was extremely interesting. The first question requested Gates to answer Harrington's questions, particularly how unfreedom was related to the Russian society.

Gates said he was for democracy everywhere; he was against the imprisonment of Djilas for example; he was for Harrington's right to speak in Moscow; but he skirted around the social implications of unfreedom in Russia.

Harrington took the floor and pointed out that if Gates took this position in Russia, they would both be in the same boat.

Most of the questions were on this topic, directed at Gates. He admitted past errors, such as not defending the first victims of the Smith Act in 1940. But always he skirted around that basic question which was asked four times, "How does the Russian denial of freedom relate to the Russian social system?"

This kept him in hot water. Ackley got up at one point and said, "How can we believe you? How do we know that this is not merely one of those line changes, a tactic to be thrown overboard tomorrow?"

Gates could only answer that he must be judged on his deeds.

One important note to the rally: It was obvious that the overwhelming majority had turned out in support of this demonstration against the banning and not simply to heckle Gates. It was a mighty impressive showing, this protest rally against Academic McCarthyism.

Get the Challenge
every week — by subscribing to
Labor Action. A student sub is
only \$1 a year!

THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.
—From the Constitution of the YSL

THE SP-SDF AND POLITICAL ACTION

By ALBERT GATES and H. W. BENSON

Socialism in the United States reduced to a number of tiny groups and some thousands of unaffiliated individuals, confronts a giant mass labor movement which is pro-capitalist in ideology and which supports bourgeois candidates in elections. It is possible for the first time in a generation to rebuild the socialist movement, to win new thousands to it, to restore it as a democratic movement and to wipe out the remaining influence of Stalinism.

But even under the best conditions, the movement will emerge as a relatively small force, enrolling thousands and attracting other tens of thousands; while the labor movement will command the support of millions. It will take time and class struggles to make a fundamental change in the balance between a small pro-socialist movement and a powerful mass pro-capitalist labor movement.

Yet socialism depends upon the organized working class. Socialism must be presented not as a rival to the real labor movement or as a substitute for it but as the consistent and conscious expression of the strivings of the working class and its organizations. This is a truism, but one that needs reaffirmation as socialism stands on the verge of a big step forward. The working class is already organized. Socialism, however, has to make its new beginning in the United States.

With this in mind, we call attention to the Report on Political Action of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation, a document which was adopted in their merger membership referendum. (Text published in Reading Labor Advocate, January 25.)

TOWARD NEW TASKS

If the merger Memorandum on Foreign Policy was a mechanical and rigid statement of views with little regard to big world events, the Report on Political Action is quite another matter. If it is read merely as a diplomatic treaty designed to patch up outlived quarrels between two small socialist groups and to hold them together by compromising a little in both directions, then it would hardly be worth attention. Such a view, however, would be misleading. This document, like the SP-SDF merger in general must be examined in the light of the pressing new task of our day, the rebuilding of the democratic socialist movement.

The Report is not a rounded political analysis. Not one of the existing socialist groups, not the SP, not the SDF, would be satisfied with it as a full presentation of views. It is not intended as such. We discuss it not as a fundamental political program, which it is not, but as a platform advanced for reuniting and rebuilding the socialist movement.

The statement opens immediately as follows:

"The United Party recognizes that its first duty in present-day America is to increase the awareness of its fellow citizens in the values of democratic socialism. Its second duty is to work with all its power of persuasion for the establishment of a labor party, which would tend to become socialist in principle. . . . The United Party at this time also reiterates its belief that the Democratic and Republican Parties as presently constituted cannot and will not properly represent the best interests of the vast mass of working people and farmers of America, in spite of the presence of some liberals in the Republican Party and a greater number in the Democratic Party."

FOR A LABOR PARTY

While it supports the formation of a labor party in general, it also takes note of already existing organizations that can serve to promote independent political action: "In various parts of the country, some of our members have been involved in labor-liberal organizations (such as the ADA, the Liberal Party of New York State, CIO-PAC, LLPE, etc.).

Members of the United Party in these organizations are urged to stress the importance of independent political action."

It is unambiguously for a Labor Party. If it does not now answer all questions associated with the problem, it need not and cannot. It refers to the establishment of such a party as "its second duty," but it is obvious that this "second" task is really a primary task for American socialists. The propaganda for democratic socialism is, so to speak, the constant activity of socialists; the strategic aim of the Labor Party can become a concretization and distillation of socialist education in the working class.

In the past, the attitude of the Socialist Party toward a Labor Party was uncertain and shifting. At times, the party looked upon it with suspicion as a possible rival to socialism; sometimes it took an ambiguous or non-committal attitude; in recent years, it was on record for the formation of a Labor Party. But its propaganda remained unclear. The party, too, took a purely negative attitude toward groups like ADA and the Liberal Party and even saw an incompatibility between membership in the SP and in them.

STEP FORWARD

In all these respects, in our opinion, the Report on Political Action marks a step forward, away from self-imposed isolation and toward participation in the real political developments of our time.

To us, in the Independent Socialist League, the formation of an independent Labor Party is the necessary forerunner of a mass socialist movement in the United States that could attract millions. It is a prerequisite, too, of the victory of socialism itself. If a revitalized democratic socialist movement in this country failed to appreciate the place of a labor party in the social struggles in our country, it would misread our history, fail to absorb its lessons and divert the movement from its main perspective and tasks.

That is why we consider this declaration of the united SP-SDF for a Labor Party of such significance.

The Liberal Party, the ADA, etc. are certainly not socialist. The Independent Socialist League, however, has never considered them as organizations which were set up to serve as rivals or competitors of the socialist groups. In fact, they came into existence precisely because there has not been an influential, mass socialist party to organize criticism of the old parties and give effective expression to it. In the concrete political conditions of our time, they served not as barriers to the growth of socialist ideas but as possible channels for the development of independent political sentiments.

ELECTORAL ACTIVITY?

We always have been and remain critical of their policy of supporting the candidates of the two old parties. Nevertheless, the ISL and its members have supported such groups because they represent the potential of a new independent political movement, a Labor Party—urging them on toward increasing independence of bourgeois politics.

The SP-SDF Report on Political Action is firm in its advocacy of a Labor Party and is outspoken in its criticism of the Democratic and Republican Parties in general. But it remains weak in one respect: it neglects to criticize the utter weakness of the liberals in the old parties and their total failure to fight for their own professed principles.

The Report shifts the attention of the SP-SDF away from election-day activity:

"Because of the obstacles and difficulties encountered in carrying on independent socialist electoral action in the coming period, the United Party will put its primary organizational emphasis on carrying on non-electoral campaigns and community activity for the maintenance of civil liberty, against segregatory policies, for the extension of social-welfare measures, for a foreign policy which would reduce the threat of war, and general educational activity for a socialist reorganization of our economy. In localities where the socialist program can be enhanced by such action, or where traditionally socialist campaigns have received support, continued socialist political action should be encouraged."

On the whole, electoral action is de-emphasized. Considering the size and strength of the new organization, its limited resources, its weak ties with the mass movement of labor, election campaigns become a mere formality without impact upon the people. When the organized working class numbers 18,000,000, a socialist movement which wins a mere few thousand votes is in danger of making a caricature of political action. Perhaps the time will return when the Socialist Party can enter the election lists as a real political force. But that time is obviously not now and there is no prospect for its speedy arrival.

OLD-PARTY CLAUSE

In 1949 the Workers Party was dissolved and the Independent Socialist League organized in its place. Electoral action was abandoned in favor of socialist propaganda and education. The ISL, then, has long recognized that a small socialist group which pretends to be a genuine workers' political party impresses no one and only disorients itself.

But there is more to the question, as posed by the SP-SDF agreement, than measuring political resources and votes. Everyone knows that one section of the united party wants to be able to support bourgeois candidates on the old-party tickets endorsed by the unions. Consider the last paragraph of the Report:

"In the absence of independent Socialist electoral action and in the absence of independent liberal-labor candidates, it shall be the privilege of individual state and local organizations to allow their individual members to support candidates for public office who have been endorsed by liberal and labor groups."

This statement, we are careful to note, does not propose that the party or its official units endorse Democratic or Republican candidates. It does not propose, either, that members be given permission to support such candidates where the SP-SDF or independent candidates are in the field. Where, however, there is neither a Socialist Party nor an independent candidate running for office, it would grant permission for individual members to support other candidates endorsed by liberal-labor groups, in other words to support Democrats or Republicans.

A REPLY TO CRITICS

This clause is undoubtedly of particular interest and concern to members of the ISL and other left-wing socialists who are opposed to the policy of endorsing bourgeois candidates.

The ISL, as is known, strongly favors unity with the SP-SDF. Some of our harshest critics, influenced by the paragraph above, draw back and declaim against us: "What, you are ready to unite with an organization that will permit its members to support bourgeois candidates! What kind of revolutionary socialist are you?"

Yes, we are ready to unite with the SP-SDF. But before explaining our attitude toward this proviso, let us give our most extreme critics the floor again.

They will hotly argue: "The Socialist Party, in order to unite with the SDF, capitulated to it and agreed to support

bourgeois candidates; the SDF in turn, wants to capitulate to the Democratic Party; and now, the ISL wants to unite with a party which has gone over to bourgeois politics. That only shows that the ISL is ready to capitulate too!"

It sounds very bad. We are consoled in part when we remember that those who predict that we are at last "capitulating" have made the same prediction annually for more than 15 years, always in vain. We are fortified, too, by the conviction that we are 100 per cent correct on this question as against them.

To repeat what everyone already knows: the ISL is against support to bourgeois liberals on the old-party tickets. And we can add that we are against any united socialist party giving its endorsement to them. But that only begins the problem. The question that must be answered is this: in a united movement, what shall govern the relations between those socialists who are against such support and those, on the other hand, who are for it under certain conditions?

Any unthinking person who substitutes radical phrases and epithets for socialist politics can be trigger-ready to reply: "No problem. We can never unite with such elements, such reformists, such Democrats, such capitulators." That is simple and clear-cut.

There is only one thing wrong with it: it means the immediate abandonment of the central task of the day, the rebuilding and broadening of the socialist movement. If it is not permissible to unite with socialists who are for supporting bourgeois liberals under certain conditions, that proscription immediately rules out not simply the old SDF but thousands and perhaps tens of thousands of those who have newly broken with Stalinism; it rules out thousands of active union militants.

To rule them out until they correct themselves on this question means to rule out the reconstruction of the socialist movement for an indefinite period.

But that is not all! If we cannot unite with them because of their policy on this question, we cannot unite with others because of their policy on some other equally important question. In sum, instead of seeking the basic minimum platform for the renewal of democratic socialism, we would be insisting upon its permanent fragmentation on the basis of innumerable issues each important in itself but not a decisive barrier to a united movement of democratic socialism against Stalinism and against capitalism.

EVALUATING CONCESSION

There is no doubt that the statement represents a real concession by the SP to the SDF. But was that concession justified or not? That is the question. We believe it was.

If the SDF was merely a tendency which wants to "capitulate" to the Democratic Party, how explain that the united party is now more firmly committed to the advocacy of a Labor Party than ever? Obviously, the situation is too complicated to be clarified by mere name calling. The political line of the SDF is clearly motivated not by a drive to support the Democratic Party, much less to "capitulate" to it, but by a determination to avoid a head-on collision with the labor movement which does support the Democratic Party. In other words, it wants to allow its members to support liberals endorsed by labor not to encourage socialists to build the Democratic Party but to give socialists access to the labor movement.

We do not agree with their policy. It is not only wrong, it is unnecessary. But we can understand and even sympathize with what motivates it. When socialists support bourgeois candidates, the political line between working-class and bourgeois politics is blurred over; the advocacy of a Labor Party is confused and hazy. At the same time, however, socialists must be ever-careful that their own activities are not carried on in such a way that they appear hostile or indifferent to the political and economic struggles of the organized working class.

A broad socialist movement, as it must and will develop, will reach across a wide spectrum of political views. We have our views. Like us, some will reject support to bourgeois candidates on the old-party tickets under any conditions; others will favor it.

We doubt, however, that a sharp and clear line of division will demarcate two clear-cut wings. Some will favor bour-

(Turn to last page)

**Putrament's Testament
Gives the Rationale for Rapprochement with the Stalinists**

Reversing Poland's October — The 'Gomulka Way'

By HAL DRAPER

The Gomulka regime's crackdown on the democratic opposition in Poland (see *LA* last week for details) was spelled out not only by the actions taken but also by expository articles in the press by Gomulka spokesmen, presenting the rationale for Gomulka's turnback. This is still a rationale adjusted to the present hot revolutionary atmosphere of Poland.

One of the most significant articles of this sort was written by Jerzy Putrament. Its significance depends first on understanding who he is, for he is a Stalinist weathervane type, unhandicapped by any prejudices about principles.

The reader may possibly remember his name from newspaper reports of the period of the stormy October days. It was Putrament who got himself personally denounced by *Pravda* in that crisis, for an article in the Polish press questioning old assumptions. Putrament was going along with the pro-democratic and anti-Stalinist tide, and there was no better "Gomulkaist" in Poland for a while.

But this Putrament is not one of those idealistic intellectuals who felt released by October and for the first time intellectually alive. He is a Stalinist operator with a record. To use an old-fashioned phrase, his record is that of the No. 1 pen-prostitute of the regime before and after October. After October, of course, this made him a weathervane "Gomulkaist."

Under the old Bierut-Stalinist regime, Putrament had been secretary-general of the Writers Union, that is, the literary cop for the totalitarians; later he became editor-in-chief of the cultural organ *Nowa Kultura*; he was and is a member of the Central Committee of the ruling party, not merely a litterateur.

Mirror of the Trend

According to reports, he was brought up in the Russian Orthodox faith—his mother a Russian, his father a Polish army officer. He began political life at the University of Wilno in an extreme right-wing youth organization and was known as a rabid anti-Semitic activist; later he became a Communist. In 1940 all the rest of his family was deported from Russian-occupied Lwow to Asia, where his father died during the war; but he stayed in Lwow as an activist Communist propagandist. Those who know him have said that he is a ruthless and brutal personality, still strongly anti-Semitic.

He was supposed to have said once a few years ago: "If it happened that I found myself in hell, I'd certainly prefer the role of the devil who pushes the poor souls into the boiling pitch, to the role of one of the souls suffering in the pitch." Holding this orthodox principle of the Stalinist hangman, he found himself in October a poor soul in a boiling revolution. It should be clear what his pitch is now.

Not a thought need be wasted, therefore, on wondering whether his sensational article reflects his own individual lucubrations. It goes without saying that it tries to mirror the trend of the regime, and attempts to articulate what is happening.

The article appeared in the February 7-13 issue of *Przegląd Kulturalny*, one of the leading cultural-political organs. That means it was written in the immediate post-election period at the latest, and that the trend it mirrors was already by then well grasped by CC member Putrament. This points once again to the amazing misunderstanding of that election that filled the Western world press, which widely greeted it as a great blow against Stalinism.

What the article preaches is the need for an open reconciliation with the Stalinists and a withdrawal from the "extreme" positions taken by pro-Gomulka elements in and after October—that is, he is preaching that "October" must be put in reverse. By its terms this preachment is directed to the anti-Stalinists.

"How Little Is Left . . ."

Putrament begins by referring to a statement in some French paper that the "Polish experiment" is no more. He demurs; if the writer "took the trouble to dig around a little," he would "find something—some efforts, some steps taken in the dark, a few actions, and a lot of hope." Having entered this demurrer he adds:

"And yet it is difficult to say the Frenchman was not right. How little is left of our ecstasies! How poor this Polish experiment looks on the 100th day of its existence!"

But we must learn from our "failure," he declares. In other words, he is telling his readers: *Let's face up to it—the October revolution is over, it failed; we must go back. . . .*

Naturally he can't dream of advocating a complete return to "the emergency socialism of the Stalinist epoch." He makes his pitch in terms of advocating a middle ground between the past and the present. To illustrate the extremes, he summarizes "the last 10 years and 3 months" with a few "facts":

"Either driving peasants into collective farms with the help of the militia. Or dispersing collective farms with the help of a mob, sometimes headed by a priest.

"Either mechanical imitation of everything Soviet. Or mechanical elimination of everything Soviet.

"Either automatic spitting on everything Western. Or mechanical worship of everything Western.

"Either driving nudism out of art. Or rejecting from art everything that wears clothes.

"Either Salvation Army. Or a brothel (who knows, maybe even one working on a basis of collective vice).

"Either hierarchy. Or anarchy.

"Either vulgar epithets toward the emigration. Or flirting and coquetry even with Anders [wartime Home Army head].

"Either sawing-in-half for a misplaced comma. Or cheerfully blasting away the very foundations of our ideology.

"Either compulsory praise for everything that happened during the 10 years. Or a compulsory rejection of everything.

"That is: either *Trybuna Ludu* 1952. Or *Po Prostu* 1956."

New Notes

It is the last line that carries the kick. If you take the first terms in each of the counterpositions (except for the Salvation Army bit, of course!) you do get "*Trybuna Ludu* 1952." But to ascribe the caricatures in the second terms to *Po Prostu*, the now world-famous independent student organ in Warsaw which is the most outspoken voice of the democratic elements behind Gomulka, this is nothing but a Stalinist slander.

The attack is concentrated on *Po Prostu*, but it is the old Stalinist "salami tactics" in operation again, this time for Gomulka.

Putrament throws out broad hints, next, that all that democratic stuff will only push Poland over to capitalism—yes, he leans hard on the "capitalist restorationist" bogey, this being a new note in post-October Poland where up to now dire warnings about the future have been in terms of the danger of a Russian massacre.

Not that he ascribes pro-capitalism to the *Po Prostu* elements themselves; the time has not come for this gambit. He merely calls for "a special effort to guard it [the Polish road to socialism] against people—often full of good-will and even zest—who from the very first moment will push it back either to the period of siege [old-Stalinism] or to the restoration of capitalism."

Another new note emerges when he charges that "Even the Central Committee of our party, during all three plenums of last year, paid very little attention to ideology. The struggle which took place there was a struggle of various political conceptions. But there was no attempt to translate all points of view into the language of ideology."

This stricture is, one sees, directed also if not especially against the hitherto sacrosanct "Eight Plenum," whose very label is the symbol of the Polish October days; for this was the plenum where Ochab and Cyrankiewicz turned the party reins over to Gomulka, against Khrushchev's shrieks.

Two Turns

Putrament advocates making two turns, which he calls "two preliminary conditions" for getting "positive results."

(1) "First of all, there is need for a proper attitude toward the Soviet Union and its leaders," he says. The elaboration of this is done eggshell-walking. He stresses that Russia's past ought to be separated from its present (very Marxistical that, indeed!), by which he means that there should be an end to linking the present Moscow rulers up with the discredited past.

Then he again hauls out and waves the capitalist danger: "Those of our feuilletonists [feature-article writers] who now so lightheartedly undermine the foundations of Marxism-Leninism in the name of an allegedly 'real' socialist revolution, ought to understand that even their activity is made possible only thanks to the neighboring USSR. Also if we imagine, purely theoretically, a Poland—even so lopsidedly socialist a one as exists today—in a capitalist environment, then a quarter of their activity would be enough for a clear capitalist intervention."

(This is the Stalinist camp's mirror-image of the argument often heard on this side of the cold war, against Western radicals: "Yes, yes, you fellows can

shoot your mouths off against American imperialism only because our NATO guns are protecting you against the Russians.")

(2) The second turn which is openly discussed is what gives the article its title, "Right Wing—Left Wing." It begins as an apparent discussion of terminology but the political meaning is quickly brought out quite starkly.

Putrament kicks off with a complaint that a *Le Monde* writer used "right wing" to refer to Ochab (who typifies the Stalinist, but non-Natolin, wing of the Gomulka regime and the dominant elements in the party apparatus) and used "left wing" for *Po Prostu* and *Nowa Kultura*, which have printed much of the material that Putrament says must now be dumped.

What this develops into, step by step, is an exposition of the thesis: *The Stalinists are (somewhat mistaken) class comrades of ours, while the "revisionists" are separated from us by a class gulf. . . .* Incidentally, this also explains what he was getting at in the talk about the "ideological" lacks of the Eighth Plenum, when the "Gomulkaists" made a bloc with the latter against the former, because of "political conceptions" without taking due account of "ideological" ties.

Stalinist Analysis

Let's follow Putrament:

"What is the criterion objectively of a left wing? Of course, a class criterion. A party which best and most effectively represents workers' interests is a party that has a right to the name leftist."

Here he throws in a special plug for the French CP, the rockribbed unreconstructed Stalinist outfit which had been hurling stinkbombs at Gomulka along with Moscow:

"Of course, this applies only to parties as a whole. In spite of all the stupid things written here about the French party (although even this party has a few big mistakes on its conscience), no one has gone so far as to say that it does not represent the interests of the French workers."

But how about factions inside a party? he continues. "Left wing" has to be understood in the context of a program. For example, Lenin often exposed "those who were raising the most leftist slogans" by showing their "concrete political and class contents."

"How can certain groups be called 'left' when (while fighting another group) they are ready for an alliance with classic reaction and even are ready to pay for such an alliance?"

"Sometimes they go even further—they agree to renounce power and hand it over to the bourgeois parties, and are ready to play the role of an adjunct to a coalition government."

"I will not quote the astonishing fact that such groups are beloved by the Western press of the extreme right. The voice of 'an enemy cannot be a criterion for us.'"

Having indulged in this Ciceronian *praeteritio* ("I pass over without mention the well-known fact that my opponent habitually kicks babies in the teeth," etc.), Putrament immediately proceeds to make a big point of the bourgeois West's love for the "revisionists" and hatred of the Stalinists.

Hatred? "Yes, but to achieve that, it is necessary to work a bit for socialism. One earns the enemy's hatred by hard work. Only its affection comes easily."

"The Natolin Group Has It"

And so to the crux:

"Which group has the objective right to be considered most left of all?"

"It is dreadful to say so, but the Natolin group has it. In the majority of problems (relation toward the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the agrarian problem, to the capitalist classes, etc.), the representatives of this group are the most left of all."

That doesn't mean they're correct, he assures. "In ideological problems they represent classic dogmatism in our era." And in the pre-October crisis last summer, "they were simultaneously politically ineffective and morally hideous." Then Putrament goes on:

"It is true that they are trying to take hold of anti-Semitic positions but this problem requires a longer analysis and clarification on how much in this attitude of theirs is of alien inspiration and how much is their own mental poverty. Anyway, this won't tip the scales. The Natolin group today represents in our party a left-sectarian attitude."

He winds up:

"The most important problem of humanity is and remains a struggle between capitalism and socialism. Only in such a perspective can the terms Right Wing and Left Wing be analyzed."

The Stalinists are for "socialism." The revisionists open the door to the "capitalist restoration." Thus, openly pointing to the Natolin group, the regime's leading intellectual-in-uniform points to a reconciliation with the Stalinists and the reversal of the October revolution.

Last week we reported increasing testimony to the great dismay of the democratic elements in the face of this Gomulka turn; there is more now, of course. There is much less about any steps in resistance by these dismayed pro-democrats. Our wish may be father to our hope that there is more than is reported by, say, the *N. Y. Times* so far. But the clearest thing to date is that Gomulka has made his choice. Our eyes turn to the revolutionary democracy.

Business Unionism — —

The ISL Program in Brief

(Continued from page 7)
 is taken care of by its "owners," the dues-paying members of the Teamsters. Further, it is now reported, for a period of time he borrowed between \$300,000 and \$400,000 from the union, on which no interest was demanded or paid. Although he admitted on a radio program that he would not recommend such transactions as a general thing for the labor movement, he added that "every rule has its exception."
 The money, it appears, was used in certain personal financial transactions. As a result of such transactions over the years, it is rumored that Beck is now a millionaire. It would seem that one need not be a financial wizard to become a millionaire if one has at one's disposal well over a quarter of a million dollars of other people's money, without interest or due-date.

BUSINESSMAN'S ANSWER

Beck's transactions have been on such a grandiose scale that we doubt if any decent labor leader will rise to defend them. (We are talking now only of the legal ways in which Beck has used the union to enrich himself.) In principle, however, what is the difference between Beck's real-estate transaction with "his" union, and the practice of many an honest union bureaucrat whose union leases a \$12,000 a year apartment for him in Washington and another one in New York? Or that of other leaders whose \$40,000 per year salaries, and equal amounts in expense accounts, are added to by the "use" of a union limousine and chauffeur and other conveniences?

That such arrangements are the rule in the business world goes without saying. That the stock-buying options for business executives make it possible for many of them to milk their stockholders, on a much larger scale than Beck has yet succeeded in milking his members, is common knowledge. If capitalists ever feel themselves called upon to "answer" for such practices, all they need say is that as long as their business is run profitably and well, its investors have no kick coming.

In effect, that is also the answer Beck and Hoffa are trying to make to the charges against them.

They have won increases and better conditions for the Teamsters. They have organized the unorganized in their jurisdiction (and far beyond it), and will continue to do the same. On other occasions, Beck has philosophized to the effect that, like any businessman, he has a commodity to sell, and he seeks to sell it at the highest price he can get.

The high-handed self-enrichment of the Teamster leaders is simply the end-product of the whole philosophy of business-unionism, or unionism as a business.

IT TAKES TWO

The fact that these, and many other, union bureaucrats are steeped in this philosophy in no way prevents them, on occasion, from leading struggles for higher wages and better conditions for their members, and even very militant ones. But since their members are regarded primarily as a commodity, they must be kept docile and pliable, and they are salable, at any time, depending on

the interests of their "leaders."

George Meany has pointed out that racketeering is not a problem confined to the labor movement but is a general social problem in American society. He is, of course, quite right. As Lincoln Steffens pointed out many years ago in connection with government corruption, it takes two for a corrupt deal. A bribe, or graft of any kind, must be offered by someone, as well as taken. That "someone" more often than not turns out to be a "legitimate" businessman seeking to protect a "legitimate" business interest.

The Waterfront Crime Commission, and every similar body which has really probed these matters close to their bottoms, has found that this applies at least as much to union racketeering and corruption as it ever did to government graft.

LABOR'S VALUES

Although Meany's observation is correct, it does not begin to approach an answer to the problem. The chief reason why American society is so corrupt financially is that its dominant value is the acquisition of wealth, and in a relatively fluid and uninhibited society, this end is made to justify almost any means of achieving it.

The labor movement, however, cannot live successfully by the same values as the business world, no matter how often its spokesmen swear that there is a harmony of interest between them. Sections of it can get by for a long time in this way, and the whole of it may even grow under special circumstances for a short time while dominated by such notions.

But at bottom the labor movement must rely on the willingness of its members to struggle for a better life. It must rely on a sense of solidarity, of community of interest, among the workers. However distorted and corrupted this sense may become in a section of the working class, without it the labor movement cannot even play the limited role assigned to it by its most conservative leaders, in the long run.

The Becks and the Hoffas have departed so far from this basic need of the union movement that they have come to be regarded as a menace by a large section of the union movement, from top to bottom. Their ruthless raiding strategy is as much a part of their contempt for labor's basic need, solidarity, as is their racketeering or personal enrichment.

All the vices which have crept into the labor movement over the years, and which show themselves in virtually all sections of it to one degree or another, are magnified and brought to a peak in the Teamsters Union because of its size and strategic location both in the labor movement and in the economy as a whole.

TWO-WORD ANSWER

The Senate investigation will now take its course. That the enemies of the labor movement, both in the Senate and in the country as a whole, will seek to use it for the purpose of striking a blow at the economic and political organization of the workers is clear enough. The dominant section of the labor leadership will use the opportunity to rid the movement of the worst racketeers and profiteers who have achieved power in it.

But if that is all that happens, it will simply be another example of a "reform" movement such as has come and gone in many a municipal and state government in the past. If that is all that happens, the labor movement will be as "clean" of racketeers and profiteers ten years from now as New York City was ten years after the passing of the La Guardia administration.

In the labor movement, an "answer" to both racketeering and profiteering lies in one short phrase: union democracy. That can no more be imported from above by the leadership, however enlightened, than it can be "given" the people in a society. It can only be achieved by the active and conscious participation of the membership in the decision of their own affairs in those unions where the forms of democracy still continue to exist, and by a struggle of the membership for democracy in those unions where the forms have been destroyed or completely gutted of content.

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

SP-SDF — —

(Continued from page 6)

geois liberals on the theory of the lesser evil; others will want to go along with the labor movement; others will not want to oppose candidates endorsed by labor even if they themselves would not support them. To ensure the harmonious and healthy growth of a united movement, it is essential that no one view be imposed by rigid rule upon all the others.

The SP-SDF agreement on political action suggests one possible reasonable solution: Neither the party nor its units endorse the candidates of the old parties; but under certain conditions, members as individuals have autonomous rights to follow their own conscience.

Let clarity come not by decree but from experience.

ISL FUND DRIVE

Most Branches Are Lagging

By ALBERT GATES
 Fund Drive Director

There was a slight improvement in contributions this week in the fund drive but still far below the weekly average we wrote about in our previous report.

We received \$775 this week and the showing was fair only because it involved no more than five areas. If every city had responded to our appeal we would have met the \$1300 weekly average needed to ensure completing the drive at the end of ten weeks.

The standings haven't changed very much even with the contributions that came in, except that Bay Area really jumped up a few notches. With over 70 per cent of its quota remitted, Bay Area may well finish on top before many weeks have passed. New York too came through with a sizable contribution of \$460, which doubled its payments as well as its percentage standing.

This week also saw Los Angeles come through with an initial payment of \$100. Although still far from a respectable showing, we know the branch there will really make it. This is only the start for LA. Cleveland and the National Office were the remaining two quotas that made any contribution. From the rest, we received nothing and heard nothing!

There's the rub. There is too much unevenness in payments. One week a handful of branches will make contributions, and the next week another. It makes it somewhat difficult for the National Office to make any calculations based upon some steady average of income in the drive.

I hope our readers do not take these remarks directed to branches of the ISL as meaning that no appeal is made to them to help us in this campaign for the reasons we already outlined in our previous stories.

The pages of LABOR ACTION have carried some interesting articles on the question of socialist regroupment; and ISL-SP-SDF unity which indicate the kind of activity the ISL is carrying on today on the most important question confronting socialist organizations. Our work with respect to that alone warrants the support of every reader to our fund drive.

One reader did send in a \$10 contribution in behalf of the ISL's case against the Attorney General. We hope to bring that matter to issue during this year,

and there is your second big reason for getting behind the drive.

If you are tired of reading these appeals, there is one way to stop them: beat the quotas and beat them early!

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

City	Quota	Paid	%
	\$10,000	\$2728.50	27.2
St. Louis	25	25	100
Seattle	100	80.50	80.5
Bay Area	400	285	71.2
Buffalo	100	65	65
Nat'l Office	1,250	510	41
Newark	450	176	39.1
Detroit	400	120	30
Cleveland	150	45	30
New York	3,900	860	22
Chicago	2,000	400	20
Philadelphia	200	32	16
Los Angeles	650	100	15.3
Pittsburgh	200	30	15
Reading	75	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
Mass.	25	0	0
Streator	25	0	0

CONTRIBUTE TO THE ISL FUND DRIVE

Independent Socialist League
 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE

(Make checks out to Albert Gates)