

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 10, 1957

FIVE CENTS

Supreme Court Delivers a Jolt To the FBI Stoolpigeon System

... page 2

YOUTH BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN STILL SPARKING MOOD OF REVOLT

... page 5

Britain: Tories See the Handwriting

... page 3

France: Mollet May Still Stay In

... page 3

CALL KHRUSHCHEV'S BLUFF!

A Slit of Light Appears In Disarmament Talks

By SAM TAYLOR

For the first time in over a decade, there appears the narrowest slit of light in the disarmament talks between the U.S. and Russia. Whatever rays of hope seem to be emanating from the meetings of the UN disarmament subcommittee meetings in London, comes less from a meeting of minds in Washington and Moscow than from the cracks in the power blocks.

The current series of talks which started on March 18 seemed to be headed toward the usual end of propaganda blasts and mutual re-primations. Both sides clearly and unambiguously stated their positions, the same positions which had led to deadlocks of all past talks.

While the disarmament negotiations were in process, both Washington and Moscow seemed to be conducting business as usual. On March 24 the U.S. agreed to supply Britain with missiles capable of carrying atomic warheads; and the Russians were busy sending diplomatic notes to NATO countries threatening them with possible nuclear destruction in war if they let the U.S. use them as a military base.

In the midst of the negotiations, while Moscow was calling upon the U.S. and its allies to ban the testing of nuclear weapons, Russia began a series of nuclear-weapons tests in Siberia. This was followed by the British test of a thermonuclear bomb in May in the mid-Pacific, and the U.S. detonation of a series of atomic bombs in Nevada.

WASHINGTON ON THE SPOT

The response to this period of unprecedented explosion of nuclear weapons and the consequent dangers of radioactive fallout has been a world-wide series of protests. American scientists, German scientists, British public opinion and the Japanese government have participated in calls for an end to all nuclear tests.

There appeared to be little chance of a change in the usual script until the end of April when the Russians took the initiative and agreed to open up a section of Russian and satellite territory to aerial inspection. In addition Moscow for the first time dissociated a proposal for disarmament from the demand for the dismantling of U.S. bases and for the banning of all nuclear weapons as a condition for inspection.

This sudden turn of events threw Washington into a dither and Harold Stassen, the American delegate returned to the U.S. for further instructions. Russia, in its April 30 proposals, took a step in the direction of the U.S. proposal of "open sky" inspection.

The question was now whether the U.S. was also willing to negotiate. Or to put it another way, could the U.S. refuse to make a proposal toward a "first step" in arms limitation in face of the world protests over the nuclear-bomb tests?

At a high-level meeting of the National Security Council, President Eisenhower made the decision to proceed with the negotiations. The decision merely to proceed had to be carried out against the opposition of Admiral Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who publicly denounced the idea of negotiations itself.

The decision just to continue negotiations is important not because it will

(Continued on page 6)

By GORDON HASKELL

Boss Nikita Khrushchev of Russia has made a bold move on the chessboard of world politics.

In his unprecedented TV interview by American newsmen over the CBS program "Face the Nation" on June 2, the Moscow dictator presented a smiling, friendly exterior in a sometimes sugary reversion to the line of the "outstretched hand," "peaceful coexistence," and "let's be friends," helped out by bland lies about Russian domination in East Europe.

But the big push that he made was for his proposal that both American and Russian troops withdraw from all foreign countries where they are now stationed—the U.S. from Western Europe and Russia from Eastern Europe. It appears that he did not condition this proposal on any previous solution of any of the outstanding political problems dividing the rival camps, such as the reunification of Germany.

The proposal constituted a sharp challenge to the West, designed to make a maximum impact on American listeners, estimated at over 10 million, and for that matter on other Western peoples. Khrushchev represented it as his idea of a "first step" toward the creation of an atmosphere which can lead to some kind of over-all political deal.

The challenge was put most sharply after one of the American interviewers—nettled by Khrushchev's claim of popular support to the satellite regimes, in spite of the fact that the newsmen were apparently not intending to bring up embarrassing items like the bloody suppression of the Hungarian Revolution—asked: "how long do you think the Kadar regime would exist without Soviet troops and tanks in Hungary?"

The Russian boss replied: "Let's have a test! Why don't you withdraw your troops from Germany and France, and we will withdraw ours from Germany, Poland and Hungary, and you will see."

Do Khrushchev and the Russian government he represents really mean his proposition of mutual troop withdrawal? In our opinion, his proposal is one of the boldest and at the same time most transparent political bluffs of recent times.

He has made it only because he is confident that the United States will not call it. He has made it, further, because if it is not called, it is calculated to restore, in some measure, the enormous loss of political capital Russia suffered all over the world by its suppression of the Hungarian Revolution.

Every thinking political person knows that what Khrushchev asserts about the popularity and viability of the Stalinist regimes in Eastern Europe is political hogwash in its purest and most repulsive form. But since this is so, why doesn't the American government, which has even proclaimed the "liberation" of the peoples of Eastern Europe as one of its prime political objectives, take up Khrushchev's challenge and thus force him to eat his words?

HOW TO DEFEAT IT

We do not doubt for a moment that if President Eisenhower were to announce tomorrow that the American government

(Turn to last page)



Challenger

The Burden of Proof Is on the H-Bombers

In a conjuncture of events focusing the spotlight on the issue of stopping the H-bomb tests, two thousand scientists have signed their names to an appeal to this end. Spokesman for the initiators has been the Nobel Prize-winning chemist Linus Pauling, and prominent among them is Hermann J. Muller, one of the country's foremost geneticists.

The appeal states:

"We, the American scientists whose names are signed below, urge that an international agreement to stop the testing of nuclear bombs be made now.

"Each nuclear bomb test spreads an added burden of radioactive elements over every part of the world. Each added amount of radiation causes damage to the health of human beings all over the world and causes damage to the pool of human germ plasm such as to lead to an increase in the number of seriously defective children that will be born in future generations.

"So long as these weapons are in the hands of only three powers an agreement for their control is feasible. If testing continues, and the possession of

these weapons spreads to additional governments, the danger of outbreak of a cataclysmic nuclear war through the reckless action of some irresponsible national leader will be greatly increased.

"An international agreement to stop the testing of nuclear bombs now could serve as a first step toward a more general disarmament and the ultimate effective abolition of nuclear weapons, averting the possibility of a nuclear war that would be a catastrophe to all humanity.

"We have in common with our fellow men a deep concern for the welfare of all human beings. As scientists we have knowledge of the dangers involved and therefore a special responsibility to make those dangers known. We deem it imperative that immediate action be taken to effect an international agreement to stop the testing of all nuclear weapons."

The 2000 scientists' names were collected in only 10 days' time, says Pauling. It is not the first, though probably the biggest, such round-robin launched

(Continued on page 7)

Supreme Court Delivers a Jolt To the FBI Stoolpigeon System

By PHILIP COBEN

In a decision reversing the lower courts on the Jencks case, the Supreme Court laid down a new principle forcing the government to produce FBI reports for the inspection of the defense when these reports form the basis of testimony by its witnesses, or else drop the case.

The opinion delivers a smashing blow especially against the privileged position of government stoolpigeons in witchhunt cases.

So serious did the government apparently consider this blow against its position that Justice Tom Clark (who undoubtedly reflects the Justice Department's state of mind) in a bitter dissent virtually limited himself to predicting the dire consequences that would ensue.

Heart and climax of the court's majority opinion was this statement:

"We hold that the criminal action must be dismissed when the government, on the ground of privilege, elects not to comply with an order to produce, for the accused's inspection and for admission in evidence, relevant statements or reports in its possession of government witnesses touching the subject matter of their testimony at the trial. . . . The burden is the government's, not to be shifted to the trial judge (as the court majority proposed), to decide whether the public prejudice of allowing the crime to go unpunished is greater than that attendant upon the possible disclosure of state secrets and other confidential information in the government's possession."

This issue exists in a number of cases still pending in various hearings, and presumably the Jencks decision will rule these too.

PANDORA'S BOX

Lamented Clark in his one-man dissent: "Unless Congress changes the rule announced by the court today, those intelligence agencies of our government engaged in law enforcement may as well close up shop . . . it opens up a veritable Pandora's box of troubles." While this is worded irresponsibly—obviously, the decision is several light-years from meaning that any government agencies may as well close up shop—Clark's complaint registers the jolt that he feels as a form-

NAACP CASE

When the Supreme Court agreed to hear the appeal of the NAACP from orders imposed upon it by the Alabama courts, it was agreeing to confront issues it has hitherto evaded. One of these is whether under the first amendment, an organ of government, state or federal, may force lawful associations to reveal their membership lists. In a free society does government have the right to invade the privacy of opinion where publication of views and associations would subject those involved to ostracism and boycott? . . .

Until now only radicals have felt the impact of the new blacklisting devices which were created in the Truman cold war era: the Attorney General's list, registration with the Subversive Activities Control Board, etc. This is the first time they have been employed against a non-leftist organization. It is indicative that the state of Alabama, in asking the Supreme Court not to hear the NAACP's appeal, cited Justice Jackson's words in *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath*, the first (and inconclusive) test of the Attorney General's list. There Mr. Justice Jackson said "mere designation as subversive" did not deprive of any legal right. The injury which resulted, he said, were "sanctions applied by public disapproval, not by law." Alabama says this justifies what it is doing to the NAACP.

The grant of certiorari may indicate that the Supreme Court is now prepared to take a more realistic view of the new blacklisting devices.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

er attorney general, rather than any ideas of justice he entertains as a jurist. The majority decision may help to close the Pandora's box that Clark helped to open up as Truman's appointed organizer of the first period of the loyalty witchhunt.

It is not clear how Congress can legislatively change the court's stand, as Clark seems to hope.

The particular case at issue involved an officer of the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, Clinton Jencks, who signed a Taft-Hartley anti-Communist affidavit saying he was not a member of or affiliated with the Communist Party. The government put him in the dock to prove that his oath was false, on the basis primarily of testimony by two professional FBI stoolies, the notorious Harvey Matusow and J. W. Ford.

In the trial the two informers said they had rendered various oral and written reports to the FBI during the period in question. The defense, in this connection, moved that the court direct the Justice Department to make available these reports, so that their credibility could be examined and compared with the two stoolpigeons' testimony in court. The trial judge denied this motion, without giving any reason.

It is on the basis of this "trial error" that the lower courts (including the Court of Appeals) was reversed, and a new trial for Jencks ordered, as far as the decision of the Supreme Court majority went.

"JUSTICE REQUIRES"

The court opinion included these points:

(1) In order to require the production of the FBI reports, the defense does not have to make a preliminary showing of inconsistency in the witnesses' testimony. For, argued the court, this might not be possible till after the secret reports were available.

(2) The court "disapproved" the practice of showing such government documents only to the trial judge (and not to the defendants) for determination by the trial judge alone of their relevance. They must be shown to the defendants, so that these can prepare their case. "Justice requires no less," comments the decision.

One angle that did not come up at all was the credibility of Matusow. Matusow is the prime example of the back-firing stoolie in the hapless history of government informers. It will be remembered that he repudiated all of the various jobs of testimony he had performed for government agencies, announcing himself as a liar. Although he has repudiated his testimony in the Jencks case too, this fact did not figure in the basis on which the case was taken up by the Supreme Court.

A heartening aspect of the decision, in addition to its specific content, was the indication it gives of the civil-liberties line-up on the court as presently constituted after all the Eisenhower appointments. The majority of five consisted of: Hugo Black and William O. Douglas, the hard-core pro-civil-liberties "faction" of the court; plus Chief Justice Warren, who has more often ranged himself with the first two than anybody else; plus two "freshmen" appointed by Eisenhower, Harlan and Brennan. Brennan wrote the decision.

HOW PROVE MEMBERSHIP?

While Clark dissented completely, a minority of Burton and Frankfurter concurred with the majority in ordering a new trial, but did so on a different basis.

The less interesting aspect of their position has been mentioned above: they

believed that the FBI reports should have been made available to the trial judge who, in turn, should decide whether they need be shown to the defendants.

The more interesting aspect is another "trial error" which they handled, while the majority did not. It is a moot issue which eventually is going to have to be decided for a number of key cases.

This is the question of the meaning of the phrases "member of" or "affiliated with" the Communist Party, as used in the Taft-Hartley Act.

Burton and Frankfurter make this the primary ground for ordering a new trial for Jencks, rather than the ground chosen by the majority. The trial judge, they say, gave wrong or inadequate instructions to the jury on this point.

The trial judge had told the jury: "In considering whether or not the defendant was a member of the Communist Party, you may consider circumstantial evidence, as well as direct. You may consider whether or not he attended Communist Party meetings, whether or not he held an office in the Communist Party, whether or not he engaged in other conduct consistent only with membership in the Communist Party and all other evidence, either direct or circumstantial, which bears or may bear upon the question of whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party on April 28, 1950."

On this Burton and Frankfurter comment: "This instruction failed to emphasize to the jury the essential element of membership in an organized group—the desire of an individual to belong to the organization and a recognition by the organization that it considers him as a member."

Furthermore, the trial judge had defined "affiliation" as "something less than membership but more than sympathy" and allowed circumstantial evidence as well as direct. The two justices comment:

"This instruction allowed the jury to convict petitioner and on the basis of acts of intermittent cooperation. It did not require a continuing course of conduct 'on a fairly permanent basis' that could not be abruptly ended without giving at

Come Out in the Open!

"While we must accept it as lawful for a department of the Government to suppress documents, even when they will help determine controversies between third persons, we cannot agree that this should include their suppression in a criminal prosecution, founded upon those very dealings to which the documents relate and whose criminality they will, or may, tend to exculpate."

"So far as they directly touch the criminal dealings, the prosecution necessarily ends any confidential character the documents may possess; it must be conducted in the open, and will lay bare their subject-matter. The Government must choose; either it must leave the transactions in the obscurity from which a trial will draw them, or it must expose them fully. Nor does it seem to us possible to draw any line between documents whose contents bear directly upon the criminal transactions, and those which may be only indirectly relevant. Not only would such a distinction be extremely difficult to apply in practice, but the same reasons which forbid suppression in one case forbid it in the other, though not, perhaps, quite so imperatively. . . ."

—Judge Learned Hand, quoted in the majority Supreme Court opinion in the Jencks case.

least reasonable cause for the charge of breach of good faith."

No doubt the courts will have to say more on this question in due course. While noting that "the membership and affiliation" issue was before them for review, the majority chose not to take it up.

Clark's dissent jibed at this, while Clark himself stated that he approved the trial judge's instructions to the jury. But, Clark pointed out, about 10 other affidavit cases are pending. "The court is sorely divided on this important issue," he said, and a stand ought to be announced.

On another "membership" issue, the court postponed decision on the cases of Claude Lightfoot and J. I. Scales, the first Communists to be convicted under the later-added "membership" clauses of the Smith Act. The cases were assigned for reargument in the fall. The constitutionality of the clauses which make CP membership punishable has still to be acted on.

Cop on the High Bench

Special comment is required on the dissenting opinion put in by Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark in the Jencks decision. As the article on this page details, the Supreme Court has required the government to show defendants the reports of FBI stoolpigeons which are involved in witchhunt trials, so that the defense can prepare.

The past history of men appointed to the high bench has not been an infallible guide to what course they pursue once they are ensconced there. But in the case of Tom Clark, one feels like saying: **Once a cop, always a cop**—at least after reading his document.

What is noteworthy about it is that it not only is the product of a cop's mentality but that it is written as such.

It literally presents not a single juridical argument against the court's decision. This is not a matter of opinion: it does not pretend or purport to do so.

There is only one authority quoted. This is done in a long citation which makes up almost half of the document.

It is from that eminent authority J. Edgar Hoover, FBI head.

Following this quotation, Clark writes only: "I can add nothing to this graphic expression . . ." He adds nothing, except the complaint (noted in our main article) that the majority didn't take up the "membership" issue. Before this, he had made only one other point: that the decision was new, not the present rule.

As a matter of fact, even most of the quotation from the FBI cop is plainly and clearly irrelevant to any issue in the Jencks case. One passage, however,

is indeed relevant. Said Hoover:

"FBI reports set forth all details secured from a witness. If those details were disclosed, they could be subject to misrepresentation, they could be quoted out of context, or they could be used to thwart truth, distort half-truths and misrepresent facts . . ."

This of course is always a possibility with any document whatsoever. In fact, the government has often been charged with doing exactly that in the use of its secret documents in security cases; the charges have even been proved at times. In the open light of a courtroom a defendant who "thwarts truth" in this case can be caught up by the prosecution and any quotes-out-of-context, etc. put straight, to the discredit of the truth-thwarting.

But if only the government prosecution is to have the right to see these reports, and not the defense at all, then it is the government which has the opportunity to quote out of context, thwart truth, distort half-truths and misrepresent facts—and there is nobody in the courtroom who can check on them in any way. (Not even the trial judge, according to Clark.)

Hoover's argument turns out to be an indictment of the dangers of the government's practice, not of the dangers of allowing a man to know the evidence against him.

And a justice of the Supreme Court—only one, fortunately—quotes this typical product of a secret-police mind as the guide for justice in the United States.

LONDON LETTER

Vote Still Slipping, Tories Move to Trap Labor Men

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, June 2

Elections in three British parliamentary constituencies went to the polls in by-elections last week. Although none of the seats changed, the result in each case was a setback for the government and a contribution of the anti-tory trend of the past 18 months.

The most spectacular of the results was that of the London borough of Hornsey, where the by-election was a straight fight between the Labor and Tory parties. Tory candidate was Lady Gamans, widow of the previous member and a political illiterate. As an example of her attitude it is sufficient to quote from her election speech the despairing observation: "If only the workers would behave like sensible, civilized human beings!"

Such remarks did not go down well with the workers, particularly when coupled with a pose as "just an ordinary girl" who didn't understand much about politics. Her reward was a seat in Parliament—but only just. At the general election two years ago her husband collected more than 33,000 votes and a majority of 12,726 over his Labor opponent. Lady Gamans collected only 24,169 votes and her majority over the Labor candidate was slashed away to a mere 3,131. In spite of a reduced total poll the Labor vote increased by a thousand.

The dominating feature of the Hornsey by-election was again the number of Tory supporters who failed to register their votes—and in such a constituency this can only be seen as yet another indication of the "middle-class revolt" against the Tories.

This trend was also well demonstrated at another by-election, in South Edinburgh. In the general election of 1955 the Tories had a majority of nearly 13,000 over Labor in a straight fight; last week their majority slumped to 4,640 and although they won the seat they did so on a minority vote. Total Tory vote was 14,421 whereas the combined vote of the Liberal and Labor candidates was 17,220. The Liberal Party candidate's 7,439 votes were drawn to a large extent from previous Tory supporters who, anxious to show annoyance with the government, were able to cast their votes against the Tory government without at the same time casting them for the Labor Party.

TORIES IN A STEW

In the third by-election, at East Ham, rebellious Tories again made their influence felt. In this Labor-held seat the Labor candidate was returned with a slightly increased majority on a smaller total vote. But the big feature was the drop of the Tory vote from nearly 41 per cent of the poll in 1955 to just over 29 per cent last week. The missing portion of the Tory vote went to a candidate from the People's League which, standing a Parliamentary candidate for the first time in its history, collected more than 12 per cent of the votes.

The Peoples League is a right-wing organization appealing to the middle class for its support. It is violently anti-Labor and anti-trade-union but at the same time carries on a minor campaign against "big business." The votes it gathered at East Ham are therefore yet another indication of the dissatisfaction among middle-class Tories.

That Prime Minister MacMillan is worried about the continued decline in support for his government there is no doubt. Today, for the second time in a few weeks, MacMillan has called together a number of his Tory partners to his house for a sort of "Sunday School" to talk things over. Today's discussions are said to be centering around the need to improve the government's propaganda machine and present "a clearer picture" to the public of what it is trying to do. The big effort of MacMillan, however, seems to be concentrated on pinning the trade unions down to an easier line on wage demands.

Yesterday the prime minister announced that this week he would be opening talks with employers, trade unions and nationalized industries to discuss the setting up of an "independent body" to deal with wages, prices and production. At the moment nothing more positive has been said, but it has been known for some time that the government would very much like to see such a body working, for it would kill several birds with one stone.

UNION SCRAP BREWING

First, if the unions could be tied to such a body through the Trades Union Congress, it would restrict the activities of the growing section of trade-union militants (particularly those of the Frank Cousins tendency) and restore the predominance of the right wing in the TUC. This would slow down the drive for higher wages and make the government's position much easier.

Second, and arising from the first point, if the trade unions could be hog-tied in such a fashion it would go a long way toward silencing some of the middle-class critics of the government, who say that the big stick should be taken to the trade unions to make them ease up on wage demands and allow more of the national income to be diverted to the middle class.

Naturally, union leaders are divided on the government's proposals and, although no official comment has so far been forthcoming from union circles, it is believed that a real conflict may take place within the TUC—with the right wing in favor of the "impartial body" and the more militant group strongly opposed.

Thus Macmillan's proposal will have a third result of opening up a fight among the top trade-union leadership.

Whether MacMillan can ride out the storm with this plan of his remains to be seen.

FRANCE

Mollet May Stay as Cabinet Crisis Simmers

By LUCIEN WEITZ

Paris, May 27

Guy Mollet has resigned.

President Coty, basing himself on the constitution, has so far refused to accept his resignation: only 250 deputies voted against the government, less than the two-thirds needed to overthrow it constitutionally. This time 131 deputies abstained (including 28 Radicals) or did not participate in the vote. Consequently, it cannot be said that France is without a government: this paradox alone helps to show the complexity of the present crisis.

The Right Wing of the Assembly forced the government into the minority by refusing to vote for its tax bills (76 billion of francs of new taxes from the industrial and commercial companies and 14 from the sale of gasoline). The Right Wing demonstrated by its vote that it does not intend to pay for even part of the Algerian war, which it approves on all other occasions.

Also, these same deputies did not protest against the 60 billion francs worth of taxes levied from the consumers, taxes which did not require a vote in Parliament to be passed.

It must be pointed out, without justifying the attitude of the reactionaries, that the remedies put forward to meet the financial crisis are nothing but another example of the confusion of French economic policy. On the other hand, the government has declared that it intends to follow a policy of expansion, and that it hopes to increase exports thanks to this expansion. But, because of the unfavorable balance of foreign trade, imports are being reduced. The tax on stock-piled materials, for instance, which brought about the rebellion of the reactionaries, did not aim primarily at weakening capitalism but at reducing imports. However, France cannot increase its industrial production and at the same time attempt to live on its own resources; it is forced to import power, certain metals, paper paste, wool, etc.

The alternative is re-establishing a true war economy. This is the economic dilemma, and the Algerian bloodletting has been highly unstable for a long time, based on deep-going reforms of the social and economic structures.

This means that, whatever the solution to the political crisis may be, the voting of new taxes cannot be avoided. The working class will be called upon to pay and Mollet, in spite of his speeches, has shown the way by freezing wages.

But even before that, it will be necessary to apply for new loans from the Bank of France to cover the internal debts, and to use some of the gold reserves to meet foreign payments. The speculations on the franc cannot be suppressed, and devaluation will become unavoidable.

WHAT THE PARTIES WANT

Against this backdrop, the crisis has quietly developed for over a week.

M. Plevin, the man of Dienbienphu—of the small center party U.D.S.R.—has been asked by the President of the Republic to investigate the possibilities for a new government. He has not, however, been entrusted with the formation of a new government, and he has stated that "in no case, and regardless of the duration of the crisis, would I accept to succeed M. Guy Mollet."

This is his solution: "It is not so much a matter of forming a new government, but of enlarging the political composition of the old, of adapting it. This, incidentally, would give M. Guy Mollet a chance to demonstrate to the [Algerian] FLN and to its Tunisian and Moroccan allies that the Algerian policy of France is unanimously supported by all republican and patriotic parties."

The situation can be explained as follows:

(1) M. Plevin, who was compelled to withdraw into semi-obscurity after the tragic end of the Indochinese adventure, is very cautious. He is the United States' man; in spite of his declarations, he does not approve the Algerian policy of Lacoste, but he does not consider the situation ripe enough (or rotten enough) to

accept government responsibility.

(2) The leaders of the Right Wing (independents and moderates) think along the same lines, but were outflanked by their own followers. They themselves—Pinay, Reynaud and Laniel—abstained in the vote.

In reality, they regret the crisis; they only wanted to scare Mollet, but they did not want to succeed him. They would have preferred to wait for him to collapse in a real catastrophe.

(3) The Christian-Democratic MRP, because of its European-federalist policy, will not make a move without the SP, and they know that the latter would not accept to return to government if it did not occupy the presidency, account a new situation. Mendes-France,

(4) The Radicals have to take into account the decisions of the party congress and reduced to a minority in the parliamentary group, has resigned from the leadership, handing over his functions to Daladier. He now pays the price of his conciliatory attitude which was, in fact, a capitulation.

A month ago he could have broken with the Radical-fascist Bourges-Maunoury and kept the party machine under his control. Today he is compelled to isolate himself to avoid dishonoring himself. At the same time, given the present confusion in the party, no Radical can make claims on the presidency of a new government.

MOLLET'S CHARADE

This is why, at the moment, it is not absurd to think that Mollet may succeed Mollet. All he has to do is to find a few new ministers, more or less on the Right, and to sacrifice Ramadier, who would be only too happy to withdraw at this point.

He might also have to sacrifice Pineau who, in spite of appearances, is not too convinced of the value of the job he has done. (In any case, he does not approve of the value of the recent break with Tunisian Premier Bourguiba, a last and useless concession of Mollet to the Right)

Of course, Mollet puts on a great show of intransigence. He says that he will concede nothing of his financial program. He is not displeased, especially in view of his situation within the SP, to play the role of the victim of the "silver wall." He has fallen "to the left" party card in hand!

Sad as it may seem, this grotesque and theatrical gesture in Parliament might induce the SP minority—which had hopes of gaining strength—to forget the tragic and irreparable consequences of the insane Algerian policy, and the insult to socialist principles it represents.

This will be seen if the National Council is held next Saturday, as announced. If, in the meantime, Plevin succeeds in his patching-up operation, we shall have to wait for the party's Toulouse Congress, and for several months more French socialism will continue to degrade itself in the bloody swamp of the Algerian war.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

NEW YORK

A PANEL DISCUSSION

The Road to Peace in the Middle East

Speakers:

JAMAL SA'D

Research Officer, Arab States Delegation

HAL DRAPER

Editor, Labor Action

THURSDAY EVE., JUNE 13

8:30 p.m. at LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14 Street, New York City

The Peculiar Equilibrium Under Gomulka in Poland

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Polish public opinion was very disappointed by the new government that was presented by the Gomulka leadership to the Sejm (parliament). That new government included Cyrankiewicz as premier, Zenon Nowak as vice-premier, and Klosiewicz as vice-minister of Labor.

Nowak and Klosiewicz are leaders of the rightist-Stalinist "Natolin" group, which is responsible for all the crimes of Stalinism in Poland. Cyrankiewicz was a loyal and servile collaborator of Bierut and Hilary Minc who, at the last moment, went over to the "liberal" course in order to save himself. When the Poznan uprising took place, it was Cyrankiewicz who threatened terror against "the agents of foreign imperialism."

How can one explain the fact that Gomulka, after his election victory, after the defeat of the Natolin group which had fought him, now seeks collaboration with the Stalinists or "reformed Stalinists" in opposition to the public opinion of the country and in particular of the left wing of the party and independent press?

Of course, there is the factor of Russian pressure and the isolation of Poland in the satellite camp; but there are also internal grounds.

Gomulka won power backed by the majority of the people against the Stalinist regime, with the active support of the students and workers and the spontaneous leadership of revolutionary elements. Gomulka's own group was very weak and did not exist as an organized political force; and so Gomulka was between two fires—the Stalinists, his hangmen, and the revolutionaries, his saviors and friends. He had to go to the elections with the socialist left, because he did not have his own organization. Under the pressure of the masses the party organization was divided between different tendencies and threatened with a split which would naturally mean the breakup of the whole "Popular Democracy."

In order to save it and himself from revolution and from Russian intervention, Gomulka considered that the most important task was to preserve the "unity" of the party, that is, the control of the monolithic structure of the PZPR [the ruling CP] and its totalitarian monopoly and leadership over Poland. After the defeat of the Hungarian Revolution, Gomulka understood that in order to save his regime the most important task he faced was to stop the growing pressure of the left.

And this he could achieve only by a deal with the Natolin group, or a part of it. In this way Gomulka offered some posts in his government to the Natolinists, obtaining their support and probably the division of the Natolin group.

ATTACK ON LEFT

The most important danger to the new regime came, of course, from the Natolin reaction, backed by Moscow. It would be child's play for the Kremlin to organize a new dissident government in Poland—ordering Mazur, Mijal or Klosiewicz to hold a meeting at Bialystok, proclaim a "real socialist government" and accuse Gomulka of "treason," thereby appealing for Russian help. Gomulka knows the Russians well enough, and in the first place he tries to divide and demoralize the Natolin group to prevent this eventuality.

Of course, the Russians have not decided to form any such government, because they know that the Natolin group is absolutely isolated from the masses, and because a repetition of the Hungarian intervention in Poland means a danger of world war, as well as an extension of the Polish revolution to the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania and the Baltic countries, which have Polish minorities and which now have strong pro-

Polish sympathies, especially for the current Polish rebellion. But the danger of such a Russian policy does exist and is probably the nightmare of Gomulka and his group.

On the other hand, the deal with Natolin was made at the expense of the Left; for Gomulka not only wants to stop its growth, but he also knows that the Left is not set to, and is not able to, overthrow him, without an immediate Russian military intervention in Poland.

He fired Staszewski as secretary of the Warsaw organization, Matwin from Trybuna Ludu, Drobner as secretary of the Cracow district, etc. The "reorganization" of Trybuna Ludu was so dramatic that all the editors presented their resignation. The new editor, Leon Kasman, is an old collaborator of Bierut's and an enemy of Gomulka's. Censorship was imposed on the independent press and the weekly Po Prostu is in serious trouble.

The working class and the youth answered with street meetings in Cracow and Warsaw; the workers of the Cegielski factory in Poznan, where the June strike began, answered with a new strike; and so did the railroad workers at Bydgoszcz. Gomulka appealed to their "common sense" and the workers went back to work. The Left and the working class demonstrated its strength, but they will not and cannot overthrow Gomulka.

FROZEN EQUILIBRIUM

The foreign press exaggerated a little Gomulka's concessions to the Stalinists as a new coup d'état, which is not true, because the camp of the Polish October is very strong, stronger than Gomulka and the Stalinists together. The turn to the right is thus limited by the strength of the revolutionary camp and by the weakness of Natolin and Gomulka's own caucus.

Gomulka is trying to overcome this peculiar state of equilibrium by building his own caucus and fighting for control of the party against Natolin and the Left. The positions won in the party from the Stalinists and the Leftists he delivered to his own men. He accused the Left of "revisionism" and a tendency to restore bourgeois democracy, because his own mediocre Marxist culture and general culture (he is only a bureaucrat) and his Stalinist past does not permit him to understand the evolution of revolutionary Marxism to a new type of political democracy, overcoming the obsolete forms of bolshevik jacobinism.

But the stability of his regime depends not so much on the internal fight between the upper strata of the party and state bureaucracy, as on the peculiar equilibrium between the status conquered by the Polish October and the Kremlin. The Polish revolution has not been defeated; it has been frozen in the Gomulka regime, as a stage of development in the fight between the growing revolution and the Stalinist counter-revolution.

As a conquest of October, the Gomulka regime is a form of national resistance to the Kremlin yoke; at the same time it remains a regime of the bureaucracy, directed against the socialist and national revolution. How long it lasts depends on how long this peculiar equilibrium continues.

FORUM DISCUSSES SOCIALIST POLITICAL ACTION

New York, May 24
A symposium on the subject "Political Action for Socialists in 1957" was held by the West Side Forum this evening. The panel leading the discussion consisted of Robert Claiborne, vice-chairman of the Committee for Socialist Unity; Dr. Jackson, a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party; and Gordon Haskell, associate editor of Labor Action.

The discussion revolved primarily around the question of the advisability

Forum on Socialist Unity Hears 3 Views in Cleveland

By JOE HAUSER

Cleveland, May 27

Amid a flurry of forums in most major cities on the general subject of regroupment of the Left, Cleveland had its meeting Saturday night, May 25, at Slovenian National Home. Sponsor of the meeting was the Cleveland Open Forum, a long established group formerly called the General Welfare Forum, well known for its policy of hearing any and all points of view.

Invitations to participate in this meeting went to a number of groups. Only the Independent Socialist League, Young Socialist League, Socialist Workers Party, and Revolutionary Workers League responded favorably. The Communist Party officially declined—at this time. The Socialist Party and Socialist Labor Party never bothered to answer.

Ed Spira chaired the meeting for the Open Forum. Representing the participating organizations were Gerry McDermott, ISL; C. B. Cowan, RWL; Bernie Hendrick, YSL; and Robert Himmel, SWP.

Spira opened the meeting with remarks on the crisis the world is in today and the resultant need for a revolutionary socialist organization.

McDermott led off by describing regroupment as both desirable and possible. He listed the developments, such as the let-up in the period of McCarthyite repression, rising Negro struggle, united labor movement, Hungarian revolution and the crisis in both world and American Stalinist movements, which together made it possible for a genuine American socialist movement to exist and to replace the CP as the rallying place for radicals in this country.

McDermott listed three conditions for a united party: for democracy on both sides of the Iron Curtain; the organization not to take a public position that Russia is any kind of socialist or workers' state; and for full and complete socialist democracy. He felt that the SP could serve as the vehicle for the regroupment, in spite of his differences with its politics. He ended up with a call for socialists of various persuasions to close ranks, put aside the Russian question for the time being, and talk socialism to the American masses.

Cowan declared he was not for mechanical unity, but for joint action on issues at hand based on common agreement, with the various organizations involved not dragging in unrelated doctrinaire differences. He felt there never was a greater need for this type of common action on the part of the Left than now. He emphasized the importance of following the class line in deciding the stand to take on any issue.

In this connection he said that he couldn't agree with McDermott's support of the Hungarians if their uprising would lead to a Horthy-or Hitler-type regime. As this point was not further clarified during the meeting it left the unfortunate impression that Cowan believed the Hungarian revolution was reactionary in nature, while this is really not his position.

YOUTH WANT UNITY

Cowan ended with his two points as a basis for joint action: recognition of the class nature of society, and taking any action that would either weaken capital-

ist society or strengthen the socialist forces.

Hendrick spoke of the problems of a socialist youth organization on the campus, the political backwardness of the students, and the confusion spread by the existence of diverse radical organizations. He explained that the YSL itself was a merger of the youth from the ISL and SP, that it contained in its ranks many socialist and pacifist viewpoints, had full internal democracy, and that he was for such a unity of the SP-ISL-YSL. He wanted a new organization as a place where disillusioned CPers could go, and also stressed the importance of a real party for YSL members to go to on becoming adults.

Hendrick spoke of the youth wanting a respectable organization without having to worry about FBI harassment. He said that while it is the Russian question that divides the sects, they must learn to face American problems first. He ended by saying that the YSL wants to be the youth section of a large unified socialist party—not of a sect. He also felt unity was a necessity to influence the coming labor party.

ALL-INCLUSIVE?

Himmel spoke on the general interest in regroupment, and laid its origin in the crisis of world Stalinism and not to any development on the American scene. He outlined the two concepts of regroupment as either all getting in one organization and then worrying about programmatic differences, or first talking about differences and then thrashing out a joint program. He felt that an all-inclusive party had proved unworkable in the past and would fall apart in its first crisis. Unity itself is not necessarily desirable and even splits are sometimes necessary and good, as in the case of the old AFL-CIO break.

He commented on the SP-SDF merger and pointed out that the ISL is for this as the future mass Socialist Party. He claimed that this would not even be a true all-inclusive party, and that the SP-SDF had its own conditions for unity, such as support of the State Department policies and an anti-Leninist loyalty oath. He felt the SP was hostile to discussions such as this Forum. He said some CP leaders were also hostile as evidenced by their absence. He praised the Muste Forum as a broad arena for socialist discussion and pointed out that only the ISL had no representative on its National Board.

Himmel wound up by calling for discussion now, not organic unity. He was also for joint action on such issues as support of struggle for Negro rights, against H-bombs and war drive, and support of the labor movement. He also pointed to the New York joint May Day meeting as a step in the right direction.

There was a question period from the audience and between the panelists, with the sharpest debate taking place between the ISL and SWP speakers. The meeting concluded with short rebuttals, with McDermott including in his remarks that he, unlike Hendrick, did not hope the new organization would be "respectable."

Only 25 or so people were present, with very few outside the participating groups appearing. This would indicate either that there was little interest in this city in this subject, or that the groups present were not able to reach those who might be interested.

Order ALL your books from Labor Action Book Service, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

June 10, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 23

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER. Business Mgr: L. G. SMITH. Associate Editors: GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL.

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

Youth Is Still Sparking Mood of Revolt in Stalinland

They Question The Whole System

By MAX MARTIN

In our April 15 issue, we reprinted from the Nation excerpts of a letter from a Russian student, which had appeared originally in the Austrian journal Forum. The letter described the wide-ranging ferment and discussion produced among the students of Lomonosov University by the Hungarian Revolution.

The May 20 New Leader prints a larger abridgement of this letter, including the following two paragraphs which did not appear in the Nation version.

We reprint them for the information of Challenge readers because of their great significance. They illustrate the degree to which Russian students are beginning to recognize, in a fairly clear theoretical fashion, the nature of Stalinist society.

"[In the discussions among students] . . . a question crystallized which is of utmost importance in the system of 'realized socialism,' namely: 'Hasn't party bureaucracy, although it is not formally entitled to own the means of production of the community, become an exploiting class in the original Marxist sense through the practical control it exercises over the various branches of production in that it determines the latter's utilization and controls the employment and salaries of workers? And is it not admissible, even necessary, to apply the old Marxist weapon of class struggle—i.e., the general strike—against it too?'"

Hungarian events . . . were used to illustrate a development for which certain prerequisites existed everywhere, the Soviet Union included. From this there emerged another question—that of the class character of Soviet society. Almost all of the participants in the discussion were of the opinion that . . . even in the Soviet Union the differences between the exploiting and the exploited continues to exist. Merely one distinguishing mark of the exploiting class—i.e., personal property rights to the means of production—had changed. But the present workers' property rights to the means of production only existed 'on paper' and the party's preference for heavy industry, supported by a central administrative system, had also fixed the class character of the Soviet community from the legal point of view; to protect themselves, those who profit by it have created the same class justice as exists in bourgeois society for the protection of the exploiting class. In the new socialist system, as in the old capitalist one, every resistance to the exploiters was branded by a 'classless justice as high treason and liable to penal servitude. But this meant that the October Revolution had been reversed. . . ."

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of Labor Action but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the Challenge or the YSL.

The role of the youth, students and intellectuals as a vanguard element in the Hungarian and Polish revolutions was marked by all observers. Since last October, young people behind the Iron Curtain have continued to give evidence of their struggle for democracy. Reports indicating widespread student unrest and disaffection have come from every Communist country in the world, including China, where a student strike in Yunan Province took place.

East Germany appears to be the scene of the most open and intense anti-Communist activity by students and intellectuals in the Stalinist world, according to numerous dispatches to the press in recent weeks and an article in the May 27 New Leader by Rainer Hildebrandt. Hildebrandt is the author of The Explosion, a work dealing with the 1953 East German uprising.

The current ferment in East Germany originated last fall in sympathy with and response to the Hungarian events, just as the Hungarian revolution started as a demonstration of solidarity with the Polish people. The students of Humboldt University in East Berlin, given an impulsion by the actions and demands of their counterparts in Budapest, called for representation for themselves outside the framework of the Communist youth organization, the FDJ. They also demanded a change from compulsory to voluntary attendance at political lectures and Russian courses.

An intensive discussion began at the university and spread to other colleges. Writes Hildebrandt:

"Under the slogan 'Sharpen the Weapons of the Mind,' the students began to interpret Marxism in the Marxist manner and to refute Stalinism with the classics of socialism. Marx and Engels, they pointed out, stated that socialism would develop in each country according to its own economic, political and cultural laws. Thus they raised the question of whether Soviet experience was relevant to German conditions. In a forum discussion at Leipzig University, 200 students cited Lenin as their authority for demanding that no state functionary receive a salary 'exceeding that of a worker's wages.'"

Students in Dresden observed a minute of silence for the victims of the Russian repression of the Hungarian revolution, while in East Berlin students posted statements of Hungarian and Polish intellectuals on the bulletin boards. A number of professors in East Germany became the center of intellectual opposition, most prominent among them being Dr. Wolfgang Harich in East Berlin, whose views, activities and arrest have already been reported in Challenge and Labor Action.

In Leipzig, a Professor Ernst Bloch of the philosophy faculty rallied students around him on the basis of declaring adherence to the views of the Hungarian Petofi circle intellectuals. Bloch was promptly fired from his position by the regime. A few months later, a Professor Gerhard Zehm at the University of Jena was similarly dismissed from his position and expelled from the Socialist Unity Party (the East German CP) for similar "confused conceptions." Neues Deutschland, CP organ, which revealed the action against Zehm, traced the latter's "ideologically and politically negative" views back to Bloch, whose student Zehm had originally been.

"LOYALTY PLEDGE" DRIVE

Then, three weeks ago, the Humboldt students again occupied the center of the stage. The dean of the university, Professor Gunter Schuetzler, was ac-

cused by the regime of having urged his students to follow the example of the Hungarian youth, and was suspended from his job. One hundred twenty students boycotted classes as a protest against the suspension of Schuetzler, who has since fled to West Berlin, and demanded his reinstatement. The student strike lasted for a week.

In retaliation, reported the Communist youth newspaper Junge Welt on May 14, the students were barred from the campus. The secret police demanded that the students purge themselves of "Western tendencies" or face permanent expulsion from the school and prosecution for their activities. The "purgation" is to take the form of letters submitted by the students in "self-criticism" of their ideas and actions, as well as pledges of allegiance to the regime.

Subsequently, Neues Deutschland reported that the "loyalty pledge" campaign would be spread to other universities. It announced that the entire student body and faculty at Jena University had sworn loyalty to the government, and that 941 students at this school had agreed to do two weeks labor during their vacations as evidence of their support to the regime. The paper also asserted that a group of 21 students at Humboldt had taken a similar vow.

The "voluntary" nature of this pledge can best be appreciated when it is recalled that two weeks earlier the government's State Secretary for Universi-

ties, Wilhelm Girus, decreed that henceforth those wishing admittance to a university would have to perform "labor service" prior to admission, and informed the German students that this requirement was promulgated in order to make certain that those going to school were "loyal." Moreover, he indicated that students already in school who were suspect ought to likewise perform such "service," as a sign of their eligibility for an education.

THE AUDIENCE LAUGHED

Student discontent has not been confined to those on the university level, but has occurred in the high schools as well.

On May 4 the newspaper Ostsee Zeitung complained of "rotten liberalism" and apathy about serving in the armed forces among high school students. "People hostile to socialism should not be tolerated in our high schools," concluded this Stalinist organ.

The prevalence of a negative attitude towards the East Germany military forces, which Ostsee Zeitung deplores, receives reinforcement from information related in the May 27 New Leader article. Writes Hildebrandt:

"Gerhart Eisler, who returned to Germany after emigrating to America and often leads discussion groups, was asked by students why East German toy shops sold People's Police tin soldiers whereas the West German Government opposed the sale of toy soldiers. When Eisler explained that the army of the German Democratic Republic was serving peace, his audience burst out laughing."

The seriousness of the problem for the East German rulers is amply documented by the great attention it receives from them and the constant discussion of this question in the press, as well as by the repressive measures adopted.

(Continued on page 7)

Persecution of a C. O.

By M. OPPENHEIMER

A 26-year-old pacifist, Seymour Eichel, is today on his twentieth day of hunger strike against his imprisonment for violation of the Selective Service Act. The only nourishment he has taken is water and that which is being forced into him by means of tubes.

Since May 21 Eichel has been imprisoned at the Federal "Correctional" Institution in Danbury, Conn. From Dec. 27, 1956, when he was convicted of refusal to register for the draft eight years to May 21, Eichel was at the West Street Detention Headquarters at 27 West Street, New York.

On May 20 Esther Eichel, mother of Seymour, began what is to be a continuous picketing of the White House urging her son's release. Eichel previously had fasted three days in protest against prison practices of passing food under bars to inmates still in quarantine. He has refused to perform any work contributing to the operation of the prison, and has spent most of his time writing letters for the other prisoners.

Eichel is the son of Julius Eichel, who served two years' imprisonment for refusing to register for the draft in World War I. In 1948, as an honor student, Seymour was permitted to graduate from Tilden High School in Brooklyn though he refused to sign the loyalty oath required of graduating seniors.

After Eichel had not eaten for twelve days, the prison doctor at West Street attempted forcibly to feed him by in-

serting a tube into his stomach through his nose, according to Eichel's father. This was attempted five times, although much blood was drawn, and in spite of Eichel's weakened condition.

After this attempt, Eichel was handcuffed to a stretcher and, without any further covering but shirt and pants, was driven to Danbury Prison. There he was further assaulted by having a catheter inserted when he refused to give a urine specimen. He was then placed in a restraining sheet or straightjacket and fed through the nose. This procedure now takes place three times a day.

The prison doctor then threatened to let the tube remain in Eichel's nose for three or more days, according to Eichel's father.

Eichel himself continues to reply to all suggestions on improving his health by saying that he is interested in his freedom only, and whatever else is done to his body is against his wishes. Originally sentenced to one year's imprisonment, he is eligible for parole now, but he refuses to apply on conscientious grounds.

Members of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and of other peace groups, have been active on the case in Washington, D. C.

In a previous case, in 1945, Corbett Bishop passively resisted the prison and Selective Service System for 144 days, including fasting. He had been forcibly fed. He concluded his non-cooperation only upon receiving parole, for which he signed no papers.

Khrushchev Isn't There Yet But... He's On the Way

By Max Martin

It has been obvious for a long time now that while the members of Russia's "collective leadership" may be equals, Nikita Khrushchev is more equal than the others. Formally the First Secretary of the Communist Party, Khrushchev clearly occupies the pre-eminent position in both the party and state hierarchies.

During the last year or so, moreover, developments have occurred strengthening his leading role among Russia's rulers and perhaps portending the beginnings of a small-scale "cult of the personality" around him.

Recent dispatches to the press by an American correspondent in Moscow and by an analyst of Russian affairs—William J. Jordan in the N. Y. Times of May 27, and Thomas P. Whitney of the AP in the N. Y. Post—present evidence which indicates such a trend.

A cautionary note: Khrushchev is nowhere near possessing Stalin's mantle, nor is his future inheritance of Stalin's role as all-powerful *Vozhd* guaranteed. What is involved is the seeming emergence into the open of the built-in tendency in Stalinist society toward the creation of a Supreme Ruler.

A totalitarian social structure has need for such a Ruler to act as the authoritative arbiter in disputes among the ruling bureaucracy, as its substitute for the democratic resolution of disputes among the ruling class in non-totalitarian society. And for a given man to play such a role requires that he be raised above others in the estimation which society holds of him to a height beyond the realm of ordinary mortals; hence the fantastic adulation and Byzantine flattery accorded Stalin during his lifetime.

MOUTHPIECE NO. 1

One cannot definitely predict that this tendency will be crowned by the creation of a new Stalin. Nor is it assured that in the event of the materialization of such a leader, Khrushchev will be the person occupying the spot. The exact working out of these tendencies depends upon too many unforeseeable events; among which are struggles between the masses and the bureaucracy, and struggles within the bureaucracy itself. All one can say at this point is that a trend toward the emergence of a new *Vozhd* seems evident, and that the First Secretary apparently leads by a comfortable margin in the contest for the job.

The most important development in this regard consists of his spokesman-ship for the regime in the announcement of all recent important policy changes.

It was Khrushchev who enunciated the decision to "decentralize" the management of industry and construction, first disclosing the new policy in his "theses" in March, and then presenting it formally to the Supreme Soviet earlier this month. Whatever the actual importance and value of the "decentralization" may be, it must be kept in mind that the changes introduced are being heralded in the Russian—and world-wide—press as vast and consequential developments.

He has also assumed the leading role in the field of agriculture, long-time chief trouble spot for the Kremlin. He is identified with the Russian government's plan for the cultivation of new lands in Siberia and central Asia, which has been the subject of much boasting by the regime in the recent period.

And it was Khrushchev who promulgated the latest Russian "plan" to overtake the United States in the per-capita production of milk, meat and butter. This announced "intention" of the Kremlin will certainly prove popular with the Russian people; the connection of the First Secretary with the "plan" may be intended to give him a certain momentary personal popularity.

In addition, Khrushchev has in recent months been freely making himself available for interviews by foreign newspapermen. In the course of his meetings with such reporters he obviously feels free to act as spokesman for the regime on all questions that come up.

Several weeks ago, he was interviewed for two hours by Turner Catledge, man-

aging editor of the N. Y. Times, an incident reminiscent of Stalin's interviews with Roy Howard and others. Subsequently, he spent many hours with visiting newsmen from China, Poland and Yugoslavia. And now he has appeared over United States television in an interview on CBS's "Face the Nation."

STRAWS IN THE WIND

The significance of this is underlined by the fact that Russian governmental and party leaders allow themselves to be interviewed by the non-Russian press most rarely, if at all. In the past only Stalin gave such an occasional interview; now Khrushchev is doing it.

Up to recently, Party First Secretaries shared the public spotlight as the spokesmen for the Kremlin. While this is still true to some extent—as their joint trips to various countries, including the projected one to Finland, show—it is Khrushchev who has emerged as the dominant individual in the ruling hierarchy.

One sign of this can be found in the increased volume of publicity accorded him in the Russian press. In his AP article, Whitney asserts that in this respect Khrushchev has now eclipsed all of the other members of the party presidium put together.

According to Whitney, there has been an increasing appearance in the Russian press of Khrushchev's pictures, the texts of his speeches, texts of telegrams signed by him, and the like. "Soviet citizens as they look at their press day after day can see" such publicizing of the First Secretary.

One straw in the wind, reports Whitney, is that various telegrams to local party leaders congratulating them for accomplishments, which are regularly printed on the front pages of the press, used to be signed by "The Central Committee," but now bear the signature "N. Khrushchev."

To be sure, Khrushchev is a long way from being called "the greatest genius of humanity" and "the sun." But the beginnings of special flattery have become discernible.

THE TREND BACK

A few weeks ago, Russian president Voroshilov called him the "determined, principled and inexhaustible leader of the Communist Party and Soviet state," and praised him for his "exceptional energy and determination" and his "outstanding service." Khrushchev was recently awarded the "Order of Lenin" together with a number of other individuals; the press reported that the others expressed their delight at receiving their medals at the same time as "the outstanding leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, N. S. Khrushchev."

This praise is, of course, relatively mild; it is still comparable to the type of thing which is said on ceremonial occasions about heads of capitalist governments. To be noted, though, is the fact that in the period from 1953 to the present it represents something new in Russia; from Stalin's death until a few months ago, and especially in the period right after the Twentieth Congress in February of last year, no individual living Russian leader had been praised in the Russian press in such a fashion, or even in more modest terms.

What appears to be developing then is a tendency towards the emergence of a new *Vozhd*, with Khrushchev playing the part, although the whole process is in an incipient stage so far.

SUBSCRIBERS — ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

21-23

If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW!

LABOR SCOPE

WHEN WILL THE DAY OF RECKONING COME?

By BEN HALL

Early in May, George Meany was honored by the NAACP's Legal Defense and Educational Fund when he received its second annual award. In the course of his address, according to *Labor's Daily*, he "charged that a number of the merged labor movement's 68,000 local unions still ignore or violate its civil-rights policy." He added that the "day of reckoning" is coming and announced that affiliated unions would be advised what they had to do in order to comply with the AFL-CIO policy on equal rights at a special conference in Washington on May 23.

So far, we have no details on the conference and cannot report what the Federation intends to do. But the outlines of what it should do have already been set by its actions on racketeering and to a lesser extent by its declaration for union democracy.

It adds up to this:

(1) To authorize a special committee to open hearings and conduct investigations into discriminatory practices in affiliated unions. This was done by the

Ethical Practices Committee to combat the rackets. It was not done to safeguard inner union democracy; for that, we will have to await complaints from within the unions.

(2) To adopt a Code of Union Civil Rights, spelling out the policy of the Federation and putting teeth into its constitution.

The constitution of the AFL-CIO does more than express an abhorrence of thievery and racketeering; it prescribes a set of procedures for action and a special committee with the responsibility of implementing its policy. It was under these clauses that the Executive Council acted against Beck and called the Teamsters Union to account.

But there is no similar detailed procedure mapped out to protect the inner democracy of the labor movement; the constitution simply expresses, in a general way, the adherence of labor to democratic practices. Yet, under this general declaration of principles, the Council has already adopted a Code of Democratic Practices and presumably will enforce compliance with it. New rights have

(Turn to last page)

Disarmament Talks — —

(Continued from page 1)

necessarily lead to disarmament or arms-limitation agreement, or that it heralds a new period of "peaceful coexistence." The barriers to even a "first step" agreement are massive and formidable, although they do not constitute an absolute bar to a tentative "first-step."

Although everyone is at one time or another for disarmament, the U.S. and Russia have tied any disarmament or serious arms-limitation proposal to a general political settlement of their cold-war differences. Both have maneuvered in and out of differing "disarmament" proposals as it best suited their tactical position at any given time. For example, the Stalinists were not for disarmament or arms limitations before they solved the technical problem of producing nuclear weapons.

The main difference has been in the political ability to squeeze the most mileage out of this issue. And on this score the Stalinists have come out far on top. The Stalinists, because they know how to use political weapons and are not bound by the need to preserve the existing social system in most of the world, have been able to play up the popular side of the threat of nuclear weapons: ban the H-bomb, destroy nuclear stockpiles, withdraw foreign troops from military bases.

On the other hand the U.S. has been primarily concerned with a series of different inspection proposals, each more intricate and complex than the previous. They inspired no political enthusiasm, and the U.S. was always left appearing as if it alone wanted to keep nuclear weapons while the Russians were for outlawing them.

THE USES OF "DISARMAMENT"

However, each approach in its own way reflected the means whereby both sides hoped to achieve "disarmament" in such a way so as to come out on top. It wasn't true that the U.S. was interested in ways of really enforcing disarmament while the Russians were not, and that therefore the U.S. proposed detailed plans for enforcement. Neither side believed that an enforceable arms limitation scheme was possible without a settlement of the political disputes that divide them into two hostile camps.

In general neither wants "disarmament" unless it can serve as a means or an aid toward domination of the rival imperialist camp.

Stalinism, and Russian Stalinism in particular, needs an armed and hostile capitalist world in order to justify its continued domination over their captive peoples.

Without the threat of NATO, American troops in Europe and nuclear warfare, what "justification" could the Russians and Gomulka have for keeping Russian troops in Poland? If the U.S.

agreed to all of Russia's proposals for disarmament and dismantling of foreign bases, it would be a calamity for the continued rule of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

On the other hand, in the absence of such acquiescence, the arms race imposes a tremendous economic burden which threatens their rule in a different way.

The U.S. uses disarmament in a different way. It has proposed various disarmament schemes; but it is not for disarmament per se. Washington's policy is to roll back the Russian empire, to weaken it and eventually destroy it. (This is the same goal that Stalinism has for the capitalist world.) The U.S. has always tied the arms question to the withdrawal of Russian power from its East European empire. The idea was that the U.S. would be able to trade off the NATO military strength for a Russian withdrawal from the center of Europe, especially Germany.

Therefore the new development in the London discussions is not only Moscow's willingness to take a step toward a "first step" agreement, which has been seriously modified by Khrushchev in his TV interview on June 2; but also Washington's willingness to proceed with negotiations apart from tying the future of Germany and East Europe.

STANDOFF AGAIN?

But both sides are looking to rush back into their old positions. Secretary of State Dulles at his news conference on May 29 stated that "what we are set upon is trying to get something started quickly. We will take any area which is sufficiently free of political complications so that the whole [bargaining] process does not get bogged down."

After all the importance attached to air and ground inspection it turns out that Dulles is willing to settle for inspection of the Arctic area. It is felt in Washington that this does not prejudice the "political complication" of Central Europe which, if it were part of the inspection area, might lead to implications that the political question (boundaries) is regarded as fixed.

On the other side, Khrushchev in his TV appearance bluffed that if both the U.S. and Russia withdrew their troops from European countries it would be a "useful first step" to establish good will in the disarmament talks.

And yet both sides know that the minute the withdrawal of their own troops from Europe is the condition for the other side's continuing disarmament discussions, it means the end of such discussions. The reason is that each has a different aim: the U.S. wants to roll Russia back to its pre-1940 borders; and Russia wants to break up NATO and American military bases.

H-Bombers — —

(Continued from page 1)

against the tests. The numbers will be impressive.

Still, it may be said, couldn't Atomic Energy Commissioner Libby, himself a scientist, who has been talking about our "clean" H-bomb, get up as impressive a list of experts to take his side? Where the experts disagree, on what basis shall a mere layman make up his mind?

We're on the side of the 2000 in this case, for the cessation of H-bomb tests and we think that the poser formulated above involves an unjustified assumption.

The assumption is that we—the lay citizenry, who are not scientific authorities on the subject and who cannot ourselves determine the scientific facts—should not take a stand unless and until someone has proved to us that the H-bomb tests are indeed deleterious and dangerous as claimed.

This assumption is false. Such proof is not necessary to justify vigorous condemnation of the tests.

The burden of proof is not, or is no longer, on those who view the radioactive explosions with alarm. It is on those who seek to lull the public to its dangers.

We do not know whether the final determination of fact will justify the fears of the 2000 scientists or not. We cannot know that; and the AEC's Strauss and Libby don't know that either.

We believe, however, that one thing has been proved beyond a shadow of a doubt:

That there is reasonable ground to believe that the continuing H-bomb tests may have the dangers charged.

And that is sufficient ground to stop them until we know better.

For otherwise, in scientific ignorance we are gambling with the fate of the planet on a scale never before known.

A QUESTION OF NUMBERS

In proportion as the consequences of ignorance can be extreme, to that same extent is it incumbent on the authorities to first prove their alleged belief that the tests are perfectly harmless.

They have to prove that, not we the contrary.

That would not be true if it were only a question of some crackpot or two who were complaining about the dangers of radioactivity.

It mightn't be true if even a few sane scientists were expressing doubts.

But when masses—literally masses—of scientists make this demand, and whole university faculties are willing to sign their names en masse in spite of the U.S. political climate, then their weight (if nothing else) serves to shift the burden of proof.

If a man were given a new-found mushroom, and told by a government issue clerk that in the opinion of some mycologists it was probably non-poisonous, he might be pardoned if he refused to eat it until the opinion of the experts was more nearly unanimous. He might not even be satisfied with a majority vote.

In the present case, it is not the AEC reassurers who have the majority.

This is one way in which the numbers of the petitioners have a bearing on our decision.

We do not know whether the atmosphere is being poisoned irretrievably. The AEC and its scientists who hand out its stories do not know. These are facts. That is enough to demand the end of the H-bomb tests.

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

Youth Sparks Discontent — —

(Continued from page 5)

During the last few months there have been constant warnings in the East German press threatening dismissals from school if the students "help the counter-revolutionaries," followed, in specific cases of unrest, by carrying out the threat.

In addition, there has been the introduction of "labor service" for students, and a ban, announced on May 28, on travel by students to West Germany. The highest leadership has participated in these threats and actions. Last December, East German CP boss, Ulbricht, delivered a speech in which he warned the "trouble-makers" and "squabblers" in the schools to beware, lest it become necessary to "shatter" them.

NEW WAVE RISING

These manifestations of student hostility to the regime and system have been matched by a ferment in the ranks of intellectuals generally.

While it is impossible in Germany today to openly organize as did the Petofi circle in Hungary, the "Harich group" continues a clandestine existence, despite repressive measures against it. And while it is impossible to write in the press as freely as was the case in Poland in the months preceding last October, thinly disguised attacks on the regime, its bureaucracy, its intellectual dishonesty, etc., have appeared in the form of satires in such periodicals as Sonntag and Eulenspiegel.

It is, of course, impossible to predict the exact course of events in East Germany during the coming period. Nevertheless, it can be said that they approach—though do not reach—conditions prevailing in both Poland and Hungary in the six-month period which preceded the great October Revolutions in those countries.

For that reason, the rise of a new wave of the anti-Stalinist revolution—this time in East Germany—within the near future is a distinct possibility.

SOURCE OF DISILLUSIONMENT

The role of young people in the Hungarian revolution surprised many observers in the United States, as we reported in Challenge at the time. Most journalists and analysts of Communism in this country held, previously, that young people in the Stalinist countries were Communism's greatest asset and its convinced adherents, because they had never known the benefits of life under capitalism. Moreover, it was assumed, these youth are the recipients of favors from the Stalinist system.

Hungary destroyed this myth, as it destroyed so many others.

And recent events in East Germany provide fresh corroboration for the true relationship of youth and students to the Communist system and regime. To understand this relationship one must first comprehend the nature of the system, and the nature of the appeal which it does make to so many; for the nature of that appeal determines the inevitability of disillusionment.

Stalinist power in the satellites is some ten years old. And while the Communist Parties came to power on Russian bayonets in most of Eastern Europe, the CPs were able to attract many workers and young people on the basis of their pretense to represent socialism.

The students of East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and the other lands were appealed to by the CPs and the regimes: "Get an education and help us to build socialism." This is the source of the strength of Stalinism.

And when these students see the "socialism" that is being built; when they observe the discrepancies between the socialism they read about in Marx, Engels and Lenin—even in the bowdlerized editions available to them—and the "socialism" being created around them;

when they see how their working-class families—and the bulk of East European students under Stalinism are of working-class origin—fare under this "socialism," they reject it and revolt against it.

The attachment of the students to the workers is great. It is for this reason that Ulbricht and the East German CP constantly try to separate the workers from the students, especially from the rebellious ones, and to threaten the student youth with opposition by the working people.

During the past months, the ruling government in Pankow has over and over again told the students: if you do not stop your ferment and cease being discontented the workers will drive you out of the schools and will replace you with people who really wish to study. You are petty-bourgeois elements, you have to work first, then you will appreciate the education you are getting.

IN RUSSIA TOO

But as Hungary and Poland made clear, the students of Eastern Europe do not feel a gulf between themselves and the working class; they regard the workers as their allies. Indeed, they regard themselves as a section of the workers. The first step taken by the revolutionary Budapest students last October consisted of the sending of delegations to the factories to establish contact with the workers, to explain their program to them, and to enter into relations with them. And as Hungary and Poland likewise proved, the workers respond in kind.

How does this apply to Russia, where there exists an established ruling class, some thirty to thirty-five years old, not a ruling class-in-formation, as is the case elsewhere, and where a large proportion of the students originate not in the proletariat but in the ruling bureaucracy?

During the last two years and more,

there has arisen active discontent among student and young people in the Stalinist heartland. This discontent is of different kinds.

The oldest form in which non-conformity with the system has appeared is one that has plagued the Kremlin for a long time: drunkenness, rowdiness, "juvenile delinquency," idleness, etc. The Russian press presents constant complaints on this score, and countless sermons to the youth to show that they are "the new Socialist Man" in the making. And yet the phenomena become ever more widespread.

More recently, the process of conscious political opposition has become manifest in Russia; the Kremlin can no longer hide this fact. In the last year or so Russian students have stayed away from classes in large numbers, have asked their teachers what the official press calls "awkward questions," have printed and the like.

and circulated clandestine publications, have held hectic discussion meetings.

In the April 15 Challenge we reprinted from the Nation excerpts of a letter written by a Russian student which report some of these activities. In this issue, we publish a few extremely important additional excerpts.

Thirdly, among writers, artists, critics, and intellectuals generally, there is taking place today a utilization of the "thaw" for the voicing of criticism and disquietude, both in fiction and in the discussion of literature and art by critics. A stir-raising example of the former is the novel, Not By Bread Alone, a work by one Vladimir Dudintsev. The latter was manifested in the discussion of that novel and other literature at the March meeting of the Soviet Writers Union.

Less turbulent than the ferment among students, the stir among writers nevertheless also reveals that beneath the surface of the monolithic-appearing Stalinist society there is much seething and bubbling.

These questions will be further pursued in Challenge shortly.

YSL FUND DRIVE

The Drive's in Trouble...

By MAX MARTIN

This report, the second to appear in Challenge since the opening of the drive on April 1, is being presented six weeks after the last account of the YSL's 1957 Fund Drive. The reason for this delay, to be brutally frank, can be found in the fact that there has been little to report in the intervening period.

A glance at "What's the Score?" will show all readers that the drive has been going badly; a major effort is now needed if we are to complete the drive successfully and on time.

The fund-raising campaign has now passed the two-thirds point of the time set for it. The national total should, correspondingly, be at approximately the 67% mark. Instead, we have collected less than half of our \$1650 goal; some \$734, or 44%.

Most units should be at the two-thirds level; a few above it and a few below.

What we have, however, is the following: "At Large & National Office," which has already reached 121%, is above. New York and Philadelphia are on schedule. Chicago is considerably behind. Dayton Area and Berkeley lag still further. And no money has arrived from Los Angeles and Pittsburgh.

The YSL's need for money is a great one. Recent and current tours required finances. So will future desired ones. Convention preparations, especially YSR, are taking a heavy toll. Where will the money come from?

Our members and friends are proud of YSR, as an organ in which they can express themselves. But only they can provide the financial aid which makes its

existence possible. No one else will. If they do not do this, our ability to publish it is threatened.

It is not too late to reverse the fortunes of the drive. A month remains.

All members and friends of the YSL should utilize it to raise the maximum amount of money possible. Units must make systematic efforts to realize their quotas in full. Readers of Challenge can do their share too.

Make checks and money orders payable to Max Martin, and send them to the YSL national office, 114 West 14th Street, New York, New York.

We should explain the appearance of Philadelphia in the score. After the last report, our Philadelphia friends, whose contributions we expected to include in the "At Large" category, informed the National Office that they wished to have a separate quota of \$25; and subsequently sent in \$16 on it, which places them high in the listing. The "At Large and N.O." quota was correspondingly reduced.

WHAT'S THE SCORE?

City	Quota	Paid	%
TOTAL	\$1650	\$734	44.5
At Lge. & N.O.	125	121	121.0
Philadelphia	25	16	64.0
New York	750	469	62.5
Chicago	300	108	36.0
Dayton Area	50	10	20.0
Berkeley	100	10	10.0
Los Angeles	200	0	0.0
Pittsburgh	125	0	0.0

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM
by
Max Shachtman
A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!
\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Call Khrushchev's Bluff — —

(Continued from page 1)

is prepared to act immediately on Khrushchev's proposal, the Russian leadership would come back with a dozen preliminary conditions for troop withdrawal, such as the unification of Germany on their own terms.

We do not doubt that they would seek, by a series of tortuous maneuvers and proposals, to try to put the blame for troops from Eastern Europe on the United States. But all that would simply expose them before the world, and further weaken their political position.

After all, from a propaganda point of view, one of the prime virtues of Khrushchev's proposal is precisely its apparent directness and simplicity. Only a similarly direct and simple counter-proposal could make it boomerang into a political defeat.

For sheer jet-propelled, supersonic gall Khrushchev's comments about the East European regimes would be hard to match. But the fact that everyone knows this will not destroy their political effectiveness if his bluff is not called.

From this day on, every open or shamefaced apologist for Russia's brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolution gets a brief reprieve from political oblivion. When the perfectly sound and just statement is made that the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe stand only on the support of Russian armies, every defender of Russian imperialism can reply: But Russia has proposed to withdraw

her armies. Through the chief spokesman of the regime, the Russian Communist Party has announced that it would not defend a Communist system which needs Russian arms to prop it up. True, only yesterday its armies had to go into Hungary to establish the Kadar government. But that was yesterday. Today they are willing to withdraw those armies, on the condition that the United States do the same. If you are right about the East European governments being satellites of Russia, held down by force, why don't you accept their proposal? As Khrushchev said: Let's have a test!

Khrushchev is confident that the American government will not call his bluff.

His confidence, it would seem, is not misplaced. The reaction in Washington to his speech is sufficient evidence for this, even if other evidence from the history of American foreign policy were lacking.

FEEBLE RESPONSE

The first response from anonymous government spokesmen in Washington was to claim that Khrushchev's "proposal" was calculated to torpedo in advance the proposals which the American government is preparing to present to the United Nations disarmament subcommittee in London. These proposals, the character of which are still somewhat nebulous, are also put forth as "first steps" which are to establish an atmos-

phere of good will and good faith in which the Russian and American governments can move forward to settle major differences, such as the unification of Germany.

The next response, in official statements made by representatives of the State Department and in unofficial statements made by U.S. senators and others, was to simply ignore Khrushchev's statement on troop withdrawal. Instead they concentrated on such trivial questions as the possibility of an Eisenhower interview to be broadcast to Russia, or Khrushchev's sally about American grandchildren living under "socialism," and the like.

It is quite understandable that a government which stood helpless and scared before the Hungarian Revolution, as the American government did, would find no way in which to call Khrushchev's bluff. But this should not influence American socialists, or those who, though not socialists, are really devoted to democracy on a world scale.

We say: Let us take up Khrushchev's proposal. Let us have a test! Let the United States announce that it is willing to withdraw its troops from the whole of Europe on condition that Russia do the same outside its borders.

Let both make an unconditional pledge to keep their troops out of Europe. No greater first step toward democracy and peace could possibly be made at the present time.

LABORSCOPE

(Continued from page 6)

been officially proclaimed for the ranks; it now is a matter of enforcing them in word and in spirit.

The constitutional provisions on discrimination are similar to those on democracy; they are general; they spell out no specific rules and they provide for no enforcing machinery. This was one of the gaps left to be filled in later.

Events moved rapidly. The merger is not even a year old, but the precedents are already there and the direction is indicated.

The constitution establishes the principle. The Executive Council has assumed the authority to concretize these principles into union "laws" or special codes. The codes become binding on affiliates, and at any rate they give the membership of every international a moral basis for beginning a campaign to bring all the lofty principles into their own unions.

So it will be if the Executive Council works up a Code of Union Civil Rights.

And immediately will be none too soon. It is not only a matter of simple justice and equality for Negro unionists. The Federation must not lag behind the nationwide struggle of Negroes for equality.

In the last elections, the labor movement stayed with the Democratic Party; the Negroes drifted away. In the last three years, the Negro movement has been fighting in action, especially in the South, for democracy; the labor movement lags behind with mere declarations of sympathy. The labor and Negro movements are natural allies; they must not be permitted to drift apart.

The Federation has taken action against the racketeers; we should expect it to begin to act against the racists.

TAKING THE FIFTH

Senator Eastland summoned a group of UAW members, including four officers of UAW Local 600 (Ford), to appear before the Internal Security Committee. It became a minor illustration of the official union attitude toward the Fifth Amendment when several UAW witnesses invoked it in refusing to answer questions about Communist Party membership.

Eastland demanded that union leaders take action against them just as they had taken action against Dave Beck. According to *Labor's Daily*, one witness consulted the UAW and "was told the union's policy against the use of the 'Fifth' is limited to an official's handling of finances, not to civil-liberties questions."

Even that is not the full story. The fact is that the Code of Ethics rules against using the Amendment only in cases where it is employed to cover up for corrupt practices.

It is noteworthy that not even Beck was charged before the AFL-CIO with resorting to the Amendment but rather with an irresponsible and unethical handling of union money. The case against him and against the Teamsters union rests not on the resort to the Fifth but on corruption itself.

This should be underlined because there has been a widespread misunderstanding and misrepresentation, in this writer's view, of the official AFL-CIO attitude on the Fifth.

TOUGH FIGHTERS

The UAW's strike against Kohler is not the only long-drawn-out fight.

On May 13, the United Rubber Workers Union's Local 511 began the second year of its strike against the O'Sullivan Company, manufacturer of rubber heels and soles. A year ago 422 strikers walked out. Only 65 have returned. And now the company is petitioning for a Taft-Hartley decertification election, under which all scabs have the right to vote but no strikers!

On April 9, 130 members of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union in Center, Texas began the fourth year of their walkout against the Denison Poultry Company.

All these companies are tough; but so are the unions.

Excerpts from Khrushchev's Challenge

Here are the portions of the Khrushchev interview which relate directly to the question of mutual troop withdrawal:

Novins—Mr. Khrushchev, may I move to a related area to what we are talking about now, and that is the question of Western Europe. There have been various proposals, as you know, sir, for providing certain conditions under which troops would be withdrawn, and these questions also deal with the reunification of Germany. I would like to ask you, what does the Soviet Government believe now to be the conditions under which it would feel sufficiently secure to withdraw from the countries in which they are now situated?

Khrushchev—Now, about our security: We feel ourselves sufficiently secure and are not afraid of anything. We do not want a war, but a war might be imposed upon us, and if it is, our people will fight with even greater enthusiasm and loyalty in defense of their country. But in order to prevent that, what steps should be taken? Why couldn't the United States and the other countries withdraw their troops from Western Germany? From the other countries of the West? From France, Italy—where else have you got troops,—Turkey, Greece, perhaps, while we would withdraw our troops from Eastern Germany, from Warsaw—from Poland, that is to say—from Hungary, from Rumania? We have no troops anywhere else.

I think that it would be very useful, a useful first step to test the goodwill of the two sides and to establish a good atmosphere which would not smell of war but which would lead to good, friendly relations that could be brought about between our two countries. That is what we have been saying, talking about and we are quite prepared to do that.

ABOUT A "FABLE"

A brief exchange about the question of "inspection" followed, after which Novins of CBS returned to the troop-withdrawal question:

Novins—Mr. Khrushchev, when you speak about withdrawing of American troops from Western Europe, you are talking about withdrawing over a period of 3,000 miles. When you speak about withdrawing Russian troops from Eastern Germany—they can go back 3,000 miles—when you speak of withdrawing Russian troops from East Germany, this is a matter of pulling back to two hours away. Now as a realistic man, wouldn't you say that some kind of as-

urance of mutual trust might be forthcoming here? What is Russia prepared to do?

Khrushchev—Your arithmetic is not quite correct when you speak about the distance of withdrawal. I will say that your withdrawal will be less than ours, because Britain, for instance, is across the Channel from the Continent. The United States is across the ocean. Now, how long does a ship take from the United States to Germany or France? And at the same time, how long would a troop train go from Irkutsk or Vladivostok in our country to Eastern Germany? And you will see that the distances are about the same.

Furthermore when we speak about disarmament, there is confidence needed. We should not look upon each other as robbers, but we should look upon each other as honest people. We are prepared to afford the means of control. We are agreed to have control, inspection posts established to check up on the agreement, and we believe that those conditions exclude the possibility of any sudden attack of one side on the other. That is the realistic view I take of the matter.

Cutler—Mr. Khrushchev, do you have any fear that, if you withdraw your troops from certain states in Eastern Europe, those countries would all remain Communist?

Khrushchev—It is a fable. You are probably contaminated with this talk, too. You seem to think that the Communist system in some country can be held up by our armed forces. But I wouldn't defend a Communist system of that kind. The Communist system must be based on the will of the people, and if the people should not want that system, then that people should establish a different system. And for that reason we have no fear of withdrawing our troops from any country of Eastern Europe or from Eastern Germany, and we are certain that the people themselves will defend their system even better without that.

Schoor—Mr. Khrushchev you are convinced in your own mind that, in every country with a Communist regime today, that regime rests on the will of the people?

Khrushchev—Absolutely! Absolutely! How can it be otherwise?

LET'S SEE, HE SAYS

Khrushchev then went on to expand on this thesis by pointing to Russian and Chinese victories since the Russian Revolution as demonstrating popular

support to their regimes. Daniel Schoor, CBS correspondent in Moscow, then asked him bluntly:

Schoor—We are not here, Mr. Khrushchev to argue with you but to get your opinions. But since you have raised America's troubles in Formosa, and this is a frank discussion I only wanted to ask you how long do you think the Kadar regime would exist without Soviet troops and tanks in Hungary?

Khrushchev—Let's have a test! Why don't you withdraw your troops from Germany and France, and we will withdraw ours from Germany, Poland and Hungary, and you will see that the Kadar regime which is the people's regime in Hungary, will flourish for ages to come. Where the working class has won power, it will not yield that power to the exploiters but will rather develop their economy and their culture. That is what the Kadar regime is. It is not the Kadar regime really, because Kadar is a servant of the Hungarian people.

TWO KINDS OF "SLAVERY"

The interview ended on the following note:

Novins—May I ask one more question, sir? Does the history of the last years since World War II indicate at all where the Soviet Union may have been at fault or may have made mistakes in international relations which have led to some of these tensions?

Khrushchev—You see, I don't know what mistakes you have in mind. I am prepared to admit that both sides might have had a more reasonable approach, and there might not have been that deterioration in relations, but still I think that the deterioration that has taken place presented a desire on the part of the capitalist countries to test us, because when your political leaders say that they are prepared to deal with us only after the liberation of the so-called enslaved peoples, meaning the Socialist countries in Europe, well, I don't want to argue about what you think slavery is, but I want to say that we look upon the capitalist society as slavery, and we think that the peoples living under a capitalist system are living under capitalist slavery. If we start arguing on this basis, results will hardly be good.

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City