

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

June 24, 1957

FIVE CENTS

**UAW Takes a Step Back on the 'Fifth'** . . . page 2

**Kadar's Course Runs into a Faction Fight** . . . page 3

**British Labor's New Pension Plan** . . . page 4

**Israel and the Eisenhower Doctrine** . . . page 4

**THE ROAD FOR WORLD SOCIALISM AND THE ANTI-STALINIST REVOLUTION** . . . page 6

## HIGH COURT BLASTS THE WITCHHUNT

In four notable decisions delivered June 17, the Supreme Court gave a powerful fillip to the trend against the McCarthyite spirit in the U. S. Its total impact on the witchhunt climate is bound to be even greater than the sum of its parts.

### (1) *The Watkins decision.*

Watkins, a UAW official, once a Communist fellow traveler, was convicted for refusing to stoolpigeon for the House Un-American Committee by naming names of former Communist associates. The ground was the First Amendment (free speech, etc.), not the Fifth.

The court upheld his right to silence on First Amendment grounds as long as the government could not adequately demonstrate the pertinency of its questions to the aims of the congressional committee.

### (2) *The California Smith Act trial.*

Of the 14 CP leaders convicted under the infamous Smith Act in California, the court ordered the freeing of five and new trials for the other nine. Its decision dealt with three questions.

**Broadest of these was the second, dealing with "advocacy of force and violence." The trial judge's charge to the jury was here criticized for failing to give proper place to the thought that only "advocacy of action," not advocacy of ideas, was barred by the Smith Act.**

This part of the decision, however, is wrapped in considerations which, the court admits, are "subtle and difficult to grasp." Its exact import is dubious at this moment in a layman's reading,

though it is clear that it makes a turn away from the Vinson decision on the Smith Act and toward a more civil-libertarian interpretation.

### (3) *The Sweezy decision.*

While similar to Watkins' case in that it involved the "right to silence" on First Amendment grounds, Paul Sweezy's also raised important questions of academic freedom, which were dealt with in Warren's majority decision and Frankfurter's concurrence. These emphasized the need to avoid all trammels on the free right of inquiry.

### (4) *The J. S. Service decision.*

Service's case is one of the more noted among those which grew out of McCarthyite pressure on the State Department. Truman's secretary of state, Dean Acheson, dismissed him as a security risk in 1951, in spite of department clearance, in capitulation to the witchhunters.

The court decided 8-0 that Acheson had had no right to so fire him, on the basis of the rules of the department. It said it was not passing on the merits of the dismissal itself.

### BLAST ABUSES

This burst of four decisions on civil liberties came after some preliminary rumblings which have shown that the

court majority is not only reflecting the freer anti-witchhunt attitude in the country but also, in turn, contributing to buck it up. Week before last, the decision in the Jencks case struck a blow against the FBI stoolpigeon system as used by the government for witchhunt purposes. Previous decisions have given support on many points to the spirit of the Fifth Amendment.

The reason the over-all effect of the Supreme Court decisions may be greater than the sum of its parts is to be seen by an examination of the texts of the decisions themselves. The scope of the grounds given is, for the most part, narrower than the headlines might give readers to suppose.

Neither Warren's opinion on the Watkins case nor Harlan's on the Smith Act, for the majority, has the civil-libertarian approach of Justices Douglas and Black. Indeed the latter two, who are the "hard-core" democrats on the bench, cogently criticized the new Smith Act opinion in a document of their own which must be read along with the majority's.

Tom Clark, Truman's sole remaining ornament on the Supreme Court, upheld his status as the cops' representative on the high bench, being the sole dissenter on the two main cases (Watkins and Smith Act).

In many places, albeit in general language, the new court decisions gave eloquent voice to the fundamental considerations of freedom. Thus the Watkins de-

cision attacked the investigating abuses which might "imperceptibly lead" to anti-democratic practice by forcing testimony:

**"And when those forced revelations concern matters that are unorthodox, unpopular, or even hateful to the general public, the reaction in the life of the witness may be disastrous. This effect is even more harsh when it is past beliefs, expressions or associations that are disclosed and judged by current standards rather than those contemporary with the matters exposed. Nor does the witness alone suffer the consequences. Those who are identified by witnesses and thereby placed in the same glare of publicity are equally subject to public stigma, scorn, and obloquy. Beyond that there is the more subtle and immeasurable effect upon those who tend to adhere to the most orthodox and uncontroversial views and associations in order to avoid a similar fate at some future time. That this impact is partly the result of non-governmental activity by private persons cannot relieve the investigators of their responsibility for initiating the reaction."**

By a coincidence, this was dramatically illustrated, simultaneously with the court decision, by the tragic suicide of a scientist who was due to be grilled on past political associations by the House committee, under TV lights.

(More on the Supreme Court decisions next week.)

## World Socialists Can Take Lead Against Bomb Tests

By GORDON HASKEL

Hugh Gaitskell, leader of the British Labor Party, has urged strongly that Britain and her allies accept a Russian proposal which would suspend nuclear-weapons tests for two or three years. Thus the BLP, which has been divided and uncertain with regard to its nuclear armament policy may have taken a step toward finding solid ground for a united stand on at least the "testing" aspect of the problem.

In the speech in which Gaitskell came out for a suspension of nuclear-weapons tests, he made it clear that he does not believe an agreement for such partial limitation need be tied to any over-all or even partial settlement between the Communist and capitalist blocs of nations. He was proposing it as a first step toward a possible broader and more comprehensive plan of disarmament to follow.

The sensitivity of the American press to the nuclear-weapons testing issue is emphasized by the fact that the New York Times, hardly a pro-BLP paper, gave Gaitskell's speech lead-space treatment.

On the other side of the world, the Social Democratic Party of Japan staged a series of demonstrations on the occasion of the forth-

coming trip of Premier Nobusuke Kishi to the United States. High on the list of the Japanese socialists' demands is abolition of nuclear-weapons tests, and barring of nuclear weapons and atomic task forces from Japan. (Other points the party is seeking to stress in connection with Kishi's visit are: vacation of all United States military bases in Japan, return of Okinawa and the Bonin islands to Japanese rule, and a general revision of the Japanese-American military pact.)

**These two events, though they take place in different political contexts, show the possibilities which lie open to the socialist movement on a world scale around the nuclear-weapons test issue.**

Up till now, the general apprehension and aversion with which millions of people look on the continued production and testing of these appalling weapons has found no concrete political expression. For their part the Russians, and their political allies and vassals in the Communist Parties of the world, have sought to exploit the issue just as they exploit the "peace" issue in general: for one-sided political gains. They have had their friends all over the world (except in Russia, of course) cry out against nuclear-weapons tests, while the Russian government itself continues to conduct them.

On the other hand, non-Communist opposition to the nuclear arms race has remained disorganized and hence relatively ineffective.

**Now, a real international offensive by the socialist movement on this question becomes possible. It could serve to expose both Stalinist and capitalist hypocrisy on the issue.**

Since both sides have indicated a willingness to curtail or suspend the arms race under conditions unacceptable to the other, the socialists could "cut through the jumble of resolutions, proposals and endless verbal arguments" (as Gaitskell put it) by a simple and direct world-wide appeal for ending the tests now, and working out the details of inspection, supervision and the like later, at the very minimum, and to put powerful pressure on both sides to stop kicking the issue around and reach an agreement on it or risk the penalty of losing political prestige and support to the socialists.

It is not necessary for anyone to hold or spread the illusion that a general complete disarmament is possible for either side in the struggle for world domination which continues between the Communist and capitalist camps. But from this it does not at all follow that as long as this struggle goes

(Turn to last page)

# UAW Takes a Step Back on the "Fifth" In Concession to Eastland Witchhunt

By BEN HALL

Senator Eastland knows how to turn labor racketeering into a useful thing.

His internal Security Committee summoned a group of obscure local union representatives and business agents to testify, knowing full well that some of them would stand on the Fifth Amendment when questioned about the Communist Party and related matters.

Obviously, his committee stood to make a neat profit out of a union dilemma:

If the unions firmly defended the rights of their minor officials, Eastland could gleefully announce that they were "soft" on Communism, pointing to a difference between the handling of racketeers who concealed corruption behind the Fifth and those accused of membership, past or present, in the Communist Party.

Of course, this performance would lend a little assistance in hard times to racketeers on the run, but then, the defense of Eastland's way of life sometimes requires queer methods, like the assassination of registered Negro voters in his state of Mississippi. If the committee and the racketeers gain comfort together, so be it!

On the other hand, if the unions caved in under Eastland's prodding and jumped on his recalcitrant witnesses—so much the better. These have been disappointing days for the witchhunters and they can use a little victory.

If the unions pressed their representatives to testify despite everything and anything, and if they penalized those who refused, it would bring a measure of moral support and legitimization, however slight, for a committee whose activities are becoming noticeably odoriferous.

## UAW REACTS

The United Auto Workers charged that it was an attempt "to smear the good name of the UAW as a diversionary measure to take the spotlight off Dave Beck," and that to do so Eastland was looking "to find someone, anyone, in the UAW who would resort to the use of the Fifth Amendment."

Two representatives of the International Association of Machinists, formerly with the UE, took the Fifth and were promptly dismissed from their union posts. But since the IAM never goes out of its way to explain its actions to the labor public, we remain in ignorance of its precise stated motives and outlook.

The United Auto Workers, however, is a case of a different kind. When several of its representatives were hailed before the committee and some of them refused to testify, Walter Reuther made public a long ten-page administrative letter in which he instructed local unions to investigate them.

This is not a new question for the UAW. On May 5, 1954 the union adopted a policy on the use of the Fifth Amendment before congressional committees.

The critical section read: "... it is the declared policy of the UAW-CIO that no member or employee will be prejudiced in any degree in his relationship to the union merely and solely because he claims the privilege of the Fifth Amendment. We will resist through the procedure of our collective-bargaining agreements any discharge or other discipline of any member of the union by the employer on the sole ground of his having claimed the privilege. The UAW-CIO is determined not to become a party to the erosion of any of our basic liberties or democratic safeguards assured by the Bill of Rights."

## SHIFT IN ATTITUDE

The latest administrative letter is advanced as an application of the above principle but, under the pressure of the Eastland committee, it presents an important modification of it and a new emphasis.

It reads: "In accordance with this policy [of May 5, 1954], it is clear that a member of our union who might exercise his per-

sonal right to invoke the Fifth Amendment will not be judged by that fact alone. It is equally clear that when a member of the UAW holding either elective or appointive office chooses to use the Fifth Amendment, the matter is no longer purely personal, for such member's holding of a union office immediately and inescapably involves the union as an organization in the matter. Under these circumstances, the union must take prompt steps to protect itself by determining beyond a doubt whether the member is eligible to hold a position of leadership in the union as a result of his personal decision to use the Fifth Amendment."

The union officer is to be called before the local's executive board and if he cannot prove that he is entitled to hold office under the UAW constitution, which bars Communists, he is to be removed from office.

The 1954 position emphasized the fact that, before committees presumably investigating Communism, a resort to the Fifth Amendment in itself would not prejudice the union against any officer. The 1957 position prescribes that any officer who resorts to the Fifth, under such conditions, must be investigated by the union and removed from office if he cannot explain his action to its satisfaction.

## LOFTY SENTIMENT

Even a quick reading of Reuther's letter reveals what prompts the shift in attitude. The UAW is anxious not to facilitate Eastland's sordid purposes but to keep its own reputation and record pure, clean and respectable, especially now when a fight goes on against the rackets.

Ordinarily, such sensitivity is a lofty sentiment. But in this case, it is allowed to stand in the way of a vigorous defense of democracy.

The UAW has been outstanding in the labor movement for its defense of democratic rights inside the union and out; it has backed up some of its own members caught in the gears of the government security program. It is expected to be more than an honest union and more than an anti-Communist union.

Real democrats in the labor movement and in the world of liberalism justifiably look to it for leadership in the fight against all would-be totalitarianizers, not only the Stalinist variety but the Eastland type as well. The UAW should be just as sensitive to that responsibility; and it is with that in mind that we approach its position on the Eastland committee and the Fifth Amendment.

## THE CURIOUS EQUATION

"Democracy? That is not the issue," will come the objection. "The UAW constitution bars Communists as well as racketeers from office and we must enforce it."

Reuther's letter stands, too, on the principle of equating racketeers with Communists. On May 31, he said:

"The UAW has a single set of standards and procedures, judgment and morality and we will apply it equally as it relates to crooks, Communists, racketeers and fascists." And on March 29 in a reply to McCarthy he declared: "Your reference to my position on the use of the Fifth Amendment also does not square with the facts. My position and the position of the UAW on use of the Fifth Amendment has been and is the same in the case of persons in positions of leadership in the labor movement charged with Communism as it is with those charged with corruption. . . ."

Curiously enough, many of the critics

(Turn to last page)

## Report from Detroit

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, June 16

Recently, Senator Eastland called before the Senate Government Operations Committee seven minor officials of the UAW, all of whom refused to answer questions on advice of attorney, using the Fifth Amendment as was their Constitutional right.

Eastland used this occasion to attack Walter Reuther for using a double standard, one for Dave Beck and one for members of his own union.

In addition, the UAW has its own constitutional amendment barring Communists and fascists and in general members of totalitarian organizations, from holding elective or appointive offices. Eastland challenged Reuther to carry out that provision of the UAW constitution.

Eastland did not ask Reuther to go after the most vicious totalitarians operating within the UAW and other unions within the UAW and other unions in the South: White Council members who hold offices in many unions including the UAW, and whose actions are far greater proof of guilt than any verbal gymnastics.

## WEAKENS THE FIGHT

Nor has the UAW, to this writer's knowledge, demanded of Eastland that he investigate his own associates and supporters in the union movement in the South, including local unions that have contributed money to Eastland's campaign.

In this context, the new policy of the UAW represents a retreat in the field of civil liberties. Its demand that anyone who pleads the Fifth Amendment be brought to a special trial to defend himself weakens the fight to defend the Fifth Amendment as a basic part of the Constitution; and it is a far weaker position than that which the Supreme Court recently stated in another excellent decision.

Three minor officials of Ford Local 600 and one chief steward at DeSoto local have already been investigated and their right to hold office reaffirmed by their local executive boards, in response to Reuther's demand that local unions act.

## WHO'S AN OFFICIAL?

To be noted: until recent times the UAW used to argue that its use of the Taft-Hartley "non-Communist affidavit" for officers (which was done as a matter of Taft-Hartley Law requirement) applied to top local union offices, not plant bargaining positions. Now the UAW itself extends its definition.

In the case of its fight against the ruling of the NLRB in the Kohler case, the UAW had argued the opposite, if the reports in the N.Y. Times on the early Kohler case rulings are accurate. A trial examiner had thrown out the main UAW case against Kohler on the ground that the UAW local union trustees involved had not signed non-Communist affidavits, and the UAW appealed this decision, successfully, on the ground that trustees are not really officers.

The contradictory legal character of the UAW policy in this respect has been called to our attention by more than one lawyer.

## BY-PASSING CONSTITUTION?

But this is just one aspect of the Pandora's box that the UAW has opened with its new policy on users of the Fifth Amendment.

The UAW by-passed its own trial procedures in the latest policy statement. Reuther specifically ordered that "The

trial procedure of the International Constitution shall not be invoked when the individual's use of the Fifth Amendment is a matter of public record."

The question arises whether a union can change its methods of removing officials and holding trials.

The last time the Reuther leadership tried this in 1948, its actions were reversed by court action in the famous Tracy Doll and Sam Sage cases, where a judgment of guilt by convention decision was not sustained in court as constituting a fair trial.

Reuther calls for the member involved to be hauled before the executive board or unit, and "Unless the member involved can present at this hearing clear and sufficient evidence that he is beyond a doubt not disqualified from holding office under the provisions of the AFL-CIO Ethical Fair Practices Codes and the UAW constitution, he shall be removed from offices held by him, and such offices shall be declared vacant."

## PRESUMPTIVE GUILTY?

Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, hit the nail on the head, when he told the units holding hearings on four minor officials under Reuther's directive:

"I want to make it clear that if he theory advanced in this letter is one of presumptive guilt, with a member being forced to prove his innocence because of his usage of the United States Constitution, then it is in itself a direct contradiction to the well-established legal principal that a man is innocent until proven guilty."

The UAW and its legal staff owes the UAW membership, as well as the public at large, a far better explanation of the intent of the new policy than is contained in the letter.

This may be said from two viewpoints: (1) The need for the UAW to bolster its well-earned reputation as a defender of civil liberties; and (2) the legal problems it may get involved in by using such a criterion, and thus affecting lives and jobs of some individuals.

## INJUSTICE AT DESOTO

The kind of injustice that can easily be encouraged by this new policy was illustrated immediately after its announcement.

At the DeSoto local, the union president removed from his post one Max Trachtenberg, a chief steward. This man had been before a committee three years ago. He had successfully pleaded the Fifth. He was then defended by the local union, which contributed \$100 to his legal aid. He was easily elected chief steward in the largest department in DeSoto, in spite of some red-baiting.

His precipitous removal violated even Reuther's directive, for Trachtenberg was not given a hearing before the Executive Board. When the board did meet five days later, this man was reinstated, but the union president has not certified him to the company.

He is thus deprived of holding a job to which he was elected by a huge majority! His case is now before the membership.

At Ford Local 600, three individuals were retained in office after they swore they were no longer members of the Communist Party. Unfortunately, local union politicians concerned themselves more with the small-time politics of the problems than the basic democratic and legal issues involved.

Ford local officials who held the hearings kept repeating that they "refused to do what Walter P. Reuther should be doing."

"If he wanted Dorosh and Cinzori removed, he has the authority to take them out of office. By making us hold hearings, Reuther wins either way. If we oust the

(Continued on page 3)

**FACTION FIGHT IN BUDAPEST**

# KADAR'S COURSE IN HUNGARY AND THE RIGHT OPPOSITION

By **MAX MARTIN**

A half year after the defeat of their revolution by the Russian army, the Hungarian people continue to demonstrate an unceasing hatred for the system and regime under which they live. Nikita Khrushchey may claim—as he did during his United States television interview—that his puppet in Budapest rules with the consent of the Hungarian people. But neither Khrushchey, nor Kadar, nor the Hungarians give the slightest credence to this boast.

No better evidence for this need be cited than the fact that at the opening session of parliament on May 9 a decision was taken to postpone the general elections scheduled by law for later that month.

**YOUTH STILL A DANGER**

Student youth and intellectuals remain the focal point of the expression of opposition. On June 5 the Hungarian parliament cheered a demand by one Bela Karcsonyi that the government undertake a sweeping purge of intellectual life and establish a more rigid control over education, art and science.

"The cultural counter-revolution is waging a stubborn and often not unsuccessful rearward action," he stated. He proposed that compulsory courses in "Marxism and Leninism" be reinstated in the universities, lest the students get the feeling that their fight during the revolution to end compulsory attendance at such classes had been "a rightful one and not counter-revolutionary."

He stated that Hungary's Stalinist cultural life had seemed secure before last October, but that it then fell to pieces. "The job of teaching youth," he concluded, "must at last be put into reliable hands."

The new Communist Youth League (KISZ) has been paying close attention to students and is attempting to supplant or absorb the non-party student organization MEFESZ, formed as an independent group just prior to the October Revolution. The anti-Stalinist leadership of MEFESZ was purged by Kadar in November and replaced with a hand-picked loyal set of leaders. Nevertheless, the regime worries that MEFESZ may again become a center of revolt, and is aiming at preventing such a development.

In its effort to prevent organized opposition, Kadar disbanded the Writers Union and arrested the pro-Nagy Communist writer Tibor Dery in April. These actions were followed by the imprisonment of additional writers. (The Polish Writers Union, incidentally, recently adopted a resolution condemning this and labeling it as an act "against the essential rights of men." The Gomulka regime, however, prevented the publication of this resolution in Poland, although it has taken no action against the Polish writers for adopting it.)

**THE NEW CP**

Another indication of hostility to Kadar can be found in the fact that the new Hungarian CP claims a membership of only 300,000, as compared with the 700,000 who belonged to the Hungarian ruling party before October. In this connection, two things must be noted: (1) great pressure undoubtedly is exerted on former Communists to rejoin the CP;

this would be one way of trying to fend off reprisals for participation in the revolution. (The press refers to those who have not rejoined as "careerists and cowards" toward whom "we have a rather angry and hostile attitude . . .")

(2) Many of those who registered in the new CP have undoubtedly done so with the conscious intention of continuing their struggle in it. It should be remembered that on November 6, after the military victory of the Russians was assured, Radio Rajk, which had been under the control of anti-Stalinist CP members, broadcast the following: "Comrades, join the pseudo-Communist Party of Janos Kadar immediately, possibly in leading positions, and do your best to make a truly Communist Party of it." And in one of its last broadcasts on the following day, "Comrades, let us preserve the fighting spirit of Marxism-Leninism, let us continue to fight within the framework of our betrayed and outraged party for the independence of the Socialist Hungarian nation." (Emphasis added.)

**"DE-STALINIZED" FRONT**

The regime shows its nervousness above all by continuing mass terror to imprison and execute participants in the revolution. There was a recent report that some 35,000 Hungarian youth have been deported to Russia and incarcerated in concentration camps; and one estimate is that some 50,000 are in Kadar's jails for participating in the revolution.

While the government rules solely through its own terror and the presence of the Russian army, it tries to appear as a "de-Stalinized" regime in the same sense that some of the other Eastern European Communist countries and Russia itself are "de-Stalinized" and "liberalized," thereby attempting to earn some popularity.

One way in which it has done this is by carefully refraining, on the whole, from formally charging those revolutionists it has brought to trial with participation in the revolution. Instead, it has charged and convicted them of individual "murders" committed during the course of the revolution, or on the basis of "illegal possession of weapons."

**NAGY TO TRIAL**

In an effort to win some popularity, the regime recently dug up a seventy-year-old man who allegedly participated in the White Terror that followed the Bela Kun regime in 1919. He was brought to court on the charge of murdering Communists in that period, and his case was cleverly intermingled with those of 1956 revolutionists—with the following effect, as described in a dispatch to the N. Y. Times:

"The case has been a windfall for the Kadar regime. While the general public is obviously disturbed by the death sentences meted out almost daily now to those who took part in the revolution,

there is no sign of sympathy for old Mr. Francia-Kiss."

Another aspect of this policy can be found in the fact that the regime has not yet put Nagy himself on trial. The government has yet to say a word indicating that it is considering this question, but that it is doing so is an open secret in Budapest.

The final decision will undoubtedly be made not in Hungary but in the Kremlin. A dispatch to the New York Times of June 17 quoted one Budapest official as follows: "This is not simply a Hungarian question, but an international one." In other words, Moscow will decide.

A straw in the wind, perhaps foreshadowing a determination to let well enough alone for the time being, may be the release from jail of Zoltan Tildy, head of the Smallholders Party and a member of the Nagy cabinet. Tildy was being held in connection with the case which the Interior Ministry is preparing against Nagy and his associates, in the event that a show-trial is held.

**THE "THAW" AS A METHOD**

The Kadar government has been making efforts to rally non-Communists, and some of the leading Communists who supported the revolution, to its own support, in order to try to gain some credit with the people. It has paid attention particularly to Social-Democratic leaders, and has succeeded in getting a few of these to come out in favor of the regime.

In addition, it has widely publicized the return to Hungary of George Lukacs. Lukacs announced that he wishes to carry on "scientific work" and apparently now supports the regime, or at least is neutral towards it.

All of these factors are intended for the purpose of presenting the Kadar regime as a "liberal" Communist one—certainly not as "liberal" as Gomulka's in Warsaw, but no less "democratized" than the regime in Bulgaria, let us say.

But it is not merely a question of pretense. The fact is that Kadar cannot rule in pre-Twentieth Congress fashion, and he has so far not tried to do so. Kadar wishes to rule Hungary in the mode of "the thaw," or as much of it as will not lead to the danger of another October.

There are various facets to this policy in Hungary. For one thing, the bitter feeling between Kadar and his supporters and what is called the "Rakosi-Gero gang" has by no means subsided.

Kadar, who was a victim of Rakosi, may feel that he still has some scores to settle with them. For another, the hatred of the masses for the personalities of the Rakosi clique is so strong that the return of the latter to positions of power might result in a new ferment or uprising.

**FACTION FIGHT**

Hence Moscow keeps Kadar and his friends in power and apparently has not insisted upon the return of the Rakosites to leadership. And from all indications, Kadar has been keeping them out of all leading posts.

Moreover, the regime has carried through the trial, conviction, and sentencing to 16 years imprisonment of Mihaly Farkas, defense minister under Rakosi, for "violations of socialist legality." Farkas was particularly noted for his brutality in carrying out measures of repression. His conviction had been demanded in the various programs drawn up during the revolution.

The Rakosites are not taking all of this lying down, however. Recent reports from Budapest indicate the existence of a real faction fight inside the CP, with Rakosi's followers constituting one of the groupings, Kadar and his supporters some kind of "center," and a third faction perhaps being a Gomulka-type "left." That such a fight exists cannot be doubted; the political coloration of the contenders, however, must remain speculative, for

information on them has been scanty. The reports indicate that the factional struggle may involve some kind of challenge to Kadar's leadership, although no one can oust Kadar without Moscow's approval. A test of strength between the groups is predicted for the party conference scheduled for later this month.

It is reported that of the Budapest district delegation chosen for this conference, only 70 per cent are backers of Kadar, with opposition to him (primarily from Rakosites) still stronger elsewhere in the country. One estimate had it that other party delegations will be split 50-50 between supporters and opponents of Kadar.

That the major challenge comes from the Rakosi group seems clear. It is hungry for power and feels that it has powerful arguments on its side, arguments which will convince the CP, and—more important—Moscow.

Softness, it says, leads to October. Kadar is too soft; one must rule the way Rakosi did—by total terror.

**THE THIRD GROUP**

Whether it will convince Moscow that Kadar should be replaced is problematical, since Moscow is interested in maintaining the pose that 1957's Communism is a new, refurbished, thawed, liberalized system. The return to power by the Rakosites would make that even more difficult than it already is at present, as well as increase the hostility of the Hungarian masses.

The nature of the other group opposing Kadar is not too clear. Indications are, however, that it includes Stalinists who, united as they are with Kadar in the face of the revolution by the people, oppose Kadar in that they would wish a Gomulkaist or Titoist development—or steps in that direction—in Hungary.

One analysis claims that Kadar himself wants such a development, but while possible, this is dubious. Kadar realizes that any independence from Russia threatens the system and regime entirely. The "Gomulka" group in the Hungarian CP may—as is the case in Poland—also include those who wish to go beyond even measures of national independence and toward democracy, perhaps some of those who entered the new CP with the idea of continuing the fight for the October revolution.

These conflicts may manifest themselves at the forthcoming party conference, although it is not very likely that they will do so openly. Kadar will be in a position to mute the struggle—since so far his voice carries the authority of the Kremlin—on the ground that it is necessary to maintain "unity" in the face of the danger of "counter-revolution" by the people below.

**STALINIST RUSSIA**

**A MARXIST ANALYSIS**

By **Tony Cliff**

\$2.00

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

*The definitive biography!  
A masterly political portrait  
of the totalitarian dictator*

**Leon Trotsky's 'STALIN'**

This book is out of print, but we have copies available for \$6.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

## Report from Detroit — —

(Continued from page 2)

men he can say, 'I told you so,' and if we don't, he can say we should have."

To have issues as basic as the question of the Fifth Amendment tossed around in that kind of petty factional atmosphere hardly does credit to anyone.

The new policy of the UAW doesn't actually settle any important question, but it indicates that the top leadership has made a big mistake in retreating before Senator Eastland's pressure.

Suppose that Senator Eastland decides to go after scores of top officials of the UAW who once had "radical" friends or political pasts!

Only this past week a well-financed Washington newsletter, dated June 12, carries a major story by J. B. Matthews, the one-time consultant of the old Dies Committee, really working over the three Reuther brothers. Is this the beginning of a major campaign against them?

It is something to think about.

## LONDON LETTER

# BLP's Pension Plan Stirs Wide Support

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, July 15

If the present Tory government survives to complete its full term of office, the people of Britain will not be going to the polling booths in a general election for another three years. But even if the government survives for this time, one of the central issues around which the election campaign will be fought is already beginning to take shape.

A few weeks ago the National Executive Committee of the Labor Party released some general details of the plan it has prepared for a nationwide scheme of retirement pensions. This immediately aroused the interest of the whole country and a large-scale debate on the proposals is now taking place on public platforms and in the press.

The Tories, annoyed that Labor has stolen a march on them, are busy preparing their own scheme, and the government has set its experts to work preparing details which it hopes to be able to bring into operation at the earliest possible moment and thus take the wind out of Labor's sails.

Two factors are responsible for the widespread public interest in retirement pension plans.

First, Britain is a nation with a rapidly aging population. At the moment there are more than five million old-age pensioners in the country (that is, women over the age of 60 and men over the age of 65); on an age distribution basis some eleven per cent of the population is at present over the age of 65 and in another twenty-five years' time this proportion will have risen to nearly 17 per cent.

Thus, on a simple arithmetical basis, the number of electors who have a subjective interest in retirement pension plans is of increasing importance to politicians with their eyes set on vote-catching.

## RESULT OF TORYISM

The second reason for public interest in pension plans is that at this very moment of time many of the old people trying to live on the existing state pension are struggling along in poverty—despite the "Welfare State."

The current rate of pension is \$5.60 a week for a man and \$9.10 for a man and wife; this is approximately 16.8 and 27.3 per cent of the average earnings of an industrial worker. Nine years ago, when the Labor government was in office, the pension was lower in money terms; but in real value it was worth more, equaling 18.9 per cent of the average workers' wage for a man pensioner and 30.5 per cent for a man and wife.

This situation is a direct result of the price increases which have accompanied the Tory government and it means that some one and three quarter million retired workers and their wives are forced to apply for extra assistance from the state National Assistance Board in order to keep alive at all. This is a state of affairs which is causing increasing concern among the public and is leading to pressure on all political parties.

## GRADUATED SCALE

A third factor which perhaps should be mentioned is that the National Insurance Fund, out of which retirement pensions are paid, will soon be running into an increasing deficit. By 1960 it is estimated that the deficit will be around \$406 million, growing to 826 million in

1970 and 1287 million in 1980. To continue with the present scheme, and make it financially sound, will thus require a drastic increase in the contributions to the fund from one or all of its three sources—workers, employers and Exchequer funds.

To meet this situation the Labor Party proposes to scrap the existing scheme of flat-rate contribution and benefits, and to substitute a scheme based on contributions and benefits graduated according to income.

There is nothing about a third of the working population (mainly government

There is nothing particularly revolutionary about this scheme in its general formulation, for already about a third of the working population (mainly government employees, professional workers, clerical employees and the like) are covered by such schemes operated by the employers in conjunction with private insurance companies. The big step in Labor's scheme is to extend this to the entire population under the auspices of the state, with the state making contribution to the funds.

To give an idea of how the scheme would work, the Labor NEC set up a technical subcommittee to work out some details, and although these are not binding on the party they do give an indication of the way in which the next Labor government will operate. The model scheme shows a contribution by the workers of three per cent of their earnings each week; the employers contribute five per cent of their workers' earnings; and the state weighs in with a contribution of two per cent of the national average earnings.

On this basis a worker who had paid into the scheme all his working life would receive a pension equal to half his weekly pay when he reached the age of 65, with a maximum level of benefits fixed so that higher paid executives and the like could not take more than \$40 a week in benefit.

## CRITICISMS

Without going into a detailed examination, a few criticisms of the scheme can be highlighted.

From the Tory point of view the scheme is dangerous because it will threaten the power of the big private insurance companies and will provide the state with large funds for investment, which the Tories think will be used for buying out private capital in industry.

From a socialist point of view the scheme is open to criticism on a number of counts, the most important being that the vast majority of pensioners would not be entitled to full benefits until 2030; that the big increase in workers' contributions will upset working-class budgets; and perhaps most important, the scheme does little to ease the plight of present-day pensioners who are to receive an increase of \$2.80 a week, which will leave them with an income of between a quarter and a third of the average workers' wage.

In the coming months, these, and other points, will be hammered out in the local Labor Parties, with the final big debate taking place at the Labor Party annual conference in three months' time.

## 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.

# Mapam Trails Ben-Gurion In Bow to U. S. Doctrine

By AL FINDLEY

The Israeli government has endorsed the Eisenhower Doctrine. The "real" political reasons are many and can be argued for and against if one accepts the frame of reference.

Israel like other countries (Arab states included) can use American dollars. Israel cannot permit itself to be isolated. Facing the open and almost complete hostility of the Russian bloc, Ben-Gurion tightened his ties with the American bloc. Ben-Gurion is consistent. His policy is based on alliances with the world powers and maneuvering as much as is possible for a small state. The immediate advantages are real. That they do not meet Israel's long-term needs is another matter.

The logical outcome of such a policy is that Israel will become more and more dependent on "outside" protection. Instead of attempting to live and integrate itself in the Middle East, it will rely on "outside" help. Whether the help will be the broken reed of Imperialist France or the new power of America, it spells the end of freedom for Israel. Whether he consciously wants to or not, Ben-Gurion is laying the groundwork for undermining the independence of Israel and forcing it to become a "client" state of the West.

The Jews of Palestine have had enough experience with British rule to know what that means. They finally threw out the British by armed struggle. The new imperialist allies will not act any better. Israel's hope that she can keep maneuvering forever can be destroyed by a unified, awakened Arab world of hostility. Ben-Gurion's policy is helping the Arab rulers build a wall against it, instead of creating chinks in that wall.

In such a situation, Israel will face a tragic eventuality. Her freedom of manipulation will be destroyed and she will become a prisoner of her "protectors."

## LEFT-WING COVER-UP

The acceptance of the Eisenhower Doctrine by Ben-Gurion should surprise no one. For years now, the Israeli government has been oriented, to one degree or another, toward the American bloc. Officially and formally, however, it was not identified with either the Russian imperialist bloc or the Western imperialists. It took a coalition cabinet composed almost entirely of workers' parties to put Israel officially on the American team.

If there ever was an object lesson in the harm done by coalitionism, the present Israeli cabinet is the best example. The leftist parties serve as a cover-up for a right-wing trend.

Mapam and Achdut Avodah, which are in the coalition, consider themselves "revolutionary socialists." In addition, Mapam is strongly pro-Russian in foreign policy and Achdut Avodah is only a little behind Mapam in its admiration for Russia. While being pro-Russian has nothing to do with revolutionary socialism, of course, these parties believe there is a connection.

But such is the logic of coalitionism that they became prisoners of the government and go along with its policies, and thus became part of the first government to place Israel officially in the Western imperialist camp.

The Israeli public greeted this stand of the "revolutionary socialists" with the cynicism it deserved. The generally accepted point of view is that these parties placed their ministerial portfolios and their share in the patronage higher than their principles. No amount of high-sounding Marxist phrases from them can erase such results.

## OTHER SIDE OF THE MOUTH

The spokesman of Mapam, M. Yaari, has lately found it necessary to repeat his party's opposition to the Sinai invasion. "Mapam believed," he declared, "it was possible to strengthen the security of Israel without having to use the desperate measure of initiating a war. That also was the opinion of the absolute majority of the government parties till the last few days before the Sinai operation."

The change of position came not as a result of action of the enemy that brought us to a zero point but because we fell victims to the illusion of a historic opportunity moment."

Renewed opposition to the Sinai war did not, however, prevent Mapam from taking responsibility for the Sinai action or, later on, from joining the ranks of those who fought against Israeli withdrawal from the conquered areas.

These contradictory positions of Mapam may be explained because it does not want to lag behind its competitor Achdut Avodah. Achdut Avodah, on its part, attempts to rival Herut in its extreme militarism.

## HINTS COME OUT

Unfortunately there are very few in Israel who dare speak out against the adventurous Sinai action. However, in all parties there are some who condemn it.

In the Knesset debate of March 6, former premier and foreign minister Moshe Sharett spoke for the first time in six months. By indirection he attacked the Sinai invasion.

He pointed out the dangers of presenting the world with "faits accomplis" and "the serious danger for future development and even existence of the state of Israel" that arise from the continued "abyss between us and the countries of Asia and other sections of the world."

The leader of Mizrahi (religious-Zionist party), Dr. Warhavtik, found it necessary to point out that in his party there were differences about the Sinai invasion.

Dr. Nahmu Goldmann also criticized the Sinai action indirectly at a press conference on March 12. In discussing the Sinai action he referred to the case of a person who bought a car on installments and then after a few years complained that he was still paying notes. "Where is the car?" a friend asked. He replied that the car has long been on the junkpile, but the payments continue.

## SOAKING THE WORKERS

Over a year ago the Israel government announced a campaign to raise money, first voluntarily through donations to a "defense fund" and then compulsorily by a special "defense tax." Almost all the parties supported the government. Nobody wanted to oppose a levy that had such a patriotic title.

Now a great majority of the population is against the tax. Lately eight bourgeois organizations of industrialists, merchants, artisans, etc., protested its annual re-enactment. A majority of Mapam and a large part of Mapai and Achdut Avodah are against the decision of the government. Mapam and Achdut Avodah capitulated only in order to avert a cabinet crisis; they agreed to a compromise. Instead of 60 million pounds the tax would raise only 50 million.

Like most taxes, the heaviest burden falls on the shoulders of the working class. According to official statistics, 60 per cent of the Israeli income tax of 1956 was collected from wage earners. The capitalist elements contributed a bare 22 per cent.

As to the "defense tax," the following was written in Al-Hamishmar, the Mapam organ, on April 2: "Ninety per cent of the bourgeois groups have evaded paying any defense tax, and the government has taken no judicial steps whatsoever. The defense tax this year is a tax almost exclusively on the wage workers. It was no accident that the finance minister refused to raise the income tax appreciably but preferred to raise the 'defense tax.'"

The Jewish Labor Bund's organ Lebensfragen (Tel-Aviv, April-May issue) writes that Max Shachtman sent the Franz Kurski Archives (of the Bund) a whole series of complete volumes of various labor journals published in the U. S., a veritable treasure for researchers.

Halton HaDemocrati, for May 17, reprinted from Labor Action articles by Brijen Gupta on the socialist movement in the Arab countries.

## LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

June 24, 1957

Vol. 21 No. 25

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 26, 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

## YSL Tour Shows Potentialities

By BOGDAN DENITCH

The West Coast tour I undertook for the YSL this spring confirms a growing impression that the prospects for the growth of the YSL as the nation-wide socialist youth organization are real and immediate.

YSL has developed activities in areas where we had never had any—Albuquerque and Boulder, Col., to give only two examples. In other situations, such as in Berkeley, despite a number of internal problems, responsible spokesmen of the YSL have established contact with former LYL youth which open a possibility of these youth being won to cooperation on a democratic socialist basis. In all areas visited I had the impression of real morale and an aggressive confidence in the future growth of the independent socialist tendency in the youth field.

The breakup of the ideological and organizational influence of Stalinism on the campus has left a void. It is a void that can only be filled by a movement which can in no way be associated with the old Stalinist "radicalism."

That is a movement which can answer without any hesitation the questions which the more politically mature students ask about socialism: "Is the socialism you defend anything like the system in Russia?"—"Under socialism, which you are for, will democratic rights exist for the anti-socialist parties?"—"What is your attitude toward the revolution in Hungary?"

In short: the many, many questions have arisen, above all in the old Stalinist periphery, about the relationship of socialism and democracy.

After the many conversations I have held with ex-LYLers and former sympathizers of the CP on campus who have deserted the CP as a result of the Khrushchev revelations and the Hungarian revolution, I am convinced of one thing: No movement—as distinct from an organization—can develop which does not understand the relationship of socialism and democracy, which cannot say: under socialism there will be more, not less, democracy; our socialism has nothing in common with the barbarism behind the Iron Curtain.

It is true that politicals on the campus must be convinced that one of the reasons the old Stalinist movement on the campus failed—and why it was good that it should fail—was their position on the question of Russia, that is, on the question of socialism and democracy. But the bulk of the students going into any new socialist youth movement will be students never before reached by socialist ideas.

### GOOD RESPONSE

In those circles the YSL—to the extent that we have begun reaching any of them—is respected (when it is respected) as a non-dogmatic unsectarian socialist intellectual current. We are in some ways better known because of our association with Anvil magazine than for any other single reason. These students, usually social-science students, cannot be won by the old Marxist jargon, by a repetition of the old "radical" slogans. The only movement that can ever reach them will be one that is able to translate its ideas in day-to-day language, a movement that values its ideas more than any immediate organizational forms.

My last general impression is that the unity perspective of the YSL, wherever I have had a chance to discuss it with non-organizational socialist students or students interested in radical ideas, is respected and is generally favorably responded to.

There are any number of reasons for this but the basic single reason is that every political student realizes that, like it or not, our unity perspective is a genuine one, genuinely designed to attempt

to break through the radical isolation in attempting to unify the fragmented socialist movement. The hostility of radical students to all remnants of sectarianism, which they always deplored even when there was no possibility of building a broad socialist movement, is very great. No movement which seems to be primarily interested in "splitting for unity" can therefore make real headway.

The above are my general political impressions from the tour. While a report on the situation from area to area would probably not be too interesting, a few stood out.

In Albuquerque the YSL organizing committee has every prospect of developing a real, solid functioning unit with a friendly campus organization of a broad "political-issues club type." Denver and Boulder offer prospects for a YSL unit which would be active in several fields—the Colorado University campus, Denver University, and a general political discussion club in Denver itself.

### ON THE WEST COAST

In Los Angeles the YSL unit has to function in a huge, dispersed city and faces great distances. And the area is one abounding with radical activities and is characterized by an active large Stalinoid movement of a type rare in the United States today.

In debating the SWP in Los Angeles I was struck by the extreme narrowness of their appeal and their almost exclusive preoccupation with the internal life of the YSL as their basic approach to youth regroupment. Incidentally the SWP speaker raised the question of unity between the YSL and SWP youth after passionately, if not convincingly, arguing that the YSL leadership and the vast majority of its membership were in the process of capitulating to social-democracy.

Bay Area was perhaps the most interesting part of the tour. The YSL and ISL

(Continued on page 7)

## Seattle Students Launch Drive Against Bomb Tests

By A. TUSSING

Seattle, June 9

Last week, under the shadow of finals, an impressive student movement against nuclear bomb tests was developing here at the University of Washington.

As this is written, the movement has been in existence for only two days, and over 2000 signatures have been collected on campus on a petition to the president of the United States urging "that the United States immediately discontinue its explosion of nuclear weapons, pending thorough investigation of the long-range effects of nuclear fall-out."

Inspired by the petition against continued testing circulated by Dr. Linus Pauling and signed by 2000 scientists, the Seattle petition campaign was the idea of students in Channing Club, the Unitarian student group. Within a few hours, other religious groups on campus and the University of Washington Daily had been informed of the project, and the drive became a movement.

Lead articles in the Daily on the petition drive and on various other aspects of the fallout question pre-

pared the ground for the collection of signatures.

The response from students and faculty alike (32 members of the Washington faculty had signed Pauling's petition) was unprecedented in recent years. Despite the general fear and suspicion with which all kinds of petitions have been greeted since the beginning of the McCarthy era, and despite the fact that the University of Washington campus has seen practically no student concern more serious than football, the reaction to the bomb petition has been overwhelmingly favorable.

At least half the students approached in class to sign the petition have signed, and aside from the statement of one professor to the Daily, no opposition has appeared.

The individuals who are sponsoring the movement are attempting to spread it to other campuses. While its initiation at the end of spring quarter handicaps the campaign in several ways, it enables those students who are leaving the Seattle area during the summer to encourage activity on campuses near their homes.

Many of the participants at the University of Washington have already written their friends at other campuses urging them to organize a campaign against bomb tests before the end of the school year.

## Letter from a British Student

Following are excerpts from a letter received by Challenge from an English socialist on student affairs at his college. Readers will find the letter of interest.—Ed.

... Exeter is not, of course, entirely typical. In spite of being one of the smallest universities (1050 students) it seems to be one of the most politically vocal. The Left seems also to be in a stronger position than in most other universities, where the Conservative societies are usually larger, though the left groups are usually more politically active.

Here the Labor Club, which is not confined to party members, has 100 members, which is considerably more than the Conservative and Unionist Association. The other group, the Liberal Club, was revived this session and has about 30 members. The Communist Society became extinct in 1954 and there are now no professed CP members. The Socialist Society, associated with the Student Labor Federation, a national Common Front of Labor, Communist and Independent Socialist students, dissolved itself at the same time and the Left has the advantage of a single organization covering a wide range of leftist views. The Socialist Bloc is a small (15 or so) discussion group of Labor Club members pledged to more rapid and radical activity in emergencies. It was formed after the Suez and Hungarian crises.

The university is also somewhat un-

usual in its very high proportion (10-15%) of students from the Commonwealth and Overseas; and in having a weekly paper. This is the organ of the Guild of Students but has almost complete liberty of action once the Council of the Guild has appointed its editor. The current editor is a member of the Liberal Club.

In October the Labor Club, with the assistance of the Conservatives, the Egyptian Association, and groups of Jewish and American students, convened the most successful political meeting ever held in the university, to debate the developing Middle East crisis. After the outbreak of the Suez War, an Action Committee organized a mass demonstration through the streets of the ancient cathedral city (to the horror of local dignitaries), a protest meeting, petitions and a monster telegram of protest to the local (Conservative) MP. The debating society carried a motion condemning all attacks upon Egypt, by 55 to 45. . . . There were further processions and activity after the Hungarian Revolution and these and the Suez activities received extensive publicity in the local and national press and on the regional radio service.

At the Annual Meeting of the Court of the University the Vice-Chancellor felt constrained to express his personal opinion that students should not take an active part in politics during their undergraduate years. This term we have been active on the questions of Jordan, the H-Bomb and Color Bars.

### C.O. ENDS FAST

Seymour Eichel, conscientious objector serving a one-year term at Danbury Federal Correctional Institution for refusal to register for the draft, went off his fast June 8 after thirty days of non-cooperation with prison officials.

On Thursday, June 6, after being denied further privileges by Federal Bureau of Prisons Director James V. Bennett, and after being locked in isolation in a small hospital room, Eichel protested by refusing to move from his cot or take water voluntarily. He was visited by his parents on June 8, and was found with a tube plastered to his face and leading to his nose, weak but apparently in good spirits. Doctors said the tube would be left in his nose permanently since Eichel would not take even water voluntarily any more.

The same evening the 26-year-old C.O., son of a World War I prison C.O., gave up his fast, which had been begun to protest his imprisonment for conscience' sake. His mother, Esther Eichel, of Brooklyn, plans to discontinue his picketing of the White House. Meanwhile Eichel stays at the Danbury Institution.

## A Draft Resolution for the ISL

# THE ROAD FOR WORLD SOCIALISM AND THE ANTI-STALINIST REVOLUTION

The accompanying draft resolution, adopted by the Political Committee of the Independent Socialist League, is being published here in order to bring it more quickly to the League membership, in view of the coming national convention. Previous draft resolutions have been published in Forum, the discussion bulletin.

It should be noted in particular that, in addition to the resolution here presented, there is a second draft resolution (previously published in Forum) devoted to "The Revolution Against Stalinism." The two documents together constitute the international portion of the convention's agenda, as drafted.

The rise of the anti-Stalinist revolution in East Europe and Russia from 1953 to 1956 marks the beginning of a new historic period for world development in general and for world socialism in particular—a new beginning as fundamental in its import as was the outbreak of the Paris Commune in its day and its world. It is the beginning of the

great change to which Third Camp socialism has looked forward.

The nature of this revolution and its significance for the peoples who now suffer under the Stalinist heel are set forth in detail in a separate document. Not less revolutionary is the meaning of this vast change for the socialist movement in the West and for international prospects.

capital) are potential lunatics. If a revolution which backs Moscow against the wall also spreads to West Germany, it is not an East-West war which will tend to be touched off but a struggle by the socialist revolution against all the forces of reaction, possibly even acting in alliance.

The East European revolution means another, longer, fruitful breathing-spell for world socialism. In our 1954 convention resolution, we noted that it was the post-Korea stalemate between the two colossi that had produced the breathing-spell then evident. The new period that opens is not that of stalemate but of revolution against the stalemated opponents. Yet there is a vital inner connection between the two.

### A Third Camp Victory

The 1954 resolution stated:

"The stalemate has been produced because neither side has been able to bring to bear such a preponderance of strength over the other as to win a decisive victory in the partial conflicts that have broken out." The two war camps, it went on, require "the mobilization of the last possible, neutral or half-neutral, independent or half-independent country, the enlistment of the support of the last possible people or groups of people." From this it follows:

"Until the forces engaged in these struggles—which are the forces of the Third Camp—have been subdued by one camp or the other, or been deprived or duped out of their independence and reduced to political and military troops of either camp, the imperialists are not likely to risk an all-out war. By the same token, insofar as the forces of the Third Camp and of the 'uncommitted world' are finally tied to or identified with one or the other imperialist camp, the outbreak of the world-consuming war is brought so much closer.

"Hence, the apologists for imperialism who, in the name of the struggle against totalitarian Stalinism, on the one side, or in the name of the struggle against capitalism, on the other, are seeking to break the resistance of the forces of the Third Camp and to undermine their independence in order to enlist them on the side of Washington or Moscow, are in actuality working to bring closer the day when the total war breaks out. Contrarywise, the possibility of prolonging the period of peace and even averting the outbreak of war altogether lies exclusively with the maintenance of the Third Camp, with organizing and coordinating its endeavors, with sharpening and deepening its independence from both war camps.

"Confused, demoralized, tired, skeptical and cowardly elements have deserted the struggle for democracy, socialism

and freedom in recent years, asserting that there is no basis for an independent struggle or movement, or that none exists or has any significant strength or importance, and that all those who still seek to maintain their independence must take the 'practical' and 'realistic' step of joining and subordinating themselves to one of the war camps. Yet the forces of the Third Camp, at which all deserters sneer, have proved powerful enough, and their resistance to the two imperialist camps, even though it is still mainly a passive, uncoordinated, not fully clarified resistance, has proved firm enough, to produce the present relaxation of the immediate war danger. It is to these forces mainly, and in no wise to the peaceable proclivities of the two imperialist powers, that the world today owes its breathing spell."

### Time to Prepare

Thus even the stalemate reflected the anti-war pressure of the Third Camp. Today, the East European revolution represents this decisive factor raised to an active force, within the Stalinist world. It is not merely "passive, uncoordinated, not fully clarified resistance," such as still mostly obtains outside the Stalinist sphere; it is the face of the alternative to both war camps, socialist revolution.

This means that world socialism has time. It has time, among other things, to revive, readapt, regain the spirit of revolutionary militancy, and fit itself to win back the Stalinized or disillusioned sectors of the working class.

This means a great blow against the panic-mongering line that only Western military power and its H-bombs can save us from the imminent horrors of a Stalinism which is fast expanding all over the world. This line, always false to the core, leaned for its demoralizing effect on the notion, never justified, that the Stalinist power was ready at any moment to unleash a war to conquer the planet by force of arms and that there stood in the way only the military strength of the capitalist war camp, which must therefore be staunchly supported by anyone who did not want to become a totalitarian slave.

Whatever propagandist power this line once had—and it must have been considerable, judging by the number of demoralized ex-radicals who yielded to it—it is clear today that there is not an ounce of truth to it. The power that stands arrayed to stop the Stalinist menace is not the Western alliance's H-bomb—which cannot do it in any way that provides a progressive outcome for the world—but is the socialist revolution, the real revolution which is constructing a "socialist encirclement" around the Moscow empire.

## II

### HOW SOCIALISTS CAN AID THEIR REVOLUTION

If the Eastern European revolution has already been of inestimable aid to socialism in the West, it is also true that one of the leading tasks of Western socialism is, in turn, to come to the political aid of the embattled anti-Stalinist upsurge.

**Political aid!** We do not advocate or support advocacy of the military intervention by any of the imperialist powers, or the UN, in this revolutionary battle. The American and Western labor and socialist movements can give new might and new heart to the anti-Stalinist revolution primarily with new political weapons above all.

This question of political aid to the anti-Stalinist revolution offers another and excellent framework for reviewing and refurbishing the whole arsenal of

foreign policy, specifically a democratic foreign policy, for the working class.

### THE SOCIALIST ALTERNATIVE

(1) The East European and Russian peoples are told that there is no hope for them in the West, not only from the capitalists but from the socialists who support the capitalists. They are given to feel—that is, their rulers want to make them feel—that they have no friends to lean on in the West who are not "bourgeois-restorationists" or other devils.

The first job of Western socialism is to show the peoples who suffer under Stalinism that capitalism and capitalist imperialism is not the force which would take advantage of their sacrifice if they were to launch the struggle against their

## HOW THEIR REVOLT AIDS WORLD SOCIALISM

### BY SHAKING WORLD COMMUNISM

(1) By unmasking the open anti-socialist and anti-revolutionary intervention of the Stalinist forces, by showing that the populations of the Eastern European countries are united to the death in hatred of the Russian totalitarianism which masquerades as socialism, the Hungarian and Polish revolutions have struck the most shattering blow yet seen against the whole international Stalinist myth, against all illusions about Russia as a socialist or workers state, against the bases on which every Communist Party lives. All over the world, Communist Parties have been split, or shaken, or seriously weakened.

Very important among these consequences has been the driving of a wedge in many places between the Communist Parties that remain loyal to Moscow and left-wing socialists, including left-wing socialists who have fellow-traveled with these CPs up to now—as in Italy, where a healthier distance has been interposed between the PSI (Nenni party) and the Stalinists, with bettered prospects of socialist unity. Very important also has been the appearance of open and semi-organized factions in formerly monolithic CPs, factions leaning in the direction of democratized views, as in the case of the American and British CPs.

The Communist world apparatus has not yet been shattered as a whole, but it is netted with cracks almost everywhere and shaken in some places.

Insofar as the Communist movement disintegrates, or wherever it starts falling apart, to that extent the socialist movement has a new and bright future to look forward to. The revival of world socialism can be the result.

This is true most particularly not only of the socialist movement as a whole, and all sections of it, but specifically of the left-wing and revolutionary Marxist currents within the various socialist movements. The discreditment of Stalinism frees them of an incubus in more than one way.

On the one hand, it weakens a competitor for the minds of precisely those workers in the various countries who are most thoroughly antagonistic to capitalism or of any of capitalism's political agents.

On the other hand, it tends to free the left-wing socialists themselves of certain illusions about Stalinism or ideological concessions to it which are so common throughout the world (e.g., the Bevanites in England; Nenni-ites in Italy; the "New Left" and allied left-wing groups in France). Thus it helps organizationally and politically to fit the revolution-

ary socialists for their task inside the socialist movement, as well as stimulating and aiding the socialist movements as a whole.

### BY POSTPONING WAR

(2) On the scale of world politics, the rise of the anti-Stalinist revolution means above all the postponement of the danger of war which has hung over the peoples.

A new buffer appears between East and West—not a go-between but a barrier—the socialist revolution in East Europe. It is not the regimes of "Popular Democracy" that are the buffer; it is the growing revolution against these regimes.

The Russian despots will think a hundred times longer before taking any action in the direction of precipitating war as long as on their eastern flank there is not a single people and not a single regiment of any of the satellites on which they can count with certainty for loyalty, indeed for anything except hatred.

As long as the Hungarian and Polish revolutions are burning, the ground is too hot for power-politics-as-usual. As in the capitalist world, the rulers can dare to resort to war in the midst of revolutionary discontent only in such case as they can expect that the outbreak of war would tend to replace that revolutionary discontent with a newly awakened chauvinism and "war spirit" that derives from a desire to defend the nation against foreign aggression real or fancied. There is little possibility of that in East Europe short of outright madness on the part of Western imperialism.

The outbreak of revolution in East Europe has also turned up the pressure within the Western camp toward a less aggressive posture toward Russia, thus making an additional contribution toward a breathing spell in world affairs.

### No Trigger

We reject the notion spread by the Stalinists as well as by any Western pundits that the East European revolution itself increases, rather than decreases, the danger of triggering off war.

The thought behind this is that if the revolution spreads, especially if it spreads from the Stalinist side of the Iron Curtain to this one, the governments will get panicky and desperate, thus possibly resorting to war in order to stop the process. While there is no insurance against sheer madness, no real politics can be founded on the assumption that the rulers either in Moscow or Washington (or London, the new H-bomb

# The Fight for Socialist Democracy on Both Sides of the Curtain...

rulers. Insofar as there is a strong Third Camp movement in the West, the Eastern European revolution is heartened to grow and fight.

## NO IMPERIALIST DEAL

(2) It is a prime duty of labor and socialists to oppose and ward off any Washington-Moscow deal over the bodies of the Eastern European peoples.

Such a deal, or rather its possibility, is what gives to the slogan of "peaceful coexistence" as that slogan is used by its protagonists, its sole concrete meaning. It is not a question of whether the two rival systems and war camps can coexist indefinitely without coming to a clash. In the short range, in its given difficult position the Russian bureaucracy can see good reason in coming to at least a temporary agreement with the Western camp to ease some points of antagonism, or reduce the arms burden, or compromise on some powderkeg area. The United States on its part, in and out of the administration, has strong pressures within it pointing to the possibility of a deal too. For both, the objective would be a trustworthy deal to leave each others' bailiwick alone, to harden the division of the world between the two camps.

Among Russia's interests in such a deal would be precisely the agreement to leave East Europe, and all other satellites and dependencies, to the unchallenged domination of the Kremlin. The importance of this would not consist in the Western aid to these peoples that would thereby be withdrawn, for this scarcely exists, but in the political abandonment of the East European revolution which would be heralded.

Socialists fight such a denouement, not as partisans of the reactionary "liberation" demagogy of the right-wing Republicans, but as partisans of the East European socialist revolution. Socialists would fight the whole conception of such a deal, whether or not it was put forward under the guise of "peaceful coexistence" or with any other slippery slogan, and would under no circumstances support it if it were made. No deal with the Kremlin against the revolution!

It is a pity that the idea of such a deal finds considerable acceptance among socialist elements in the world, though its anti-revolutionary impact is muted and its "peace" aspect is what is usually operative. The hope for "negotiations" with Russia is one of the facets of neutralism (not to speak of Stalinist-inspired propaganda for it). In turn, the demand for "negotiations with Russia" usually means the desire for a "peace" deal that will leave both war camps satisfied, if not sated.

This neutralist slogan has anti-war sentiment as its progressive kernel, but it manifests the inevitable sterilization of any "peace" slogan which seeks peace in a non-revolutionary direction. If peace is to be achieved in any way on the basis of, and by, the existing imperialist powers (which is the unspoken assumption of such thinking), then it is truly hard to see any other road to peace than an amicable agreement among them; and an amicable agreement among imperialists is severely limited in its content.

Thus, although neutralism reflects the inchoate Third Camp leanings of masses of people who do not want to tie themselves to either camp, it reflects them in a fundamentally reformist way. This is the central characteristic of neutralism as distinguished from a genuinely Third Camp approach. This is why so much of neutralism points simultaneously to both a healthy sentiment among the people and a reactionary political program in its concrete crystallization.

## IMPERIALISM AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

(3) To give the fullest political aid to the East European revolution, socialists must fight uncompromisingly against their own government's imperialism. This generality has been given dramatic substance and fearful vividness by the events of the anti-Stalinist upsurge of 1956.

In the case of both the Hungarian and Polish revolutions, the involvement of

Western imperialism was such as to play a great rôle in permitting the Stalinists to turn the revolution back.

In their bloody suppression of the Hungarian Revolution on November 4, the Russian forces took maximum advantage of the world scandal created by the French-British-Israeli attack on Egypt, which in turn had been launched at its hour in all probability to take advantage of Russia's involvement in East Europe. In considerable part the Kremlin did indeed succeed in covering its crime with the contemporaneous crime of the Western aggressors' intervention; in Asia, for instance. While it cannot be asserted with certainty (as British, Austrian and other socialists asserted) that the Russians would not have moved in on Budapest as they did except for the cover provided by the colonialists, there can not be the slightest doubt that the Kremlin's task was immeasurably eased.

What is certain, too, is that no one could confidently appeal to the indignation of militant workers against the Russian crime in Hungary who did not likewise condemn the assault on Egypt. In the turmoil and ferment within the Communist movement following those November days, it is understandable that bourgeois apologists for the Egyptian adventure were the last ones who could be effective in persuading workers that suppression of a smaller and weaker country was heinous enough to merit a political break with its perpetrators.

In Britain the Labor Party, by coming out against the aggression, under the pressure of its left wing, was able to deliver a body blow to the Communist movement and to come before the people as a whole with clean hands. But in France and other Western European areas, it was unfortunately the social-democracy which was specially compromised.

It is a fact to be faced that two of the three governments in the disgraceful attack on Egypt were led by "socialists," that is, by leaders of socialist parties—Guy Mollet and David Ben-Gurion, the former being indeed in that period the head of a French government carrying on brutal and murderous colonialist massacres of the Algerian fighters for national freedom. It is significant that it is in France that there is a mass Communist Party supported by a majority of the working class which has been least of all affected by the East European revolution and which has remained most staunchly old-style Stalinist of all.

The lesson which is thereby told is the interpenetration of the imperialists' guilt; the pattern by which each oppressive camp feeds on the sins of its rival, without which it could not continue to dominate its own dissentience; and the primary necessity for a socialist movement to break with its own imperialism before it can help, and not hinder, the East European revolution.

In the case of the Polish Revolution too, one of the biggest weapons used (by the Gomulka regime) to turn back the advance of the revolutionary forces, divide and demoralize them, and finally reduce them to uncertainty and inaction, while the regime strengthens the trend toward totalitarianization and makes concessions to the discredited Stalinists, was the appeal which pointed to the dangers of German remilitarization and NATO to the West. NATO, which has been able to boast of very few successes on its own account, helped provide Gomulka with his success to a decisive extent.

The German social-democracy, which at least opposed German remilitarization even though in its inconsistent and negative way, presented the Stalinists with another form of aid in turning back the Polish Revolution, together with the bourgeois parties. The German SDP, unfortunately, counterposes to Adenauer's policy not a Third Camp position but the perspective of a deal with Russia which would re-establish German unity with the Kremlin's blessing. The Adenauer government, which in its nature opposes any working-class revolutionary government, looked upon the Polish revolution as a threat to its NATO orientation. The Social Democratic Party leaders, while hostile to Stalinism and capitalist restora-

tion, looked upon the Polish revolution as premature and a deterrent to their perspective of a unified Germany achieved by Russian consent. Thus instead of aiding and encouraging the Polish Left, the German Social Democrats manifested fear of the perspective of a socialist revolution in Poland.

It is therefore the continuing responsibility of the socialist left in the West to work for the transformation of the social-democratic parties into militant, class struggle organizations with a policy of complete independence toward capitalism and Stalinism and for the restoration of a consistent socialist foundation in all these parties.

## WITHDRAW TROOPS!

(4) In this connection a fundamental demand that must be raised by socialists, as a measure of vital political aid to the East European revolution, is that for withdrawal of all foreign troops from Europe.

We believe that the Khrushchev proposal for mutual withdrawal of all troops from foreign areas (U.S. from Europe, Russia from all East Europe) is probably a gigantic bluff; that the Kremlin knows that it can depend only on its own troops (if on them!) in the last analysis to keep the satellites on its leash. If it is a bluff, that bluff must be called. If it turns out not to be a bluff, then we are all the more confident that the maneuver can be fateful for the Russian masters. In any case and either way, a political blow can be struck at the fundamentals of Stalinist power by following this road.

The issue faces American policy with its fundamental dilemma: rely on military force, or rely on politically undermining Russian power?—a dilemma which it invariably solves by adopting the former line, for Western capitalism shows itself incapable of meeting the Stalinists in the political warfare which is decisive for the fate of the world.

As long as American troops man the NATO "Maginot Line" in Europe, it is only the Kremlin that benefits. The people in the country involved tend more and more to look upon the troops as a new occupation. The peoples of Eastern Europe can believe that it is only their continued presence which keeps the Russian forces on their own neck.

While we demand the withdrawal of all foreign troops, including both U.S. and Russian, to their own countries, an essential part of a political program to aid the anti-Stalinist revolution from the West is the demand that the U.S. take the initiative now in withdrawing its own troops whether or not the Russians withdraw their troops simultaneously, on the basis of our conviction that a failure of the Stalinists to follow suit would make their position completely untenable politically and in any case would enormously stimulate the revolution against Stalinism in all the countries that it dominates.

## DEMOCRATIC FOREIGN POLICY

(5) The above points are to be understood within the context of a Program for a Democratic Foreign Policy such as was set forth in the 1951 and 1954 ISL resolutions.

A genuinely and consistently democratic foreign policy cannot be implemented by a capitalist government. As indicated, the international social-democracy is far from standing for such a program. The implementation of such a program requires not only a labor government (that is, a government organized and led by a working-class party) but only such a labor government as takes over the nation and defends the interests of the working people on the basis of a genuinely democratic course in foreign and domestic policy which is not in fact subordinated to the interest of capitalism and imperialism.

Such a government, which in our view must inevitably be or become a socialist workers' government, is the objective of all genuine socialists.

## Amendments

The following amendments are submitted by Comrade Hal Draper.

### (1) ON ARMS TO HUNGARY.

In Part II, second paragraph, after "Political aid!"—replace the sentence beginning "We do not advocate . . ." with the following:

"We do not call for such actions as would turn an anti-Stalinist revolution into an inter-imperialist war. With this in mind, we do not call on any of the imperialist powers, including the U.S., or on the UN, to intervene in this battle militarily or by sending arms."

### (2) ON THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY.

In Part II, section (3), last paragraph of section—replace this paragraph with the following:

"In the most concrete way, not in theory but in demonstrated life, the lack of a revolutionary policy to the west of the Iron Curtain was one of the factors which blocked the extension and victory of the East European revolution in 1956. It is therefore the continuing responsibility of the socialist left in the West ("something we can do") to transform this factor, namely, the complete degeneration and theoretical bankruptcy of the official Social Democratic leaderships in Europe, who represent nothing more than petty-bourgeois socialism in the working-class movement; that is, the policy of reforms within the framework of maintaining capitalism, at its best, and social-imperialism, at the worst. Nevertheless, despite the political character of its leadership, we note our continuing view that the place of revolutionary socialists is within these mass social-democratic parties in Europe, and not in sects outside them."

## CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 5)

members in that area are active in two major Forum groups, one in San Francisco, one in Berkeley. These Forums include the entire radical movement in the area and are scrupulously limited to discussing socialist ideas and problems.

I addressed a friendly audience of about 250 students at a street-corner meeting outside Sather Gate—a traditional "free speech" area near the University of California—on the "United States and the Arab World." Despite the fact that the meeting took place on the last day of school when the students were generally preoccupied with finals, this turned out to be one of the largest campus radical meetings in years.

During the balance of my stay in the area I mostly addressed various audiences on the general question of regroupment.

### "OPENING TO THE RIGHT"

At two public meetings I debated the representative of the YSL minority on this question. My general impression is that neither the Cannonite nor the YSL minority's line on socialist regroupment (they seemed to me fairly similar) are capable of attracting any real support from the audiences to which they are addressed, i.e., the ex-Stalinists and stalinoids. The major single reason for this seems to be that those groups do not understand that their audience, if not themselves, are above all interested in what they term "an opening to the right," a movement which can function by bringing socialist ideas to the labor movement as it is here and now, and to the lib-lab world in general.

The balance of the tour covered well-established YSL units of Chicago and Pittsburgh, both of which give every evidence of being able to continue their steady functioning. At no time since the formation of the YSL have so many opportunities existed for the building of a socialist youth movement in this country.

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

# UAW Takes a Step Back --

## The ISL Program in Brief

(Continued from page 2)  
of the AFL-CIO stand take a parallel position but pointed in the opposite direction. If the Federation proposes to handle racketeers and Communists in the same manner, so do these critics. They defend those who are victimized for refusing to testify on the Communist Party and insist that it is just as necessary to spring to the defense of racketeers hailed before the congressional committees.

In the Daily Worker, George Morris is convinced that the whole campaign inside the labor movement against racketeers is really a subtle device for facilitating action against "progressives." The Militant all but makes a hero out of Dave Beck for refusing to testify and denounces the AFL-CIO for capitulating to the bosses by acting against him!

### THE DIFFERENCE IS VITAL

But if a defense of the justified democratic rights of all dissenters in the labor movement, including CP members and sympathizers, depended upon a defense of the rights of racketeers, it would indeed be a sad and hopeless cause. But that is not the case.

Reuther is fond of making this point: There's not much difference between Communists and racketeers; one deals in ideological values and the other in monetary values. This aphorism rings so nicely that it is disappointing to discover that it means nothing.

For it is exactly the difference between "ideological values" (that is, politics) and "monetary values" (that is, simple crimes) that is the nub of the whole issue.

In his letter, Reuther unconsciously makes a distinction between the two. If a rank-and-filer refuses to testify about Communism, he does not prescribe discipline. But suppose some other rank-and-filer refused to testify about connections with labor racketeering? Would he be exempt from charges? I doubt it!

Suppose a union officer was once a member of the Communist Party and, as many have done, quit and became its bitter enemy. If he testified freely before a committee, the union would find it not merely unpunishable but positively laudable. Suppose, however, another union official testified that he once stole money from the union treasury, had been deep in rackets but now decided to give it up. Can anyone in his right mind imagine that the UAW would welcome him into the fold?

### NO THOUGHT COPS

It is a simple difference and one that everyone would grant if they could immunize themselves against the waning witchhunt hysteria. A racketeer is a mere criminal who should be driven out of the labor movement and perhaps put in jail. A Communist union member is motivated by political ideas which must be combatted politically. The police are properly concerned with crime but let them keep their hands off politics.

The labor movement has its own responsibility for acting against racketeers; for decades union progressives demanded that it fulfill this responsibility. At last, the united labor movement is acting and everyone should hail its decision.

The racketeers have taken refuge in theories of union "autonomy"; they have resisted intervention in their criminal

affairs by pleading for "democracy." In the days when he was highly touted as nothing less than a successful though honest businessman, Dave Beck argued that no union could remove an officer until he has been tried and convicted in the courts with every chance to appeal. He based himself upon "democracy," the Constitution, justice and humanity; it has since been revealed that he was actually motivated by more mundane considerations.

The labor movement must not wait for action by the government; it has the moral responsibility to clean out crookedness itself. As George Meany puts it: it may not be against the law to carry on certain rackets, but it is against the trade-union law.

### UNDER "TRADE-UNION LAW"

Even racketeers deserve all their legal rights. If they evade or conceal corrupt practices before official government bodies and refuse to testify about them, that is and should remain their right under the law; but it is not their right under the trade-union law.

It is not simply a question of taking the Fifth Amendment in general. But where a union official is clearly evading answers to questions about stealing union funds or engaging in labor racketeering, the labor movement is duty-bound to call him to account and, if he cannot defend himself, to throw him out.

Perhaps, if we searched carefully and calmly into every nuance of the question, we would discover that in some obscure case someone accused of racketeering was denied some aspect of his union rights. That would be regrettable. But it is hardly enough to arouse anyone's emotion or to inspire a campaign for the defense of "democratic rights for racketeers." The witness has the right to protect himself. But the union has a right to protect itself.

But, we insist, the case of Communists or those accused of Communism or those required to answer questions about it is basically different. Their "crime" is almost invariably that of holding unorthodox opinions or of belonging to the CP on the basis of their opinions. The government campaign against them is motivated primarily by the aim of destroying their right to hold their views or to carry on political activity.

There has been a witchhunt and it continues. Here it is a question of defending elementary democracy.

### ENFORCE THE CONSTITUTION?

So far, we base our position on a defense of the democratic rights of all, including Communists, and upon their right to be members of unions and to hold office if elected. "But," it can be argued, "that is where you stand; but you have not been able to convince the labor movement; most unions bar Communists from holding office, even from membership; if a man makes himself suspect by taking the Fifth, how can you object to us, from our point of view, acting against him under our constitution?"

It is hard to object to enforcing the constitution; at least this much, however, must be underlined: By adopting such Constitutional provisions and by enforcing them, the union movement finds it hard to stand up firmly to the Eastland inquisitors! But that is not all.

Let us leave the question of the rights of Communists in particular and go back to the issue that is agitating people today: the union attitude toward those who stand on the Fifth Amendment in refusing to answer questions about Communism. Remember, not all those who invoke the Fifth Amendment are Communists!

### AGAINST FORCED STOOLING

The 1954 UAW letter went into some detail on this point and it is reaffirmed in the recent administrative letter:

"We recognize fully that to waive the privilege of the Fifth Amendment involves the risks of incurring abuse, mental torture, the possible eventuality of being forced into the distasteful role of informer on one's friends and former associates and finally the possibility of being cited for contempt of Congress. . . .

"The problem of the former Communist who has for some considerable time broken with the party and who has

clearly demonstrated his complete opposition to the Communist Party, its policies and program, and whose loyalty to America has been proven unmistakably, is confronted with a considerably more difficult problem when he appears before a committee of this type. A favorite device of such committees to humiliate the former Communist who today plays an honorable and constructive role in the labor movement is to insist on his naming all other persons ever known to him as Communists—no matter how long ago and no matter whether they have continued in the party or, like himself, sickened of it and got out. The committee insists in such circumstances that the witness become an informer on old friends who may have gotten into the party under the same circumstances as himself and who to his knowledge were never remotely engaged in any activities of a treasonable or conspiratorial nature. These people may, like himself, have completely broken with the Communist Party and have clearly demonstrated their loyalty to America by constructive support of democratic ideals and principles.

"The attempt of the committee to blackmail the witness under such circumstances by threats of contempt citations is indecent and immoral and will not contribute in any way to strengthening the security of the nation. It is obvious that the FBI has superior information on all such people and to force such testimony can only do great harm to such persons, their families, children and relatives. . . .

"The technicalities with which the courts have fenced in the privilege provided by the Fifth Amendment not to be a witness against one's self puts the witness in danger of prosecution for contempt if he has made any disclosure of his own membership because by so doing he has waived the constitutional privilege. We of the UAW-CIO, while recognizing this risk, believe it is a price well worth paying to help defend our basic liberties in this period of growing hysteria and political immorality."

### THE PRICE PAID

At that time, the UAW letter was cast in the form of advice to its members and officers alike. Now, however, the union insists that its officers testify fully before such committees or face charges in the union. And all the risks and injustices it has cited? The union finds that "a price well worth paying." Unfortunately, the individual officer is the one who is asked to take the risk and do the paying.

All union officials, however unimportant, are asked to risk jail; to dare contempt proceedings, to brave their own self-contempt as stool pigeons and ruin friends who may have joined the CP for the best of motives. This is a big assignment to foist upon small officials. All this, so that the top officers might be spared the need to defend decency and democracy in a forthright way under somewhat difficult and even embarrassing circumstances.

Then too, it should be far easier for the union to stand up against the Eastland committee today than it was in 1954. Since then, the witchhunt hysteria has been pushed back; the Supreme Court has bolstered the Fifth Amendment against all those who would violate its effectiveness.

### PRUDENT?

Alas, we are not all heroes, at least not to the same extent and for the same things. Even a man who is not as "brave" as he should be according to union rules, and who is not ready to risk all for his own conscience and for his superiors' convenience, deserves his rights and should expect his union to defend them.

The irony lies in this: the lone individual is asked to throw caution to the wind; to act with personal courage and take the consequences; but the powerful union movement, its leaders backed by millions, its treasuries bulging . . . must be prudent.

If the individual union official is asked to demonstrate courage, his union should show him the way by exposing the aims of the Eastland witchhunters as before, protesting against its attempts to intimidate unionists, defending its victims.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

Don't miss a single week of  
**LABOR ACTION**  
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

## Take Lead --

(Continued from page 1)

on, the testing of nuclear weapons must be a part of it.

From any point of view, it is to the interest of all socialists that they unite and give leadership to the general popular anti-nuclear-test sentiment.

World History—Year by Year  
The bound volumes of  
**LABOR ACTION**  
1950-54.....\$3 per vol.

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, New York City